### **CP**

text –

#### Vote aff to affirm economic engagement by United States with Latin America through the lens of epistemic disobedience – this delinking from Western thought breaks the illusion of progressive modernity and portrays the reality of our colonial domination – this is the ONLY effective and ethical affirmation of the resolution.

#### OUR NET BENEFIT IS CRITICAL GEOPOLITICS

#### THE WORD “THE” IN FRONT OF USFG IS A VIOLENT ACT OF GEOPOWER

Thrift 2000

[Nigel Prof of Geography @ Univ. of Bristol. "Its's the Little Things" Geopolitical Traditions. A Century of Geopolitical Thought: in Atkinson, D., Dodds, K. (eds) Page 383-385 Google Print] [ct]

<1st few sentences of paragraph inaccessible to print.google>

words function to bring about geopolitical change and it is not possible to do so as long as geopolitical forces continue to be framed as "big" and "commanding" (with all the masculine overtones.) Some of the most potent geopolitical forces are, I suspect, lurking in the 'little' 'details' of people's lives, what is "carried" in the specific variabilities of their activities' (Shotter and Billig 1998: 23), in the context of utterances. And these variabilities have immediate consequences. Thus,

As Bakhtin notes, and is confirmed by the work in conversational analysis, 'we sensitively catch the smallest shift in intonation, the slightest interruption of voices in anything of importance to us in another person's practical everyday discourse. All those verbal sideward glances, reservations, loopholes, hints, thrusts do not slip past our ear, are not foreign to our own lips' (Bakhtin 1984: 201). And we in turn show our stance to what they do or say also in fleeting bodily reactions, facial expressions, sounds of approval or disapproval, etc. Indeed, even in the continuously responsive unfolding of non-linguistic activities between ourselves and others - in a dance, a handshake, or even a mere collision on the street - we are actively aware of whether the other's motives are, so to speak, 'in tune' or 'at odds' with ours. And in our sense of their attunement or lack of it, we can sense their attitude to us as intimate or distant, friendly or hostile, deferential or arrogant, and so on. (Shotter and Billig 1998: 23).

Thus, very effective work has been done in disciplines like anthropology and discursive psychology (Billig 1995, 1997) which attempts to provide a sense of how national identity and an accompanying geopolitical stance are inscribed through the smallest of details. Thus, for example, national identity is not accomplished in grand displays which incite the citizen to wave the flag in a fit of patriotic fervour. Instead, it goes on in more mundane citations:

it is done unobtrusively on the margins of conscious awareness by little words such as 'the' and 'we'. Each day we read or hear phrases such as 'the prime minister', 'the nation', or 'the weather'. The definite article assumes deictically national borders. It points to the homeland: but while we, the readers or listeners, understand the pointing, we do not follow it with our consciousness - it is a 'seen but unnoticed' feature of our everyday discourse. (Shotter and Billig 1998: 20).

Such work goes some way towards understanding the deep, often unconscious aggressions which lurk behind so much geopolitical 'reasoning', which through small details build a sense of 'us' as not like 'them', and from which political programmes then flow as infractions are identified and made legible.

In these few brief comments, I hoped to have outlined a parallel agenda for critical geopolitics, one still based on discourse, but on discourse understood in a broader way, and one which is less taken in by representation and more attuned to actual practices. In turn, such an agenda leads us away from interpretation of hyperbolic written and drawn rhetorics (which, I suspect, are often read by only a few and taken in by even fewer) towards the (I hesitate to say 'real') work of discourse, the constant hum of practices and their attendant territorializations within whcih geopower ferments and sometimes boils over.

#### GEOPOWER IS AT THE ROOT OF WAR MAKES CASE IMPACTS INEVITABLE

Tuathail 96

[Gearoid Professor, Government and International Afffairs, School of Public and International Affairs, Virginia Tech Critical Geopolitics: the politics of writing global space Page/s 1-2 GooglePrint] [ct]

Geography is about power. Although often assumed to be innocent, the geography of the world is not a product of nature but a product of histories of struggle between competing authorities over the power to organize, occupy, and administer space. Imperial systems throughout history, from classical Greece and Rome to China and the Arab world, exercised their power through their ability to impose order and meaning upon space. In sixteenth-century Europe, the centralizing states of the "new monarchs" began organizing space around an intensified principle of royal absolutism. In regions both within and beyond the nominal domain of the Crown, the power of royal authority over space was extended and deepened by newly powerful court bureaucracies and armies. The results in many instances were often violent, as the jurisdictional ambitions of royal authority met the determined resistance of certain local and regional lords. Within the context of this struggle, the cartographic and other descriptive forms of knowledge that took the name "geography" in the earls modern period and that were written in the name of the sovereign could hardly be anything else but political. To the opponents of the expansionist court, "geography" was a foreign imposition, a form of knowledge conceived in imperial capitals and dedicated to the territorialization of space along lines established by royal authority. Geography was not something already possessed by the earth but an active writing of the earth by an expanding, centralizing imperial state. It was not a noun but a verb, a geo-graphing, an earth-writing by ambitious endocolonizing and exocolonizing states who sought to seize space and organize it to fit their own cultural visions and material interests.

More than five hundred years later, this struggle between centralizing states and authoritative centers, on the one hand, and rebellious margins and dissident cultures, on the other hand, is still with us. While almost all of the land of the earth has now, been territorialized by states, the processes by which this disciplining of space by modern states occurs remain highly contested. From Chechnya to Chiapas and from Rondonia to Kurdistan and Fast Timor, the jurisdictions of centralized nation-states strive to eliminate the Contradictions of marginalized peoples and nations. Idealized maps from the center clash with the lived geographies of the margin, with the controlling cartographic visions of the former frequently inducing cultural conflict, war, and displacement. Indeed, the rise in the absolute numbers of displaced peoples in the past twenty-five years is testimony to the persistence of struggles over space and place. In 1993 the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees estimated that roughly 1 in every 130 people on earth has been forced into flight because of war and state persecution. In 1970 there were 2.5 million refugees in the world; today that figure is well over 18.2 million. In addition an estimated 24 million people are internally displaced within their own states because of conflict. More recently, genocide in Rwanda left over 500,000 murdered and produced an unprecedented exodus of refugees from that state into surrounding states. Refugees continue to be generated by "ethnic cleansing" campaigns in the Balkans; economic collapse in Cuba; ethnic wars in the Caucasus; state repression in Guatemala, Turkey, Indonesia, Iraq, and Sudan; and xenophobic terror in many other states. Struggles over the ownership, administration, and mastery of space are an inescapable part of the dynamic of contemporary global politics.

### K

#### The 1AC operates under a destructive humanist worldview that ensures that anthropocentrism continues – causes extinction

Bell, York University department of education, and Russell, Lakehead University associate professor, 2k (Anne C. and Constance L., department of education, York University, Canada, and Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, “Beyond Human, Beyond Words: Anthropocentrism, Critical Pedagogy, and the Poststructuralist Turn,” CANADIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION 25, 3 (2000):188–203, http://www.csse-scee.ca/CJE/Articles/FullText/CJE25-3/CJE25-3-bell.pdf, p. 192)

We come to critical pedagogy with a background in environmental thought and education. Of primary concern and interest to us are relationships among humans and the “more-than-human world” (Abram, 1996), the ways in which those relationships are constituted and prescribed in mo- dern industrial society, and the implications and consequences of those constructs. As a number of scholars and nature advocates have argued, the many manifestations of the current environmental crisis (e.g., species extinction, toxic contamination, ozone depletion, topsoil depletion, climate change, acid rain, deforestation) reflect predominant Western concepts of nature, nature cast as mindless matter, a mere resource to be exploited for human gain (Berman, 1981; Evernden, 1985; Merchant, 1980). An ability to respond adequately to the situation therefore rests, at least in part, on a willingness to critique prevailing discourses about nature and to consider alternative representations (Cronon, 1996; Evernden, 1992; Hayles, 1995). To this end, poststructuralist analysis has been and will continue to be invaluable.¶ It would be an all-too-common mistake to construe the task at hand as one of interest only to environmentalists. We believe, rather, that disrupting the social scripts that structure and legitimize the human domination of nonhuman nature is fundamental not only to dealing with environmental issues, but also to examining and challenging oppressive social arrangements. The exploitation of nature is not separate from the exploitation of human groups. Ecofeminists and activists for environ- mental justice have shown that forms of domination are often intimately connected and mutually reinforcing (Bullard, 1993; Gaard, 1997; Lahar, 1993; Sturgeon, 1997). Thus, if critical educators wish to resist various oppressions, part of their project must entail calling into question, among other things, the instrumental exploitive gaze through which we humans distance ourselves from the rest of nature (Carlson, 1995).¶ For this reason, the various movements against oppression need to be aware of and supportive of each other. In critical pedagogy, however, the exploration of questions of race, gender, class, and sexuality has proceeded so far with little acknowledgement of the systemic links between human oppressions and the domination of nature. The more-than-human world and human relationships to it have been ignored, as if the suffering and exploitation of other beings and the global ecological crisis were somehow irrelevant. Despite the call for attention to voices historically absent from traditional canons and narratives (Sadovnik, 1995, p. 316), nonhuman beings are shrouded in silence. This silence characterizes even the work of writers who call for a rethinking of all culturally positioned essentialisms.¶ Like other educators influenced by poststructuralism, we agree that there is a need to scrutinize the language we use, the meanings we deploy, and the epistemological frameworks of past eras (Luke & Luke, 1995, p. 378). To treat social categories as stable and unchanging is to reproduce the prevailing relations of power (Britzman et al., 1991, p. 89). What would it mean, then, for critical pedagogy to extend this investigation and critique to include taken-for-granted understandings of “human,” “animal,” and “nature”?¶ This question is difficult to raise precisely because these understandings are taken for granted. The anthropocentric bias in critical pedagogy manifests itself in silence and in the asides of texts. Since it is not a topic of discussion, it can be difficult to situate a critique of it. Following feminist analyses, we find that examples of anthropocentrism, like examples of gender symbolization, occur “in those places where speakers reveal the assumptions they think they do not need to defend, beliefs they expect to share with their audiences” (Harding, 1986, p. 112).¶ Take, for example, Freire’s (1990) statements about the differences between “Man” and animals. To set up his discussion of praxis and the importance of “naming” the world, he outlines what he assumes to be shared, commonsensical beliefs about humans and other animals. He defines the boundaries of human membership according to a sharp, hier- archical dichotomy that establishes human superiority. Humans alone, he reminds us, are aware and self-conscious beings who can act to fulfill the objectives they set for themselves. Humans alone are able to infuse the world with their creative presence, to overcome situations that limit them, and thus to demonstrate a “decisive attitude towards the world” (p. 90).¶ Freire (1990, pp. 87–91) represents other animals in terms of their lack of such traits. They are doomed to passively accept the given, their lives “totally determined” because their decisions belong not to themselves but to their species. Thus whereas humans inhabit a “world” which they create and transform and from which they can separate themselves, for animals there is only habitat, a mere physical space to which they are “organically bound.”¶ To accept Freire’s assumptions is to believe that humans are animals only in a nominal sense. We are different not in degree but in kind, and though we might recognize that other animals have distinct qualities, we as humans are somehow more unique. We have the edge over other crea- tures because we are able to rise above monotonous, species-determined biological existence. Change in the service of human freedom is seen to be our primary agenda. Humans are thus cast as active agents whose very essence is to transform the world – as if somehow acceptance, appreciation, wonder, and reverence were beyond the pale.¶ This discursive frame of reference is characteristic of critical pedagogy. The human/animal opposition upon which it rests is taken for granted, its cultural and historical specificity not acknowledged. And therein lies the problem. Like other social constructions, this one derives its persuasiveness from its “seeming facticity and from the deep investments individuals and communities have in setting themselves off from others” (Britzman et al., 1991, p. 91). This becomes the normal way of seeing the world, and like other discourses of normalcy, it limits possibilities of taking up and con- fronting inequities (see Britzman, 1995). The primacy of the human enter- prise is simply not questioned.¶ Precisely how an anthropocentric pedagogy might exacerbate the en- vironmental crisis has not received much consideration in the literature of critical pedagogy, especially in North America. Although there may be passing reference to planetary destruction, there is seldom mention of the relationship between education and the domination of nature, let alone any sustained exploration of the links between the domination of nature and other social injustices. Concerns about the nonhuman are relegated to environmental education. And since environmental education, in turn, remains peripheral to the core curriculum (A. Gough, 1997; Russell, Bell, & Fawcett, 2000), anthropocentrism passes unchallenged.1¶ p. 190-192

#### The alternative is to endorse global suicide of humanity. The role of the ballot is to evaluate alternatives to the status quo – that allows for critical discussion and problematizes status quo issues

Kochi, Queen's University School of Law lecturer, and Ordan, linguist, 08 (Tarik and Noam, Borderlands Volume 7 Number 3, 2008, "An Argument for the Global Suicide of Humanity," p. 3)

¶ However, is the form of reflection offered by Hawking broad or critical enough? Does his mode of reflection pay enough attention to the irredeemable moments of destruction, harm, pain and suffering inflicted historically by human action upon the non-human world? There are, after all, a variety of negative consequences of human action, moments of destruction, moments of suffering, which may not be redeemable or ever made better. Conversely there are a number of conceptions of the good in which humans do not take centre stage at the expense of others. What we try to do in this paper is to draw out some of the consequences of reflecting more broadly upon the negative costs of human activity in the context of environmental catastrophe. This involves re-thinking a general idea of progress through the historical and conceptual lenses of speciesism, colonialism, survival and complicity. Our proposed conclusion is that the only appropriate moral response to a history of human destructive action is to give up our claims to biological supremacy and to sacrifice our form of life so as to give an eternal gift to others.¶ From the outset it is important to make clear that the argument for the global suicide of humanity is presented as a thought experiment. The purpose of such a proposal in response to Hawking is to help show how a certain conception of modernity, of which his approach is representative, is problematic. Taking seriously the idea of global suicide is one way of throwing into question an ideology or dominant discourse of modernist-humanist action. [3] By imagining an alternative to the existing state of affairs, absurd as it may seem to some readers by its nihilistic and radical ‘solution’, we wish to open up a ground for a critical discussion of modernity and its negative impacts on both human and non-human animals, as well as on the environment. [4] In this respect, by giving voice to the idea of a human-free world, we attempt to draw attention to some of the asymmetries of environmental reality and to give cause to question why attempts to build bridges from the human to the non-human have, so far, been unavailing.

### FW

A. Our framework – debate should be a site for contest over political proposals. This requires that the affirmative present a predictable plan of action and defends that their policy should be adopted by the United States federal government.

B. Our interpretation most predictable given the wording of the resolution:

1. The topic is defined by the phrase following the colon – the USFG is the agent of the resolution, not the individual debaters

Webster’s Guide to Grammar and Writing – 2000

<http://ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm>

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on… If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter.

1. “Resolved” expresses intent to implement the plan

American Heritage Dictionary 2000

[www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved](http://www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved)

To find a solution to; solve …

To bring to a usually successful conclusion

1. “Should” denotes an expectation of enacting a plan

American Heritage Dictionary – 2000 [www.dictionary.com]

3 Used to express probability or expectation

and, our definition excludes action by smaller political groups or individuals.

Black’s Law Dictionary Seventh Edition Ed. Bryan A. Garner (chief) 1999

Federal government **1.** A national government that exercises some degree of control over smaller political units that have surrendered some degree of powers in exchange for the right to participate in national political matters.

C. Violation – The affirmative is not an instrumental affirmation of the resolution

D. Reasons to prefer –

(1st is) Ground – The aff will always win that the principles of their advocacy are good in the abstract – we can only debate the merits of their framework if they defend the specific consequences of political implementation

Michael Ignatieff, Carr professor of human rights at Harvard, 2004 *Lesser Evils* p. 20-1

As for moral perfectionism, this would be the doctrine that a liberal state should never have truck with dubious moral means and should spare its officials the hazard of having to decide between lesser and greater evils. A moral perfectionist position also holds that states can spare their officials this hazard simply by adhering to the universal moral standards set out in human rights conventions and the laws of war. There are two problems with a perfectionist stance, leaving aside the question of whether it is realistic. The first is that articulating nonrevocable, nonderogable moral standards is **relatively easy. The problem is deciding how to apply them in specific cases.** What is the line between interrogation and torture, between targeted killing and unlawful assassination, between preemption and aggression? Even when legal and moral distinctions between these are clear in the abstract, **abstractions are less than helpful when political leaders have to choose between them in practice.** Furthermore, the problem with perfectionist standards is that they contradict each other. The same person who shudders, rightly, at the prospect of torturing a suspect might be prepared to kill the same suspect in a preemptive attack on a terrorist base. Equally, the perfectionist commitment to the right to life might preclude such attacks altogether and restrict our response to judicial pursuit of offenders through process of law. Judicial responses to the problem of terror have their place, but they are no substitute for military operations when terrorists possess bases, training camps, and heavy weapons. To stick to a perfectionist commitment to the right to life when under terrorist attack might achieve moral consistency at the price of leaving us defenseless in the face of evildoers. Security, moreover, is a human right, and thus respect for one right might lead us to betray another.

(2nd is) Topical Education – By manipulating the topic to access their political project they skirt debate about the implementation of policies by the government. Their education is distrusting of institutional study and pragmatic reform. Even if their intentions are noble, their message results in fascist totalitarianism

Martin Lewis, Assistant Professor at George Washington, 1992 *Green Delusions* p. 258

A majority of those born between 1960 and 1980 seem to tend toward cynicism, and we can thus hardly expect them to be converted en masse to radical doctrines of social and environmental salvation by a few committed thinkers. It is actually possible that a radical education may make them even more cynical than they already are. While their professors may find the extreme relativism of subversive postmodernism bracingly liberating, many of today's students may **embrace only the new creed's rejection of the past**. Stripped of leftist social concerns, radical postmodernism's contempt for established social and political philosophy—indeed, its contempt for liberalism—may well lead to right-wing totalitarianism. When cynical, right-leaning students are taught that democracy is a sham and that all meaning derives from power, they are being schooled in fascism, regardless of their instructors' intentions. According to sociologist Jeffrey Goldfarb (1991), cynicism is the hallmark—and main defect—of the current age. He persuasively argues that cynicism's roots lie in failed left- and right-wing ideologies—systems of thought that deductively connect "a simple rationalized absolute truth ... to a totalized set of political actions and policies" (1991:82). Although most eco-radicals are anything but cynical when they imagine a "green future," they do take a cynical turn when contemplating the present political order. The dual cynical-ideological mode represents nothing less than the death of liberalism and of reform. Its dangers are eloquently spelled out by Goldfarb (1991:9): "When one thinks ideologically and acts ideologically, opponents become **enemies to be vanquished**, political compromise becomes a kind of immorality, and constitutional refinements become inconvenient niceties.

### 1NC – Engagement

**Any offense they might win on the engagement flow is turned by framework.**

**And, you should have an extremely high threshold for them on engagement. They don’t actually engage with anyone. Cross apply FW here. They just end engagement.**

**Be very skeptical about granting them anything on this – in the CX of the 1AC they couldn’t even name a substantial amount of policies that need to be rejected. Cutting off all engagement because of a couple policies that the aff tries to use to prove solvency of the 1AC is not enough to justify the total isolation of Latin America.**

**TURN – In order to solve for their impacts, the US needs to engage more with Latin America.**

The Economist ’10. The Economist is a widely known newspaper that reports on current events, public affairs, and foreign policy. <http://www.economist.com/node/16990967/print> MG

Much has been done; but there is much still to do. Building on this success demands new thinking, both within Latin America and north of the Rio Grande.¶ The danger for Latin America is complacency. Compared with much of Asia, Latin America continues to suffer from self-inflicted handicaps: except in farming, productivity is growing more slowly than elsewhere. The region neither saves and invests sufficiently, nor educates and innovates enough. Thanks largely to baroque regulation, half the labour force toils in the informal economy, unable to reap the productivity gains that come from technology and greater scale.¶ Fixing these problems requires Latin America's political leaders to rediscover an appetite for reform. Democracy has brought a welcome improvement in social policy: governments are spending on the previously neglected poor, partly through conditional cash-transfer schemes, a pioneering Latin American initiative. But more needs to be done, especially to improve schools and health care, if everyone is to have the chance to get ahead. Also needed is a grand bargain to tackle the informal economy, in which labour-market reform is linked to a stronger social safety-net. And, even if some things like infrastructure and research and development plainly need more government spending, the worry is that triumphalism over escaping the financial crisis may prompt a return to a bigger, more old-fashioned state role in the economy—despite the failure of these policies in the region in the past.¶ Getting these things right will be easier if relations with the United States improve. Latin America needs to shed its old chippiness, manifest in Mr Chávez's obsession with being in the hated yanqui's “backyard”. More sensible powers, notably Brazil, should be much louder opponents of this nonsense. As they start to pull their weight on the world stage, working with the United States will become ever more important.

### 1NC – Pedagogy

**First – they say that this round is key and our position as students are key to solve for education. This doesn’t work. There are thousands of rounds all the time that actually defend the resolution and defend policy implementation. All of the education from this round is outweighed a thousand times over by the so-called “flawed” education obtained in other debates.**

#### Their intense focus on epistemology is rejectionalist – soils the chances of anything actually being solved.

#### Rejectionalism fails – look to Palestine.

Foreign Affairs 11. Published by the Council Foreign Relations. The Problem Is Palestinian Rejectionism. <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/136588/yosef-kuperwasser-and-shalom-lipner/the-problem-is-palestinian-rejectionism> MG

The true reason for the intransigence among Palestinian officials has nothing to do with settlement building; rather, it is their continued rejection of the Jewish character of Israel. The Palestinians are fully aware that once they sit down at the negotiating table and agreement is reached on all other outstanding issues, they will need to answer whether they are ready to recognize Israel as the nation-state of the Jewish people. And as Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told the U.S. Congress this past May, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict “has never been about the establishment of a Palestinian state. It has always been about the existence of the Jewish state.” He continued: “The Palestinians have been unwilling to accept a Palestinian state if it meant accepting a Jewish state alongside it.”¶ Israel has maintained its independence and self-determination through its ability to defend itself. But prowess on the battlefield is not equivalent to true stability and peace. The Palestinian refusal to recognize Israel as a Jewish state stands at the root of the struggle and behind every so-called core issue, from determining borders to resolving the dispute over Palestinian refugees. Genuine reconciliation can be achieved, then, only once the Palestinians come to terms with Israel’s existence as a Jewish state.