The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its economic engagement toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela.

What is economic engagement in the context of the resolution? We begin the 1AC by defining economic engagement as the antithesis of equal relationships and cooperation, the opposite of itself. Engagement is exploitation and subjugation of people, ideas, and things, and the never ending expansion of economic power.

In the debate space, economic engagement manifests itself in cross-ex, when we look at the judge instead of communicating with our opponents. We are taught to speak at each other, to always argue and not to ask open ended questions for fear that the other person will talk too much or actually answer our questions. Wins are the currency of debate. One can use them to purchase friends, ballots, and sheer advantage. Trash talking can be used as a weapon, if you try hard enough, and so people cut other debaters to little pieces, hoping to regain some credibility. Women and people of color are merely spectacles and statistics, numbers which we use to create the illusion of diversity. They are meant to be seen, but not to be heard.

In American foreign policy, economic engagement is the way in which we treat people in other countries. We see each country as only its government and engage with this government through primarily selfish means. This is epitomized in the Washington Consensus, an umbrella policy used so the US could look like the benevolent of Latin America. We overthrow leaders who we dislike and replace them with people who we can manipulate like puppets. We force engagement on countries and ignore their resistance. Venezuela is currently the leader of the anti-American movement. They rally countries and have publicly stated that they aren’t going to stand for the disrespectful, neoliberal way that America engages with the rest of the world. Our response was to ignore them, only reacting when they threw out American ambassadors, when we declared a quid pro quo and threw out exactly the same number of Venezuelan ambassadors. Profit driven decision making also leads to environmental destruction in the name of monetary success. All of these actions can be characterized with one word – neoliberalism, the framework underlying every policy the US does, making market efficiency the a priori issue for social interaction.

The resolution is an invitation to critically examine our method of engagement. Treating the resolution as a call to action is the equivalent of handing someone a blank check. The cloak of neoliberalism over our policy making and knowledge production shields us from developing critical thought about American foreign policy. This same cloak enshrines the relationships which we sustain with other people, corrupting and contaminating the way we understand what a friend is. This is the primary reason why we think that new ideas don’t belong – we accept the resolution without interrogating it. Why don’t we write the topic paper? Or the topic?

#### Voice needs to develop value in order for us to question dominant structures. Neoliberalism within international policies and within our interpersonal relationships results in contaminated social cooperation. Alexis and I had people literally stand right in front of us during cross-ex, or snap at us for no reason. People read wrong forum counterplans and then told us that they weren’t telling us to get out. Everyone read generic framework blocks against us. No one actually listened. No one actually understood that we had debated switchside for two years. No one engaged me in a discussion of my narrative. No one bothered to analyze the value of having a debate about debate, and no one established what they think the debate space should look like. We’re telling you now – we’re offended by people who ignore the 1AC. The narrative matters. We’re telling you now that debate is personal, and that discussion of personal experiences is a good thing. Let’s talk about people, because debate doesn’t exist without them. Let’s talk about interpersonal relationships. Because knowing how to coexist with the rest of your species in a way that doesn’t hurt thousands of people is more valuable than pretending to pass policies and learning how to abuse other countries. This is an impact.

Couldry 10 (7/14/2010, Nick, Professor of Media and Communications at Goldsmiths University of London, “Why Voice Matters: Culture and Politics After Neoliberalism,” LW)

This reflexive concern with the conditions for voice as a process, including those that involve its devaluing, means that 'voice', as used here, is a value about values or what philosophers sometimes call a 'second order' value.¶ Why should this distinction be important? What can the term 'voice', used in this special way, add to other terms, such as democracy or justice, in helping us think about political change? The reason lies in a historically specific situation. A particular discourse, neoliberalism, has come to dominate the contemporary world (formally, practically, culturally and imaginatively). That discourse operates with a view of economic life that does not value voice and imposes that view of economic Life on to politics, via a reductive view of politics as the implementing of market functioning. In the process of imposing itself on politics and society, neoliberal discourse evacuates entirely the place of the social in politics and politics' regulation of economics. These moves have been implemented in various ways in different countries, whether or not they are formal democracies and to greater or lesser degrees using the disguise of democracy. The result is the crisis of voice under neoliberalism. I offer 'voice' here as a connecting term that interrupts neoliberalism's view of economics and economic life, challenges neoliberalism's claim that its view of politics as market functioning trumps all others, enables us to build an alternative view of politics that is at least partly oriented to valuing processes of voice, and includes within that view of politics a recognition of people's capacities for social cooperation based on voice, I use one word - voice - to capture both the value that can enable these connections and the process which is that value's key reference-point. The term 'voice', as used here, does not derive from a particular view of economic processes (consumer 'voice') or even mechanisms of political representation (political 'voice'), but from a broader account of how human beings are. The value of voice articulates some basic aspects of human life that are relevant whatever our views on democracy or justice, so establishing common ground between contemporary frameworks for evaluating economic, social and political organization (for example, the varied work of philosophers Paul Ricoeur and Judith Butler, development economist Amartya Sen, social theorist Axel Honneth and political theorist Nancy Fraser); and it links our account of today's crisis of voice to a variety of sociological analyses (from diagnoses of the contemporary workplace to accounts of particular groups' long-term exclusion from effective voice). All are resources for addressing the contemporary crisis of voice and thinking beyond the neoliberal framework that did so much to cause it.

Dear debate,

The United States Federal Government should are words imprinted into my mind by your adamant policing of my agency. The words change, but the arguments I spit out are exactly the same. And it always came down to playing pretend. We pretend to be policy makers, and then a judge chooses their favorite pretend policy, and then nothing happens. For all of two years, I thought that pretending was good for my education. The more times I practice pretending, the better I’ll be at pretending. You stole from me the knowledge that I was an agent of change. It took me two whole years to realize that playing a game doesn’t get you ready for real life.

Stealing back my agency happened over the course of a month. This past summer, I spent a month trying to reconfigure my approach to debate. I had to reprogram myself to question the foundation of my beliefs. I forced myself to value the opinions of people at the SNFI, and to listen to the people I met, like Judy Butler and jon sharp, with an open mind. I met new people this summer, and debated with someone whose experiences in life had been completely different from mine, and she really opened my eyes. One common ideal stuck out to me in all my conversations, especially during the pirates lecture – put yourself into debate, don’t put debate into you. Debate is the cultures and values established by the community. Without us, debate doesn’t exist. And for us to conform to an activity dependent upon our individuality is ridiculous. Once I changed the way I thought about debate, I stopped trying to become the perfect pretend policymaker. Judy Butler spent three weeks explaining to me why understanding the implications of our actions is important, and the power of a nuclear explosion is only one of these implications. But we have to analyze the implications for **all** who our action could affect, which means the object of our action is just as relevant as ourselves, and every perspective matters. We ignore interpersonal relationships in the spirit of winning, as if we were at war. We kill every soldier who is wearing the wrong color. We don’t try to figure out who we are killing. If the bomb drops, we analyze the statistics instead of understanding how many civilians just died. We play a superficial game, and forget that we are only playing pretend.

At the culmination of this analysis, I looked to myself. What kind of game was I playing? And was it time for that game to change? Asking myself these questions, and putting thought into them, I realized that the wins and losses don’t mean it’s a game. There is more at stake than just a win. There comes a point when our education is compromised. Because if I really wanted to play a game, I’d be at home right now. Last year, I had to force myself to stay in the activity because it was a place where I didn’t ever want to be. A place where we refuse to engage because it might cost us the W. We have a caste system in debate, a social class organization that doesn’t belong in an academic activity. I spent too long at the edge of the cliff, ready to quit. I was lucky enough that someone gave me the right answers to the right questions. Not everyone is so fortunate.

October 18, 2013

Dear Nikki and Lexi:

From one outsider to two other outsiders:

In 2011 I attended the Tournament of Champions at Kentucky University with Damyir Davis and Miguel Feliciano from Beacon High School – I had been working with them whenever possible since the beginning of their junior year when we met at Scranton’s tournament – Scott Odekirk was hired by the TOC tournament that year to do a website following the events at the tournament, including full debate rounds and interviews with various people at the tournament – he interviewed a lot of my colleagues and by the third day of the tournament, he and I were swapping debate stories when he asked whether he could interview me for the tournament web site so he could get an “outsider’s” perspective on the tournament – I have been coaching debate professionally since 1983 while still in college (served for 10 years at Northwestern’s Institute, 15 at Emory’s Institute), started coaching full time straight out of college in 1986 for Emory University, coached at Woodward Academy, I am a co-founder of the Stanford Institute and senior faculty their since its inception, taught the first Urban Debate Lab, etc) The team I accompanied to the tournament ended up undefeated and the top seed – I was stunned by his conception of what (and who) is inside the community of debate - If I am an outsider what exactly does it take to be an “insider/” It seems that 28 years of successful participation at what some would consider the highest levels of the national debate scene had earned me the status of “outsider.” This is a stunning level of insularity; where a 28-year veteran of the process is still considered an outsider, regardless of either the success of my teams or the depth of my relationship with debaters – it became clear that regardless of the level or quality of my participation in debate that I would never achieve “insider” status in some people’s minds– I imagine insider status has less to do with coaching or even success but much more to do with an intellectual commitment to a certain way of thinking that supports the status quo of debate – one that I do not ascribe to – and because of that I can never be considered “inside” the community.

Judy Butler

How we verify our truth claims is predicated upon four main parts:

1. Organic intellectuals are those who artistically disrupt hegemonic structures by forming coalitions.
2. Academic intellectuals are deemed experts in their field by society. Credentials lend them ethos in the public sphere. The authors cited before reading excerpts of their article are the academic intellectuals in the 1ac.
3. Personal narratives are the sharing of personal experiences by the movement. My narrative is a truth claim.
4. Subjugated knowledges are the genealogies and narratives which are coopted and pushed out of the public sphere by oppressive narratives. The entirety of the 1ac functions as a way to expose subjugated knowledges.

Effective formation of truth claims is imperative to the development of good knowledge production. If one finds something to be untrue, it is unethical and bad for education if this person was to read that argument anyway. Reading arguments without analyzing their truth value bankrupts our decision-making capabilities. Without a balanced understanding of truth, we assume that the knowledge we have is truth, and often times the academies from which we gain our knowledge are driven by dominant knowledges. Changing the way we understand truth, and finding the best way to identify the basis of policies is critical to epistemological growth and critical thinking. The judge is placed in a position to be an individual analyzing policy, and ultimately to be a teacher in an academic activity. We facilitate the analysis of the underlying framework of every economic interaction with Latin America. Critical Pedagogy is interlinked with ethical questions and genealogy. It is the only way to be able to operate in the real world, not the make believe one we create by playing ‘pretend.’

Giroux 11 (Chair of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, “Rejecting Academic Labor as a Subaltern Class: Learning from Paula Freire and the Politics of Critical Pedagogy”, http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/8\_2/Giroux8\_2.html, AD)

Paulo Freire and Henry A. Giroux, Amherst, Massachusetts, 1981. (Photo: Henry A. Giroux) Paulo Freire is one of the most important critical educators of the 20th century.[1] Not only is he considered one of the founders of critical pedagogy, but he also played a crucial role in developing a highly successful literacy campaign in Brazil before the onslaught of the junta in 1964. Once the military took over the government, Freire was imprisoned for a short time for his efforts. He eventually was released and went into exile, primarily in Chile and later in Geneva, Switzerland, for a number of years. Once a semblance of democracy returned to Brazil, he went back to his country in 1980 and played a significant role in shaping its educational policies until his untimely death in 1997. His book, "Pedagogy of the Oppressed," is considered one of the classic texts of critical pedagogy, and has sold over a million copies, influencing generations of teachers and intellectuals both in the United States and abroad. Since the 1980s, there has been no intellectual on the North American educational scene who has matched either his theoretical rigor or his moral courage. Most schools and colleges of education are now dominated by conservative ideologies, hooked on methods, slavishly wedded to instrumentalized accountability measures and run by administrators who lack either a broader vision or critical understanding of education as a force for strengthening the imagination and expanding democratic public life. As the market-driven logic of neoliberal capitalism continues to devalue all aspects of the public good, one consequence has been that the educational concern with excellence has been removed from matters of equity, while the notion of schooling as a public good has largely been reduced to a private good. Both public and higher education are largely defined through the corporate demand that they provide the skills, knowledge and credentials that will provide the workforce necessary for the United States to compete and maintain its role as the major global economic and military power. Consequently, there is little interest in both public and higher education, and most importantly in many schools of education, for understanding pedagogy as a deeply civic, political and moral practice - that is, pedagogy as a practice for freedom. As schooling is increasingly subordinated to a corporate order, any vestige of critical education is replaced by training and the promise of economic security. Similarly, pedagogy is now subordinated to the narrow regime of teaching to the test coupled with an often harsh system of disciplinary control, both of which mutually reinforce each other. In addition, teachers are increasingly reduced to the status of technicians and deskilled as they are removed from having any control over their classrooms or school governance structures. Teaching to the test and the corporatization of education becomes a way of "taming" students and invoking modes of corporate governance in which public school teachers become deskilled and an increasing number of higher education faculty are reduced to part-time positions, constituting the new subaltern class of academic labor. But there is more at stake here than a crisis of authority and the repression of critical thought. Too many classrooms at all levels of schooling now resemble a "dead zone," where any vestige of critical thinking, self-reflection and imagination quickly migrate to sites outside of the school only to be mediated and corrupted by a corporate-driven media culture. The major issue now driving public schooling is how to teach for the test, while disciplining those students who because of their class and race undermine a school district's ranking in the ethically sterile and bloodless world of high stakes testing and empirical score cards.[2] Higher education mimics this logic by reducing its public vision to the interests of capital and redefining itself largely as a credentializing factory for students and a Petri dish for downsizing academic labor. Under such circumstances, rarely do educators ask questions about how schools can prepare students to be informed citizens, nurture a civic imagination or teach them to be self-reflective about public issues and the world in which they live. As Stanley Aronowitz puts it: "Few of even the so-called educators ask the question: What matters beyond the reading, writing, and numeracy that are presumably taught in the elementary and secondary grades? The old question of what a kid needs to become an informed 'citizen' capable of participating in making the large and small public decisions that affect the larger world as well as everyday life receives honorable mention but not serious consideration. These unasked questions are symptoms of a new regime of educational expectations that privileges job readiness above any other educational values."[3] Against this regime of "scientific" idiocy and "bare pedagogy" stripped of all critical elements of teaching and learning, Freire believed that all education in the broadest sense was part of a project of freedom, and eminently political because it offered students the conditions for self-reflection, a self-managed life and particular notions of critical agency. As Aronowitz puts it in his analysis of Freire's work on literacy and critical pedagogy: Thus, for Freire literacy was not a means to prepare students for the world of subordinated labor or "careers," but a preparation for a self-managed life. And self-management could only occur when people have fulfilled three goals of education: self-reflection, that is, realizing the famous poetic phrase, "know thyself," which is an understanding of the world in which they live, in its economic, political and, equally important, its psychological dimensions. Specifically "critical" pedagogy helps the learner become aware of the forces that have hitherto ruled their lives and especially shaped their consciousness. The third goal is to help set the conditions for producing a new life, a new set of arrangements where power has been, at least in tendency, transferred to those who literally make the social world by transforming nature and themselves.[4] What Paulo made clear in "Pedagogy of the Oppressed," his most influential work, is that pedagogy at its best is about neither training, teaching methods nor political indoctrination. For Freire, pedagogy is not a method or an a priori technique to be imposed on all students, but a political and moral practice that provides the knowledge, skills and social relations that enable students to expand the possibilities of what it means to be critical citizens, while expanding and deepening their participation in the promise of a substantive democracy. Critical thinking for Freire was not an object lesson in test taking, but a tool for self-determination and civic engagement. For Freire, critical thinking was not about the task of simply reproducing the past and understanding the present. On the contrary, it offered a way of thinking beyond the present, soaring beyond the immediate confines of one's experiences, entering into a critical dialogue with history and imagining a future that did not merely reproduce the present. Theodor Adorno captures the spirit of Freire's notion of critical thinking by insisting that "Thinking is not the intellectual reproduction of what already exists anyway. As long as it doesn't break off, thinking has a secure hold on possibility. Its insatiable aspect, its aversion to being quickly and easily satisfied, refuses the foolish wisdom of resignation.... Open thinking points beyond itself."[5] Freire rejected those regimes of educational degradation organized around the demands of the market, instrumentalized knowledge and the priority of training over the pursuit of the imagination, critical thinking and the teaching of freedom and social responsibility. Rather than assume the mantle of a false impartiality, Freire believed that critical pedagogy involves both the recognition that human life is conditioned not determined, and the crucial necessity of not only reading the world critically, but also intervening in the larger social order as part of the responsibility of an informed citizenry. According to Freire, the political and moral demands of pedagogy amount to more than the school and classroom being merely the instrument of official power or assuming the role of an apologist for the existing order, as the Obama administration seems to believe - given its willingness to give Bush's reactionary educational policies a new name and a new lease on life. Freire rejected those modes of pedagogy that supported economic models and modes of agency in which freedom is reduced to consumerism and economic activity is freed from any criterion except profitability and the reproduction of a rapidly expanding mass of wasted humans. Critical pedagogy attempts to understand how power works through the production, distribution and consumption of knowledge within particular institutional contexts and seeks to constitute students as informed subjects and social agents. In this instance, the issue of how identities, values and desires are shaped in the classroom is the grounds of politics. Critical pedagogy is thus invested in both the practice of self-criticism about the values that inform teaching and a critical self-consciousness regarding what it means to equip students with analytical skills to be self-reflective about the knowledge and values they confront in classrooms. Moreover, such a pedagogy attempts not only to provide the conditions for students to understand texts and different modes of intelligibility, but also opens up new avenues for them to make better moral judgments that will enable them to assume some sense of responsibility to the other in light of those judgments//. Freire was acutely aware that what makes critical pedagogy so dangerous to ideological fundamentalists, the ruling elites, religious extremists and right-wing nationalists all over the world is that, central to its very definition, is the task of educating students to become critical agents who actively question and negotiate the relationships between theory and practice, critical analysis and common sense and learning and social change. Critical pedagogy opens up a space where students should be able to come to terms with their own power as critically engaged citizens; it provides a sphere where the unconditional freedom to question and assert is central to the purpose of public schooling and higher education, if not democracy itself. And as a political and moral practice, way of knowing and literate engagement, pedagogy attempts to "make evident the multiplicity and complexity of history."[6] History in this sense is engaged as a narrative open to critical dialogue rather than predefined text to be memorized and accepted unquestioningly. Pedagogy in this instance provides the conditions to cultivate in students a healthy skepticism about power, a "willingness to temper any reverence for authority with a sense of critical awareness."[7] As a performative practice, pedagogy takes as one of its goals the opportunity for students to be able to reflectively frame their own relationship to the ongoing project of an unfinished democracy. It is precisely this relationship between democracy and pedagogy that is so threatening to so many of our educational leaders and spokespersons today and it is also the reason why Freire's work on critical pedagogy and literacy are more relevant today than when they were first published. According to Freire, all forms of pedagogy represent a particular way of understanding society and a specific commitment to the future. Critical pedagogy, unlike dominant modes of teaching, insists that one of the fundamental tasks of educators is to make sure that the future points the way to a more socially just world, a world in which the discourses of critique and possibility in conjunction with the values of reason, freedom and equality function to alter, as part of a broader democratic project, the grounds upon which life is lived. This is hardly a prescription for political indoctrination, but it is a project that gives critical education its most valued purpose and meaning, which, in part, is "to encourage human agency, not mold it in the manner of Pygmalion."[8] It is also a position, that threatens right-wing private advocacy groups, neoconservative politicians and conservative extremists. Such individuals and groups are keenly aware that critical pedagogy, with its emphasis on the hard work of critical analysis, moral judgments and social responsibility, goes to the very heart of what it means to address real inequalities of power at the social level and to conceive of education as a project for freedom, while at the same time foregrounding a series of important and often ignored questions such as: "What is the role of teachers and academics as public intellectuals? Whose interests does public and higher education serve? How might it be possible to understand and engage the diverse contexts in which education takes place? What is the role of education as a public good? How do we make knowledge meaningful in order to make it critical and transformative? In spite of the right-wing view that equates indoctrination with any suggestion of politics, critical pedagogy is not concerned with simply offering students new ways to think critically and act with authority as agents in the classroom; it is also concerned with providing students with the skills and knowledge necessary for them to expand their capacities both to question deep-seated assumptions and myths that legitimate the most archaic and disempowering social practices that structure every aspect of society and to then take responsibility for intervening in the world they inhabit. Education is not neutral. It is always directive in its attempt to teach students to inhabit a particular mode of agency; enable them to understand the larger world and one's role in it in a specific way; define their relationship, if not responsibility, to diverse others and to presuppose through what is taught and experienced in the classroom some sort of understanding of a more just, imaginative, and democratic life.