## T

#### Or means separate countries

#### Violation, they engage all the topic countries

#### Kills education – should increase focus on one country, rather than spreading out over a multiple different countries

Fairness -

## K

#### CP Text: We advocate the 1AC embracement, however we reject the discourse of “Central America” in favor of individual countries, Argentina ¶ Bolivia¶ Brazil¶ Chile¶ Colombia¶ Costa Rica Cuba¶ Dominican Republic¶ Ecuador¶ El Salvador¶ Guatemala¶ Haiti¶ Honduras¶ Mexico¶ Nicaragua¶ Panama Paraguay¶ Peru ¶ Uruguay¶ Venezuela

#### A - Use of the term Central America obscures the ontological questions which underlie and make the plan impossible. This both recreates colonialism and guarantees plan failure.

**Gregory 11**

Derek Gregory (Prof of Geography at University of British Columbia, Ron Johnston (Prof of Geography at Univ of Bristol), Geraldine Pratt (Prof of Geography at University of British Columbia), Michael Watts (Prof of Geography at University of California), Sarah Whatmore (Prof of Environment and Public Policy at Oxford) **The Dictionary of Human Geography (Google Books)**

1. **Latin America** In conventional usage, the term refers to those countries of the American continent that share a history of Spanish, Portuguese and French coloniaism. However, the term also **is widely used to denote al countries south ot The USA**(Lewis and Wtgen, 1997, p. 182). **The term's ambiguity has led to academic disputes over how the category is deﬁned and which countries property belong within it**. For instance, Quebec is not included, despite a history of Frenchcolonialism; nor are the Mexican states annexed by the USA in 1848. **The problem with such debates is that they presume a natural congruence between geographical categories and an underlying social reality. which can be accurately mapped. Obscured are ontological questions concerned with how categories are constituted through intersecting DISCOURSES and interlocking POWER-GEOMETRIES. Since its inception, the term ‘Latin America’ has been tangled in colonial and post-colonial contests over identity and territory** (Mignolo, 2005). John Phelan(1968) attributes the term to nineteenth-century Frendi scholars. who positionedFrance as the leader of a Latin ‘race’ engaged in a struggle tor domination againstAnglo-Saxon and Slavic racial blocs. According to Phelan (1968. p. 296). the term‘Latin America‘ was baptized in 1861 in La revue des races Latines. a magaﬂne‘dedicated to the cause of Pan-Latinism‘. Theories of Pan-Latinism were caledupon to naturalize attempts by Napoleon Ill to expand imperial power in what wasthen commonly called Hispanic America

#### B - The term “Central America” is utilized in a racist manner to elevate the Western European heritage over all other backgrounds. This marginalizes racial and cultural diversity and contributes to a faulty epistemology. This problem guarantees failure for distribution efforts of engagement.

1. **Demuro 12**
2. Examining ‘Latinidad’ in Latin America:Race, ‘Latinidad’ and the Decolonial Option Eugenia Demuro Ph.D. from the University of SydneyVisiting Fellow, School of Language Studies, College of Arts and Social Sciences,Australian National Universityhttp://www.acrawsa.org.au/files/ejournalfiles/187Demurofinalversion.pdf
3. Following the conquest and colonisation of the Americas, **the concept of race, as a category, became instrumental to social organisation and, significantly, continues to be a powerful stratagem today. This is clearly evident in** the idea of Latinidad (Latinity) that underscores **the nomenclature ‘Latin America’, which continues to elevate European heritage to the detriment of all other racial or ethnic groups.** We can see this, for example, in the fact that whilst an Aymaran Amerindian from Bolivia may not share much with an Afro-Cuban from Santiago, or with a porteñofrom Buenos Aires, or a Mexican from Tijuana, each is deemed to be Latin American. **Given the cultural heterogeneity of the region, it seems imprecise to speak of Latin America as though there were no marked differences between the nations, regions, cultures and peoples of the huge landmass that extends from the south of Río Grande to Tierra del Fuego. It is difficult to employ the term Latin America with any validity for a number of reasons:** to reiterate, **it** is the referent of an incredibly vast and heterogeneous region; additionally, the term emerged as the result of conflicts between imperial nations and was hence applied to the region from outside(see Mignolo 2005); and, most importantly, the very idea of Latinidad **functions to define Latin American identity in relation to the European heritages, and erases and marginalises the racial and cultural diversity of people residing in Latin America. For these reasons, the term Latin America and its continued usage must be seen as part of a larger program of coloniality that began with the inception of the Americas as the New World in the 15thcentury, and that continues today through global, Western capitalism and its accompanying epistemology.** In Latin America, the colonial project that began with the arrival of Europeans did not end with the cessation of Spanish and Portuguese colonial rule. In fact, **coloniality persists today and is evident in the distribution of wealth and resources across the region and the globe.**

#### C - This homogenization of Cental America undercuts effective policy implementation. Only a focus on specific countries sends a clear message toward increased economic engagement.

**Navia (prof of global studies at NYU) 11**

How Successful Was Obama's Trip to Latin America? By Peter Hakim, Patricio Navia, Cynthia Arnson
*Latin America Advisor, March 30, 2011* http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=2631

#### Patricio Navia, master teacher of global studies at New York University: "There is a clear lesson from Obama's trip to Latin America. U.S. presidents should refrain in the future from traveling to the region as a whole-unless they attend a regional summit-and instead should focus on traveling to individual countries within the region. Latin America has grown very diverse in terms of economic and social development. The political evolution of the region's democracies-or absence thereof in Cuba-has also taken on different paths depending on the specific countries. Relations with the United States have also evolved differently depending on the bilateral agenda items. Some countries are more concerned with immigration; others worry more about trade or drug policies. Thus, U.S. presidents should accept that Latin America is no longer a homogenous region and they should refrain from seeking to send the same message to all countries. Different agenda items require different messages. Different priorities necessitate designing and implementing different policies. President Obama's trip to Brazil was successful because he focused on bilateral U.S.-Brazilian issues. The visits to Chile and El Salvador were less so because Obama brought a message to the entire region and did not pay sufficient attention to the bilateral issues those two countries have with the United States. Had Obama sought to reach more narrow objectives in his trip, addressing issues that concerned Chile and El Salvador, he would have sent a clearer invitation to other Latin American countries to engage bilaterally with Washington to advance their own agendas."

### CP

#### Text: No

**Any form of engagement will result in coloniality – when confronted with colonial projects the only ethical response is radical negativity. We are compelled to be disobedient to modernity.**

**Mignolo 09** [Walter D. Mignolo, Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom, Theory and Culture 2009, published 2009]

ONCE UPON a time scholars assumed that the knowing subject in the disciplines is transparent, disincorporated from the known and untouched by the geo-political configuration of the world in which people are racially ranked and regions are racially configured. From a detached and neutral point of observation (that Colombian philosopher Santiago Castro-Gómez (2007) describes as the *hubris of the zero point*), the knowing subject maps the world and its problems, classifies people and projects into what is good for them. Today that assumption is no longer tenable, although there are still many believers. At stake is indeed the question of racism and epistemology (ChukwudiEze, 1997; Mignolo, forthcoming). And **once upon a time scholars assumed that if you ‘come’ from Latin America you have to ‘talk about’ Latin America; that in such a case you have to be a token of your culture. Such expectation will not arise if the author ‘comes’ from Germany, France, England or the US.** In such cases it is not assumed that you have to be talking about your culture but can function as a theoretically minded person. **As we know: the first world has knowledge, the third world has culture; Native Americans have wisdom, Anglo Americans have science. The need for political and epistemic delinking here comes to the fore, as well as decolonializing and decolonial knowledges, necessary steps for imagining and building democratic, just, and non-imperial/colonial societies**. Geo-politics of knowledge goes hand in hand with geo-politics of knowing. **Who and when, why and where is knowledge generated (rather than produced, like cars or cell phones)? Asking these questions means to shift the attention from the enunciated to the enunciation.** And by so doing, turning Descartes’s dictum inside out: rather than assuming that thinking comes before being, one assumes instead **that it is a racially marked body in a geo-historical marked space that feels the urge or get the call to speak, to articulate, in whatever semiotic system, the urge that makes of living organisms ‘human’ beings.** By setting the scenario in terms of geo- and body-politics I am starting and departing from already familiar notions of ‘situated knowledges’. Sure, all knowledges are situated and every knowledge is constructed. But that is just the beginning. The question is: who, when, why is constructing knowledges (Mignolo, 1999, 2005 [1995])? **Why did eurocentered epistemology conceal its own geo-historical and bio-graphical locations and succeed in creating the idea of universal knowledge as if the knowing subjects were also universal? This illusion is pervasive today in the social sciences, the humanities, the natural sciences and the professional schools. Epistemic disobedience means to delink from the illusion of the zero point epistemology.** The shift I am indicating is the anchor (constructed of course, located of course, not just anchored by nature or by God) of the argument that follows. **It is the beginning of any epistemic decolonial de-linking with all its historical, political and ethical consequences**. Why? **Because geo-historical and bio-graphic loci of enunciation have been located by and through the making and transformation of the colonial matrix of power: a racial system of social classification that invented Occidentalism** (e.g. IndiasOccidentales), that created the conditions for Orientalism; **distinguished the South of Europe from its center** (Hegel) **and, on that long history, remapped the world as first, second and third during the Cold War. Places of nonthought (of myth**, non-western religions, folklore, underdevelopment involving regions and people) today have been waking up from the long process of westernization. The anthropos inhabiting non-European places discovered that s/he had been invented, as anthropos, by a locus of enunciations self-defined as humanitas. Now, **there are currently two kinds or directions advanced by the former anthropos who are no longer claiming recognition by or inclusion in the humanitas, but engaging in epistemic disobedience and de-linking from the magic of the Western idea of modernity, ideals of humanity and promises of economic growth and financial prosperity (Wall Street dixit).** One direction unfolds within the globalization of a type of economy that in both liberal and Marxist vocabulary is defined as ‘capitalism’. One of the strongest advocates of this is the Singaporean scholar, intellectual and politician Kishore Mahbubani, to which I will return later. One of his earlier book titles carries the unmistakable and irreverent message: Can Asians Think?: Understanding the Divide between East and West (2001). Following Mahbubani’s own terminology, this direction could be identified as de-westernization. Dewesternization means, within a capitalist economy, that the rules of the game and the shots are no longer called by Western players and institutions. The seventh Doha round is a signal example of de-westernizing options. The second direction is being advanced by what I describe as the decolonial option. The decolonial option is the singular connector of a diversity of decolonials. **The decolonial paths have one thing in common: the colonial wound, the fact that regions and people around the world have been classified as underdeveloped economically and mentally. Racism not only affects people but also regions or, better yet, the conjunction of natural resources needed by humanitas in places inhabited by anthropos**. De colonial options have one aspect in common with de-westernizing arguments: the definitive rejection of ‘being told’ from the epistemic privileges of the zero point what ‘we’ are, what our ranking is in relation to the ideal of humanitas and what we have to do to be recognized as such. However, decolonial and de-westernizing options diverge in one crucial and in disputable point: while the latter do not question the ‘civilization of death’ hidden under the rhetoric of modernization and prosperity, of the improvement of modern institutions (e.g. liberal democracy and an economy propelled by the principle of growth and prosperity), **decolonial options start from the principle that the regeneration of life shall prevail over primacy of the production and reproduction of goods at the cost of life** (life in general and of humanitas and anthropos alike!). I illustrate this direction, below, commenting on ParthaChatterjee’s re-orienting ‘eurocentered modernity’ toward the future in which ‘our modernity’ (in India, in Central Asia and the Caucasus, in South America, briefly, in all regions of the world upon which eurocentered modernity was either imposed or ‘adopted’ by local actors assimilating to local histories inventing and enacting global designs) becomes the statement of interconnected dispersal in which decolonial futures are being played out. Last but not least, my argument doesn’t claim originality (‘originality’ is one of the basic expectations of modern control of subjectivity) but aims to make a contribution to growing processes of decoloniality around the world. **My humble claim is that geo- and body-politics of knowledge has been hidden from the self-serving interests of Western epistemology and that a task of decolonial thinking is the unveiling of epistemic silences of Western epistemology and affirming the epistemic rights of the racially devalued, and decolonial options to allow the silences to build arguments to confront those who take ‘originality’ as the ultimate criterion for the final judgment**.1

### ON

#### These critiques come from within a single knowledge base – no risk that their “deconstruction” is the one desired by ones most effected – who are they to speak for these people, that’s a link.

Mignolo 2, Duke University professor of Literature and Romance Studies,

(Walter, Argentine semiotician and professor at Duke University, Published Winter 2002, “The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference”, Pg. 85-86, The South Atlantic Quarterly, Volume 101, Number 1, Winter 2002, Accessed July 10 2013, JB)

I have mentioned that Wallerstein, Quijano, and Dussel have dependency theory as a common reference, and my previous argument suggested that while Wallerstein brought dependency theory to the social sciences as a discipline, Quijano and Dussel follow the political and dialectical scope of dependency theory. The epistemic colonial difference divides one from the other. Of course, this does not place one against the other but underlines the colonial difference as the limit of the assumed totality of Western epistemology. That is why to open the social sciences is a welcome move, but an insufficient one. It is possible to think, as Quijano and Dussel (among others) have, beyond and against philosophy and the social sciences as the incarnation of Western epistemology. It is necessary to do so in order to avoid reproducing the totality shared by their promoters and their critics. In other words, the critiques of modernity, Western logocentrism, capitalism, Eurocentrism, and the like performed in Western Europe and the United States cannot be valid for persons who think and live in Asia, Africa, or Latin [End Page 85] America. Those who are not white or Christian or who have been marginal to the foundation, expansion, and transformation of philosophy and social and natural sciences cannot be satisfied with their identification and solidarity with the European or American left. Nietzsche's (as a Christian) criticism of Christianity cannot satisfy Khatibi's (as a Muslim and Maghrebian) criticism of Christianity and colonization. It is crucial for the ethics, politics, and epistemology of the future to recognize that the totality of Western epistemology, from either the right or the left, is no longer valid for the entire planet. The colonial difference is becoming unavoidable. Greece can no longer be the point of reference for new utopias and new points of arrival, as Slavoj Zizek still believes, or at least sustains. 76

If Wallerstein, Quijano, and Dussel have dependency theory as a common reference, they also share a critique of Eurocentrism. 77 However, their motivation is different. Quijano's and Dussel's critiques of Eurocentrism respond to the overwhelming celebration of the discovery of America, which both scholars read not only as a Spanish question but also as the beginning of modernity and European hegemony. Both concur that Latin America and the Caribbean today are a consequence of the North Atlantic (not just Spanish and European) hegemony. Wallerstein's critique of Eurocentrism is a critique of the social sciences: "Social sciences has been Eurocentrism throughout its institutional history, which means since there have been departments teaching social science within a university system." 78 Thus Wallerstein's critique of Eurocentrism is one of epistemology through the social sciences. Quijano's and Dussel's critiques come to Western epistemology through coloniality of power from the colonial difference.

#### explain empathy bad

### DA

**A – The US focus is on the Philippines and disaster relief as part of the “pivot to Asia.”**

**Mardell on 11/12/13**

Mark, North American Editor for the BBC, Mardell: US pivots to the Philippines <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-24915818>

**President Obama's much debated "pivot to Asia**" can often seem like an abstract diplomatic desire. But it **may now be saving lives. The "pivot" has meant Mr Obama has continued switching US military focus from the Middle East to the Pacific Ocean.**

**It is controversial on many levels, but it may be paying dividends for the unfortunate people of the Philippines.** Yesterday two transport planes and a group of marines [were sent](http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/11/12/us-sends-water-generators-and-troops-to-aid-storm-survivors/) to Tacloban. New treaty likely The aircraft carrier George Washington and cruisers Antietam and Cowpens, the destroyers Mustin and Lassen, and the supply ship Charles Drew are also [heading to the area](http://killerapps.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/11/11/everyone_hates_us_bases_in_asia_until_disaster_strikes). The US military has had a tortured relationship with the Philippines - a [base was closed](http://www.nytimes.com/1991/12/28/world/philippines-orders-us-to-leave-strategic-navy-base-at-subic-bay.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm) in the 1990s, which was a real strategic loss.Recently relationships have improved a lot, and a [new treaty](http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=120696) is likely. This swift response from the US is in contrast to the Philippines' big neighbour, China. They've [offered](http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/11/12/us-china-philippines-aid-idUSBRE9AB0LM20131112) a measly $100,000. OK, they are locked in a [bitter dispute](http://globalnation.inquirer.net/80899/china-hits-manila-as-un-arbitration-proceedings-on-spratlys-dispute-start) over who owns the Spratley Islands. This makes them all the more worried about the [possible treaty](http://www.chinapost.com.tw/commentary/the-china-post/special-to-the-china-post/2013/07/21/384313/Philippine-bases.htm) **between the Philippines and the US,** but **that makes offering aid clever diplomacy, rather than comforting the enemy.**

**B – Economic engagement to (FILL IN COUNTRY NAME) is a substantial change and would require a pivot away from Asia and the Philippines.**

**Haibin 13**

(Niu [Research Fellow, Shanghai Institutes for International Studies]; Latin America's Rising Status in the Sino-US Relationship; www.chinausfocus.com/foreign-policy/latin-americas-rising-status-in-the-sino-us-relationship/; kdf)

For the Obama administration's second term, **it is a major policy adjustment rather than a policy continuation to focus on Latin America**.Since 9/11, counter-terrorism efforts, the international financial crisis, and the pivot to Asia have occupied the majority of the U.S. foreign policy agenda. Subsequently, Latin America has been an overlooked region for more than a decade. The Obama administration’s first term tried to improve its relationship with the region, but faced setbacks because of its policies on Cuba, immigration and anti-drug issues. Instead, the regional approach must be shifted to a bilateral, country-by-country approach.¶ There Obama administration’s policy shift in Latin America can be explained by two factors: the rediscovered importance of Latin America to the United States’ economic recovery and Latin America’s position as a promising region could allow US engagement to make visible achievements. First, in the 2012 presidential debates, Republican candidate Mitt **Romney criticized Obama's Latin American policy and treated the Latin American economy as an alternative to China, arguing to strengthen US trade with the region**. This argument obviously had an impact on Obama’s second term agenda and Latin American policy. Second, **following the same logic of its pivot to the Asia Pacific, Latin America is a stable and promising region the U.S. can’t afford to overlook.** Achievements in US relations with Latin America will also help Democrats win future presidential elections considering the increasing influence of Latinos in domestic politics.¶ In regards to President Xi’s Latin American policy, it is more a continuation than an adjustment of policy. In the past decade, the Sino-Latin American relationship has witnessed a golden period of development. China is the second largest trading partner for Latin America; its demand for raw materials and primary products has both improved Latin American countries’ terms of trade and contributed to the region’s better performance in dealing with the recent international financial crisis. Additionally, President Xi has worked to deepen the ties by addressing potential challenges, strengthening this promising relationship. China raised its strategic partnerships with Peru and Mexico to comprehensive strategic ones. Mutual investment, financial cooperation and open trade are being paid more attention from the Chinese side. One aim of China’s recent diplomacy is to establish a Sino-Latin American Dialogue Forum, which has received positive supports from Brazil, Mexico, and other countries within the region.¶ Now**, it is necessary to understand how this strengthening interest by the US and China in Latin America could impact the Sino-US relationship as well as Latin America as a whole**. From a geopolitical perspective**,** **both sides have some arguments to dilute each other’s influence globally**.However, policy influence of such arguments is very limited. It is natural for both world powers’ diplomatic agendas to intersect. One noteworthy argument from Chinese side is that China should enhance its engagement with regions outside of Asia as the US pivot to the Asia Pacific attempts to contain China. This argument should be interpreted to explore the diplomatic space available for China as a global power rather than to counter US hegemony. Also, China needs to understand the recent intensive American engagement with Latin America by following the same logic.¶ In fact, both countries demonstrated their pragmatic spirit and economic-oriented approach during their recent engagements with Latin America. The most cited achievement about President Xi's visit to Mexico was that China agreed to resume imports of Mexican pork and to import tequila. Similar review was also given to President Obama’s visit to Mexico by arguing the trip was to focus on economic cooperation rather than drug issues. This is a good posture considering that no Latin American country wants to choose side between the US and China. Ultimately, Latin American countries benefit from cooperation with the world’s two largest markets.¶ **Although both countries are trying to avoid geopolitical competition, it is important to manage their interaction in Latin America**. At the bilateral level, **the United States and China have held several strategic dialogues on Latin American affairs** since 2006. The purpose of the dialogue is to enhance mutual trust and prevent miscalculations by interpreting their engagements with Latin America. This continual dialogue can help interpret why the US government holds a positive attitude to China’s increasing ties with Latin America despite some very conservative and suspicious attitudes in the US. The US has showed its support to both China’s permanent observer status in the Organization of American States and China’s membership at the Inter-American Development Bank.

**C – Failure to effectively contribute aid to the Philippines increases the chance of violence against womyn and rape. We have a moral obligation to stop this. Now is key.**

**Holzer 11/12/13**

Jillian Holzer,Post-Haiyan, Urgent Action Needed to Prevent Violence Against Women, <http://womenthrive.org/media-resources/pressroom/releases/post-haiyan-urgent-action-needed-prevent-violence-against-women>

**With thousands of women in the Philippines displaced by Friday’s historic typhoon**, a leading voice for women in developing countries is calling on disaster response actors to put women’s safety front-and-center in their efforts—now, not next week. The following is a statement from Ritu Sharma, Co-Founder and President of Women Thrive Worldwide: **“The decisions made in these next few crucial days will determine the safety of womyn and girls in post-typhoon Philippines. Unless relief actors get it right, starting now we *will* see an uptick in assaults against womyn and children**. **“What we learned in Haiti in 2010, the Indian Ocean tsunami in 2004, and other natural disasters is that crises like Haiyan are especially hard on womyn and girls. We typically see an increase in rape and other forms of violence against womyn after natural disasters for many reasons. As shelters for internally displaced people are set up, response actors need to keep the concerns of womyn and girls at the forefront.** “Some steps should be obvious, yet are often overlooked. Camps should be adequately lit. Showers and latrines for women and girls should be private and secure. Shelters should be guarded against intruders. And distribution of supplies should be monitored closely to prevent sexual exploitation. **International relief agencies and government officials have a moral obligation not only to ensure that aid is being delivered, but also that measures are undertaken right away to prevent gender-based violence.”**

<this evidence has been gender modified>

**We think this is important enough to move it beyond the debate round – we will stand in silence the remainder of this speech and give you a few options of ways that you can help – we would encourage you to take out your phone and donate $10 to help with relief through one of the following ways**

**The UN World Food Programme – Text AID to 27722**

**Salvation Army – Text Typhoon to 80888**

**Or send water purification through Operation USA by texting AID to 50555**