### 1ac --- oil

#### Advantage 1 is oil.

#### Drilling in Cuba is inevitable --- the embargo prevents cooperation and coordinated response to spills --- destroys Florida’s ecosystem

\*We do not endorse ablest language

**Stephens and Colvin, 11** – Sarah, Executive Director of the Center for Democracy in the America, and Jake, VP for Global Trade Issues at the National Foreign Trade Council

(“US-Cuba policy, and the race for oil drilling,” 9/29, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/184661-us-cuba-policy-and-the-race-for-oil-drilling>)//HA

To protect the national interest — and for the sake of Florida's beaches and the Gulf of Mexico’s ecosystem— it is time to stop sticking our heels in the sand when it comes to U.S.-Cuba policy. Before the end of the year, a Chinese-made drilling platform known as Scarabeo 9 is expected to arrive in the Gulf. Once it is there, Cuba and its foreign partners, including Spain’s Repsol, will begin using it to drill for oil in waters deeper than Deepwater Horizon’s infamous Macondo well. The massive rig, manufactured to comply with U.S.-content restrictions at a cost of $750 million, will cost Repsol and other companies $407,000 per day to lease for exploration. They are taking this financial risk because Cuba needs the oil and its partners — Spain, Norway, Russia, India, Vietnam, Malaysia, Canada, Angola, Venezuela, and possibly China — believe that drilling in waters said to contain undiscovered reserves of approximately 5 billion barrels of oil is good business. In virtually every other country in the world, developments like these would prompt high-level discussions about how to exploit these resources safely or to anticipate a crisis were a disaster to strike. Experts who have studied the currents say a spill in Cuban waters would send 90% of the oil into the Keys and up the East Coast of Florida. But the embargo leaves Florida’s sensitive coastal resources defenseless. Due to the fact that the drilling involves Cuba, American companies and workers cannot lend their expertise to what could be a risky operation. U.S. economic sanctions prevent our private sector from helping Cuba drill safely and paralyze the U.S. government, which ought to be convening bilateral discussions on best practices and coordinating disaster response. In fact, the U.S. has no emergency response agreement with Cuba for oil spills. While some specific licenses have been granted to permit U.S. firms to conduct limited transactions with Cuba, current sanctions bar the United Statesfrom deploying the kind of clean-up equipment, engineers, spare parts for blow-out prevention, chemical dispersants, and rigs to drill relief wells that would be needed to address an oil crisis involving Cuba.

#### Cuba will keep looking for oil- it’s too early to determine nothing is there.

Maffei 12- Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs

(Elena,“The Lure of Cuban Energy Independence: One Twist After” Council on Hemispheric Affairs, June 25, 2012,<http://www.coha.org/the-lure-of-cuban-energy-independence-one-twist-after-another/)//HA>

With the conclusion of the Spanish company’s operations on the island, the Cuban dream for energy independence could vanish, especially considering that the leased platform Scarabeo 9,is the only one allowed to operate offshore in the Cuban Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), an area of 112 square kilometers in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. Repsol’s initial plan was to move the platform to a different location unless another company stepped up to lease the oil rig, at a cost of $150,000 USD per day. The Spanish company, in consortium with Statoil of Norway and the Indian ONGC, held an option to drill another well in the waters of the Cuban EEZ. But Brufau was terse in rejecting the arrangement, stating that the company preferred to concentrate its search for oil in Angola and Brazil. Unsurprisingly, Cuba does not want to abandon its quest for oil. In an official statement, the Cuban government affirmed that Repsol’s decision does not eliminate the potential of the Cuban EEZ. He asserted that the EEZ could eventually become one of the largest reservoirs of oil production worldwide, given the high estimates regarding the country’s yet to be discovered hydrocarbon reserves. A U.S. geological survey, for instance, projects a presence of approximately 5 billion barrels in oil reserves in the country.(1) In light of such figures, this dry well could be considered isolated and not totally symptomatic. Cuban oil expert at the University of Texas Jorge Piñón affirms that two unprofitable wells are not indicative of the presence or lack of oil deposits in Cuba.(2) The press release by the Cuban government clarifies that the exploration will continue and that the semi-submerged platform Scarabeo 9 (previously utilized by Repsol) has now been moved to the Catoche 1X sector, located north of the province of Pinar del Rio. The Malaysian oil company Gulf PC is operating in the new drilling site in cooperation with the Russian company Gazpromneft. Once this drilling is completed, the Scarabeo 9 will be moved again, this time further to Cabo de San Antonio 1X, and another round of drilling will likely commence under the supervision of the state-owned Venezuelan oil company PDVSA (Petroleos de Venezuela SA), which will hold the master lease on the platform.(3)

#### Catastrophic oil spills coming now – Cuba can’t access US safety equipment.

Davenport, 11 (Coral, National Journal, “Drill, Bebe, Drill,” 7/28, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/will-sloppy-drilling-off-the-coast-of-cuba-threaten-florida-gulf-beaches--20110728)//HA

But the potential of a closer relationship with Cuba comes with a terrifying specter: An oil blowout in Cuban waters could reprise the nightmare that was last year’s Gulf of Mexico oil spill, and send crude spewing to the beaches of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina. And the likelihood for such a disaster is very real, say oil industry experts, thanks in part to Washington’s 49-year-old embargo on Cuba. Because of the embargo, U.S. companies cannot drill in Cuba, supply equipment to Cuba, have any say over safety regulations in Cuba, or even take part in helping control a blowout and spill in Cuba. As the island prepares to begin offshore drilling, it has signed contracts with oil companies from Brazil, India, Italy, Russia, and Spain—and is in talks to lease major portions of its coastal water to Chinese companies (continuing China’s pattern of pursuing oil exploration in countries where U.S. drillers aren’t welcome). Under the embargo’s terms, the oil drilling and safety equipment used by those companies must be less than 10 percent U.S.-made. But all of the most technologically advanced equipment for drilling and preventing or stopping oil spills is made in the United States or by U.S. companies. “There are not international suppliers of this level of equipment. They will have to buy copycat or second-tier parts,” Lee Hunter, president of the Houston-based International Association of Drilling Contractors, told National Journal. Hunter and other experts say that, to date, it appears that the Cuban government, fearful of the devastation an oil spill could wreak on its economy, wants to use the lessons learned from the BP oil disaster to develop a rigorous safety and oversight program. But it will be nearly impossible for drillers in Cuba’s waters to legally use the safest equipment. “The Cubans want to use good technology; they want to drill safely,” Hunter said. “But … their ability to drill safely is extremely compromised.” Also deeply compromised is their ability to respond to a disaster should it occur. Even if oil from a Cuban spill laps at Florida’s shores, the U.S. agencies and oil companies that have all-too-hard-won expertise in wrestling a spill—the Coast Guard, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Interior Department—would be banned from crossing into Cuban waters to help. And experts say that the Cuban oil industry and government don’t yet have a fraction of the resources and expertise they would need to deal with such an event on their own. State Department officials are well aware of the problem, and they are working with Hunter’s group, along with others, to find a way for U.S. companies to get into Cuban waters—if not to drill, at least to help out in case of a spill. One way this could happen is if the Treasury Department issues special advance licenses granting U.S. companies the ability to travel to Cuban waters to give aid in a disaster. Cuban officials are also cautiously indicating interest in cooperating with the U.S. on the plan, despite the embargo.

#### US tech is key to prevent and contain a spill – international companies’ methods are unsafe.

Rogers, 12 – Bacevich Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, focusing on science, technology, and national security (Will, “Western Hemisphere Happenings: Cuba’s Continued Quest for Offshore Oil” December 17, 2012, http://www.cnas.org/blogs/naturalsecurity/2012/12/western-hemisphere-happenings-cuba-s-continued-quest-offshore-oil.html)//HA

With fresh memories of the Gulf Coast Deepwater Horizon accident, U.S. government officials – including the U.S. Coast Guard – have been increasingly worried about offshore oil drilling in non-U.S. waters that could impact the U.S. coast if an accident occurs. Increased activity in Cuban waters is a particular concern for U.S. officials. A March 2012 The Washington Post report noted that Cuba’s capacity to respond to an offshore oil spill is extremely limited, with “only 5 percent of the resources needed to contain a spill approaching the size of the Deepwater Horizon disaster.” These concerns have also raised the question of how the United States could respond to an oil spill in Cuban waters given the state of U.S.-Cuba relations, including export restrictions that prohibit U.S. companies from providing equipment or otherwise performing response functions that could be construed as aiding the Cuban government. In particular, the half-century old Cuban embargo obliges any company operating in Cuba to use only equipment that contains less than 10 percent U.S.-made parts in order to avoid sanctions. This means that companies operating in Cuba’s deepwater may not necessarily be using the most sophisticated or the safest tools and techniques shared by U.S. drilling companies. This might not be a concern in shallow water (several hundreds of feet deep), but in ultra deep water (depths beyond 1,500 meters), U.S. companies have a comparative advantage over many other international drilling companies. Moreover, deepwater drilling remains risky, even for U.S. companies. And while Zarubezhneft plans to drill in shallower water for its next project, it is still drilling in deep water: 6,500 meters. Given that Washington does not maintain official diplomatic ties with Havana, it is unclear how the United States and Cuba would cooperate around an oil spill that could have economic and environmental implications for U.S. coastal communities, and it is something that should be a concern for U.S. officials as drilling continues off Cuba’s coast.

#### Florida is a unique biodiversity hotspot

Alles, 07 – Professor of Biology at the Western Washington University (David L., “Biodiversity Hot Spots: The Florida Everglades”, 3/7/2007, http://www.biol.wwu.edu/trent/alles/Everglades.pdf)

"Biodiversity hot spots are areas where endemic species with small ranges are concentrated. Not all are in the tropics, but most are. Hot spots can be extraordinarily concentrated; thousands of species may be found within a relatively small area. Species with small ranges are particularly vulnerable to impacts. Nature has put her eggs in a small number of baskets, and we are in danger of dropping them. On land, worldwide 25 areas are recognized as hotspots which contain concentrations of endemic species that are disproportionately vulnerable to extinction from regional habitat destruction. These areas retain less than 10% of their original habitat and have unusually high human population densities." (Pimm, 2001) ¶ The Florida Everglades contains one of the highest concentrations of species vulnerable to extinction in the United States. The 5,000-square-kilometre wetland in southern Florida is home to at least 60 endangered species, including the American crocodile (Mason, 2003). And the area retains less than 10% of its original habitat as the human population density of southern Florida threatens to over-run one of the most unique habitats in North America.¶ The Florida Everglades in the Afternoon Sun¶ Nourished by the rain soaked Kissimmee River Basin and stretching south from 700 square mile Lake Okeechobee (left center), the Everglades are a wide slow moving river of marsh and saw grass covering some 4,500 square miles, flowing slowly towards the mangrove estuaries of the Gulf of Mexico (right below center). The Everglades are a unique habitat; there are no other everglades in the world. No other place combines a subtropical climate, a broad, shallow river, and a stunning diversity of plants and animals into such a complex and fragile ecosystem. No other place is so dramatically defined by annual rhythms of drought and flood, fire and sunshine and torrential rain.¶ Everglades National Park is the largest remaining subtropical wilderness in the United States. Its abundant wildlife includes rare and endangered species, such as the American crocodile, Florida panther, and West Indian manatee. Alligators, like the one shown above, are an important part of this ecosystem, and are regarded as a “keystone” species of the Everglades. The Florida Everglades ecosystem is also the only place in the world where alligators and crocodiles exist side by side.¶ The American crocodile, shown above, was listed as an endangered species in Florida in 1975. Its numbers had dropped dramatically because of hunting and loss of habitat. Today, the American crocodile's habitat is limited to the southern half of Florida, and has an estimated population of 2,000 up from approximately 200 to 400 two decades ago. They are found in the ¶ U.S. in the remaining tidal marshes in the Everglades along Florida Bay and in the Florida Keys. Though the species resemble one another, crocodiles vary greatly from the more than 1 million alligators found in Florida. Crocodile color ranges from olive green to gray compared with the black hue of alligators. Their snouts are narrower, and the bottom and top teeth are visible from the side when the mouth is closed; only the upper teeth are seen on an alligator. Adult crocodiles are larger than some other crocodile species, with some males reaching lengths of 6.1 m (20 ft). Decidedly less aggressive than the infamous Nile and Australian crocodiles, American crocodiles are rarely seen by people.¶ The West Indian manatee is a large, herbivorous, aquatic mammal. These gentle creatures are endangered throughout their range. High annual mortality, primarily associated with human activity, as well as a low reproductive rate and loss of habitat continue to keep the number of manatees low and threaten the species’ future. 7¶ The manatee population has long been the focus of battles between conservationists and boaters. Boating kills dozens of manatees a year, crushing or gashing the slow-moving mammals as they rise to the surface to breathe. ¶ Red tide algae blooms have been another cause of mortality for manatees along Florida's south-central Gulf Coast. The one-cell organism that causes red tide releases a toxin when it dies, sickening manatees. Once the toxin is in the animal, it affects their coordination and causes paralysis (Flewelling, et al., 2005).¶ "Manatees on Florida’s Gulf coast are frequently exposed to brevetoxin, a potent neurotoxin produced by the dinoflagellate Karenia brevis, during red tide events. In 1996, 151 manatees were documented to have died in southwest Florida from brevetoxicosis. This epizootic was particularly detrimental to the manatee population because more adults were killed than any other age class. Other red tide epizootics in 1982, 2002, 2003, and 2005 resulted in the deaths of 37, 34, 96, and (preliminarily) 81 manatees, respectively. There is no clear evidence that these events have been increasing in frequency along Florida’s coast, but ¶ certainly the impact on the manatee population has increased over the past two decades. Viewed globally, harmful algal blooms have been increasing over the past 25 years in frequency and in their impacts on the economy, public health, and marine life." ¶ Mangrove Estuaries of Florida Bay¶ In addition to rare and endangered species, the Everglades are rightly famous for the profusion of bird species found there, with 347 species recorded within the Park boundaries. The mangrove estuaries of Florida Bay, in particular, are a breeding habitat for Roseate Spoonbills, Wood Stork, White Ibis, Glossy Ibis, and eleven species of egrets and herons.¶ The “River of Grass”¶ Once, water flowed freely from Lake Okeechobee to Florida Bay in a “river of grass”, Florida environmentalist Marjory Stoneman Douglas's poetic phrase. It is a river that is 120 miles long and 50 miles wide, but less than a foot deep. In this flat landscape, even a few inches of elevation meant the difference between wet marsh and dry ground.¶ Today, the Everglades is an ecosystem in danger of extinction. Canals and levees capture and divert its water for human use, including drinking water, irrigation, and flood control. Often, too much water is withheld from the Everglades during the wet season, or too much is diverted into it during the winter drought, disrupting the natural cycles of feeding and nesting which depend on these patterns. Much of the time the water is contaminated by pollutants.

#### So is the Caribbean

CEPF ‘10

(quoting Mittermeier -- the same author that establishes the “hotspot” thesis and writes our impact ev. , Dr. Russell Alan Mittermeier is a primatologist, herpetologist and biological anthropologist. He holds Ph.D. from Harvard in Biological Anthropology and serves as an Adjunct Professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. CEPF is the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund – “Ecosystem Profile: THE CARIBBEAN ISLANDS BIODIVERSITY HOTSPOT” – Prepared by: BirdLife International¶ in collaboration with:¶ Durrell Wildlife Conservation¶ Trust / Bath University¶ The New York Botanical Garden¶ and with the technical support of:¶ Conservation International-Center¶ for Applied Biodiversity Science; assistance for this report was offered by 100 international and non-profit organizations. Jan 15th – http://www.cepf.net/Documents/Final\_Caribbean\_EP.pdf)

The Caribbean Islands Hotspot is one of the world’s greatest centers of biodiversity and¶ endemism, yet its biodiversity and the natural¶ services it provides are highly threatened. Although¶ the islands have protected areas systems, most ar¶ e inadequately managed and important areas lack¶ protection. This strategy will ensure that CEPF¶ funds are employed in the most effective manner¶ and generate significant conservation results that¶ not only complement the actions of other¶ stakeholders but also enable significant expansion¶ of strategic conservation for the benefit of all.¶ Everyone depends on Earth’s ecosystems and their life-sustaining benefits, such as clean air,¶ fresh water and healthy soils. Founded in 2000,¶ the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)¶ has become a global leader in en¶ abling civil society to participate in and benefit from conserving¶ some of the world’s most critical ecosystems. C¶ EPF is a joint initiative of l'Agence Française de¶ Développement, Conservation International, the Gl¶ obal Environment Facility, the Government of¶ Japan, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the World Bank. As one of the¶ founding partners, Conservation International ad¶ ministers the global program through a CEPF¶ Secretariat.¶ CEPF provides grants for nongovern¶ mental and other private organizations to help protect¶ biodiversity hotspots, Earth’s most biologically¶ rich and threatened areas. The convergence of¶ critical areas for conservation with millions¶ of people who are impoverished and highly¶ dependent on healthy ecosystems is more ev¶ ident in the hotspots than anywhere else.¶ CEPF is unique among funding mechanisms in th¶ at it focuses on biological areas rather than¶ political boundaries and examines conservation th¶ reats on a landscape-scale basis. A fundamental¶ purpose of CEPF is to ensure that civil society is¶ engaged in efforts to conserve biodiversity in¶ the hotspots, and to this end, CEPF provides ci¶ vil society with an agile and flexible funding¶ mechanism complementing funding currently¶ available to government agencies.¶ CEPF promotes working alliances among commun¶ ity groups, nongovernmental organizations¶ (NGOs), government, academic institutions and¶ the private sector, combining unique capacities¶ and eliminating duplication of efforts for a¶ comprehensive approach to conservation. CEPF¶ targets trans-boundary cooperation for areas rich of¶ biological value that straddle national borders¶ or in areas where a regional approach may be more effective than a national approach.¶ A recent, updated analysis reveals the existence of¶ 34 biodiversity hotspots, each holding at least¶ 1,500 endemic plant species, and having lost at¶ least 70 percent of its original habitat extent¶ (Mittermeier¶ et al¶ . 2005). The Caribbean islands qualify as one of these global biodiversity¶ hotspots by virtue of their high endemicity and high degree of threat.¶ The Caribbean Islands Hotspot is exceptionally important for global biodiversity conservation.¶ The hotspot includes important ecosystems, fro¶ m montane cloud forests to coral reefs, and¶ supports populations of unique species amounting to at least 2 percent of the world’s total¶ species.

#### Biodiversity loss causes extinction

**Coyne and Hoekstra, 07 -** \*professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Chicago AND \*\* Associate Professor in the Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard University (Jerry and Hopi, The New Republic, “The Greatest Dying,” 9/24, http://www.truthout.org/article/jerry-coyne-and-hopi-e-hoekstra-the-greatest-dying)

Aside from the Great Dying, there have been four other mass extinctions, all of which severely pruned life's diversity. Scientists agree that we're now in the midst of a sixth such episode. This new one, however, is different - and, in many ways, much worse. For, unlike earlier extinctions, this one results from the work of a single species, Homo sapiens.We are relentlessly taking over the planet, laying it to waste and eliminating most of our fellow species. Moreover, we're doing it much faster than the mass extinctions that came before. Every year, up to 30,000 species disappear due to human activity alone. At this rate, we could lose half of Earth's species in this century. And, unlike with previous extinctions, there's no hope that biodiversity will ever recover, since the cause of the decimation - us - is here to stay.     To scientists, this is an unparalleled calamity, far more severe than global warming, which is, after all, only one of many threats to biodiversity. Yet global warming gets far more press. Why? One reason is that, while the increase in temperature is easy to document, the decrease of species is not. Biologists don't know, for example, exactly how many species exist on Earth. Estimates range widely, from three million to more than 50 million, and that doesn't count microbes, critical (albeit invisible) components of ecosystems. We're not certain about the rate of extinction, either; how could we be, since the vast majority of species have yet to be described? We're even less sure how the loss of some species will affect the ecosystems in which they're embedded, since the intricate connection between organisms means that the loss of a single species can ramify unpredictably.     But we do know some things. Tropical rainforests are disappearing at a rate of 2 percent per year. Populations of most large fish are down to only 10 percent of what they were in 1950. Many primates and all the great apes - our closest relatives - are nearly gone from the wild.     And we know that extinction and global warming act synergistically. Extinction exacerbates global warming: By burning rainforests, we're not only polluting the atmosphere with carbon dioxide (a major greenhouse gas) but destroying the very plants that can remove this gas from the air. Conversely, global warming increases extinction, both directly (killing corals) and indirectly (destroying the habitats of Arctic and Antarctic animals). As extinction increases, then, so does global warming, which in turn causes more extinction - and so on, into a downward spiral of destruction.     Why, exactly, should we care? Let's start with the most celebrated case: the rainforests. Their loss will worsen global warming - raising temperatures, melting icecaps, and flooding coastal cities. And, as the forest habitat shrinks, so begins the inevitable contact between organisms that have not evolved together, a scenario played out many times, and one that is never good. Dreadful diseases have successfully jumped species boundaries, with humans as prime recipients. We have gotten aids from apes, sars from civets, and Ebola from fruit bats. Additional worldwide plagues from unknown microbes are a very real possibility.     But it isn't just the destruction of the rainforests that should trouble us. Healthy ecosystems the world over provide hidden services like waste disposal, nutrient cycling, soil formation, water purification, and oxygen production. Such services are best rendered by ecosystems that are diverse. Yet, through both intention and accident, humans have introduced exotic species that turn biodiversity into monoculture. Fast-growing zebra mussels, for example, have outcompeted more than 15 species of native mussels in North America's Great Lakes and have damaged harbors and water-treatment plants. Native prairies are becoming dominated by single species (often genetically homogenous) of corn or wheat. Thanks to these developments, soils will erode and become unproductive - which, along with temperature change, will diminish agricultural yields. Meanwhile,with increased pollution and runoff, as well as reduced forest cover, ecosystems will no longer be able to purify water; and a shortage of clean water spells disaster.     In many ways, oceans are the most vulnerable areas of all. As overfishing eliminates major predators, while polluted and warming waters kill off phytoplankton, the intricate aquatic food web could collapse from both sides. Fish, on which so many humans depend, will be a fond memory. As phytoplankton vanish, so does the ability of the oceans to absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. (Half of the oxygen we breathe is made by phytoplankton, with the rest coming from land plants.) Species extinction is also imperiling coral reefs - a major problem since these reefs have far more than recreational value: They provide tremendous amounts of food for human populations and buffer coastlines against erosion.     In fact, the global value of "hidden" services provided by ecosystems - those services, like waste disposal, that aren't bought and sold in the marketplace - has been estimated to be as much as $50 trillion per year, roughly equal to the gross domestic product of all countries combined. And that doesn't include tangible goods like fish and timber. Life as we know it would be impossible if ecosystems collapsed. Yet that is where we're heading if species extinction continues at its current pace.     Extinction also has a huge impact on medicine. Who really cares if, say, a worm in the remote swamps of French Guiana goes extinct? Well, those who suffer from cardiovascular disease. The recent discovery of a rare South American leech has led to the isolation of a powerful enzyme that, unlike other anticoagulants, not only prevents blood from clotting but also dissolves existing clots. And it's not just this one species of worm: Its wriggly relatives have evolved other biomedically valuable proteins, including antistatin (a potential anticancer agent), decorsin and ornatin (platelet aggregation inhibitors), and hirudin (another anticoagulant).     Plants, too, are pharmaceutical gold mines. The bark of trees, for example, has given us quinine (the first cure for malaria), taxol (a drug highly effective against ovarian and breast cancer), and aspirin. More than a quarter of the medicines on our pharmacy shelves were originally derived from plants. The sap of the Madagascar periwinkle contains more than 70 useful alkaloids, including vincristine, a powerful anticancer drug that saved the life of one of our friends.     Of the roughly 250,000 plant species on Earth, fewer than 5 percent have been screened for pharmaceutical properties. Who knows what life-saving drugs remain to be discovered? Given current extinction rates, it's estimated that we're losing one valuable drug every two years.     Our arguments so far have tacitly assumed that species are worth saving only in proportion to their economic value and their effects on our quality of life, an attitude that is strongly ingrained, especially in Americans. That is why conservationists always base their case on an economic calculus. But we biologists know in our hearts that there are deeper and equally compelling reasons to worry about the loss of biodiversity: namely, simple morality and intellectual values that transcend pecuniary interests. What, for example, gives us the right to destroy other creatures? And what could be more thrilling than looking around us, seeing that we are surrounded by our evolutionary cousins, and realizing that we all got here by the same simple process of natural selection? To biologists, and potentially everyone else, apprehending the genetic kinship and common origin of all species is a spiritual experience - not necessarily religious, but spiritual nonetheless, for it stirs the soul.     But, whether or not one is moved by such concerns, it is certain that our future is bleak if we do nothing to stem this sixth extinction. We are creating a world in which exotic diseases flourish but natural medicinal cures are lost; a world in which carbon waste accumulates while food sources dwindle; a world of sweltering heat, failing crops, and impure water. In the end, we must accept the possibility that we ourselves are not immune to extinction. Or, if we survive, perhaps only a few of us will remain, scratching out a grubby existence on a devastated planet. Global warming will seem like a secondary problem when humanity finally faces the consequences of what we have done to nature: not just another Great Dying, but perhaps the greatest dying of them all.

#### Independently, biodiversity collapse causes disease spread.

**Matt and Gebser 11** – Florian and Ronny, citing Keesing et al. 2010, “Biodiversity decline can increase the spread of infectious diseases like Hantavirus,” <http://www.eea.europa.eu/atlas/teeb/biodiversity-decline-can-increase-the/view>)//a-berg

What is the problem? Intuitively one might expect that higher overall biodiversity leads to greater diversity and abundance of pathogens and thus more incidences of the transmission of diseases. Therefore, species-rich environments might be seen to exhibit a higher infection risk than anthropogenic disturbed environments with a low biodiversity. However, research results show the opposite. Several studies suggest that with the loss of biodiversity the transmission of diseases increases (Keesing et al. 2010). Thus biodiversity loss causes the loss of an important ecosystem service: buffering the spreading of infectious diseases to humans, animals and plants (Pongsiri et al. 2009). The decline of biodiversity might lead to a faster rate of emergence and re-emergence of infectious diseases, such as the Hantavirus, and therefore the infection of a greater proportion of the human population (Keesing et al. 2010, Pongsiri et al. 2009, Suzan et al. 2008, Peixoto and Abramson 2006). Regionally different genotypes of Hantaviruses cause hemorrhagic fever with renal syndrome (HFRS) in Asia and Europe and the Hantavirus pulmonary syndrom (HPS) in the Americas (Pongsiri et al. 2009). Which ecosystem services were examined? And how? The examination of circumstances of recent Hantavirus outbreaks, transmitted from host animals to humans, so called zoonoses, showed that all outbreaks occurred in anthropogenic highly disturbed habitats with reduced biodiversity (Pongsiri et al. 2009, Suzan et al. 2008). Host species of Hantaviruses are rodents and the viruses are transmitted to humans by aerosolized rodent excreta or by direct contact with the animals. Among rodents, the virus spreads through physical contacts (aggressive encounters). In general, each Hantavirus genotype is associated with a certain rodent (host) species. Therefore, the probability that a certain Hantavirus genotype infects other rodent species successfully is very low. A study in Utah, USA, found a negative correlation between small-mammal diversity and Sin Nombre Hantavirus (SNV) infection prevalence in deer mice (Clay et al. 2009). High mammalian species diversity reduced the infection prevalence mainly by reducing the intraspecific encounters rather than by reducing host density. A result also supported by experiments. Deer mouse population density was not statistically associated with SNV infection prevalence. This suggests that high diversity reduced intraspecific encounters rather than host abundance (Clay et al. 2009). There seems to be evidence that in recent outbreaks the rodent species transmitting the virus was a generalist species (Suzan et al. 2008). Generalist species have a high adaptability to a wide range of habitats and can subsist on a variety of food sources. Keesing et al. (2010) speculate that species usually amplifying pathogens tend to invest less energy into immune defence and are more vulnerable to pathogens. In contrast, specialist species are highly adapted to a narrowly defined habitat and require one or a few specific food resources and may invest more into immune defence and hence buffering pathogens (Keesing et al. 2010). Anthropogenic disturbance to natural ecosystems frequently results in extensive simplification of the environment. Often, many specialist species become locally extinct whereas the population density of certain opportunistic species rises dramatically due to their better adaptability to a changing environment and the decrease of competitive pressure. Reduced diversity of rodent species subsequently means that the virus spreads most efficiently as there are fewer encounters with other species. Thus, it can be expected that Hantaviruses are transmitted and spread most efficiently within host communities of low diversity. Furthermore, the population of a generalist species tends to increase when species biodiversity decreases in highly disturbed regions, resulting in a higher risk of disease transmission to humans (Suzan et al. 2008). Hence, if biodiversity decreases, transmission events rise due to an increase in encounter rates among infected and between infected and susceptible hosts. Assuming that a rodent has a certain amount of aggressive encounters during its life, it transmits the virus in more cases if the small-mammal diversity is low, since aggressive encounters happen more often within the same species. A recent experimental field study conducted on wild rodent populations of different species in southwestern Panama backs this view. It showed that the relative abundance of Hantavirus hosts increases with a decrease in small-mammal species diversity (See figure below from Keesing et al. 2010). This in turn increases human infection risk (Pongsiri et al. 2009, Suzan et al. 2008). As a consequence of these findings Montira et al. (2009) suggest supporting policies that maintain or enhance biodiversity rather than trying to support or eliminate a certain species. Focusing on one species can have unexpected implications such as enhancing further biodiversity loss when eliminating a rodent species that might serve as food for others or as a buffer for diseases. Keesing et al. (2010) discuss that for certain diseases it can be considered to add a species (i.e. natural enemy or competitor) in order to control the host of the disease. It is also essential to reduce antibiotic overuse in order to avoid adaptation and resistance of pathogens. Further, it is important to identify potential emergence hotspots. The conservation of natural habitats can provide protection against emerging pathogens as it does not only foster biodiversity but also helps to reduce human-wildlife contact. It is also suggested to reduce contact between domestic animals and wildlife. However, the elimination of disease hotspots has the risk to “backfire” by resulting in pathogen transmission (Keesing et al. 2010).

#### Extinction

**Yu ‘9** [Victoria, “Human Extinction: The Uncertainty of Our Fate,” Dartmouth Journal of Undergraduate Science, May 22, http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate]

In the past, humans have indeed fallen victim to viruses. Perhaps the best-known case was the bubonic plague that killed up to one third of the European population in the mid-14th century (7). While vaccines have been developed for the plague and some other infectious diseases, new viral strains are constantly emerging — a process that maintains the possibility of a pandemic-facilitated human extinction**.** Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus.  It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system.  However, for more easily transmitted viruses such as influenza, the evolution of new strains could prove far more consequential. The simultaneous occurrence of antigenic drift (point mutations that lead to new strains) and antigenic shift (the inter-species transfer of disease) in the influenza virus could produce a new version of influenza for which scientists may not immediately find a cure. Since influenza can spread quickly, this lag time could potentially lead to a “global influenza pandemic,” according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (9). The most recent scare of this variety came in 1918 when bird flu managed to kill over 50 million people around the world in what is sometimes referred to as the Spanish flu pandemic. Perhaps even more frightening is the fact that only 25 mutations were required to convert the original viral strain — which could only infect birds — into a human-viable strain (10).

#### Cuba is key to regional bio d and collapse spills over

**Almeida ‘12**

Rob Almeida is Partner/CMO at gCaptain. He graduated from the US Naval Academy in 1999 with a B.S in Naval Architecture and spent 6.5 years on active duty as a Surface Warfare Officer. He worked for a year as a Roughneck/Rig Manager trainee on board the drillship Discoverer Americas. May 18th – http://gcaptain.com/drilling-cuba-embargo-badly/

In short however, Cuba’s access to containment systems, offshore technology, and spill response equipment is severely restricted by the US embargo, yet if a disaster occurs offshore, not only will Cuban ecosystems be severely impacted, but those of the Florida Keys, and US East Coast.¶ If disaster strikes offshore Cuba, US citizens will have nobody else to blame except the US Government because outdated policies are impacting the ability to prepare sufficiently for real-life environmental threats. Considering Cuba waters are home to the highest concentration of biodiversity in the region and is a spawning ground for fish populations that migrate north into US waters, a Cuban oil spill could inflict unprecedented environmental devastation if not planned for in advance.

#### Biodiversity hotspots key

**Mittermeier ‘11**

(et al, Dr. Russell Alan Mittermeier is a primatologist, herpetologist and biological anthropologist. He holds Ph.D. from Harvard in Biological Anthropology and serves as an Adjunct Professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. He has conducted fieldwork for over 30 years on three continents and in more than 20 countries in mainly tropical locations. He is the President of Conservation International and he is considered an expert on biological diversity. Mittermeier has formally discovered several monkey species. From Chapter One of the book Biodiversity Hotspots – F.E. Zachos and J.C. Habel (eds.), DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-20992-5\_1, # Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2011. This evidence also internally references Norman Myers, a very famous British environmentalist specialising in biodiversity. available at: http://www.academia.edu/1536096/Global\_biodiversity\_conservation\_the\_critical\_role\_of\_hotspots)

Extinction is the gravest consequence of the biodiversity crisis, since it is¶ irreversible. Human activities have elevated the rate of species extinctions to a¶ thousand or more times the natural background rate (Pimm et al. 1995). What are the¶ consequences of this loss? Most obvious among them may be the lost opportunity¶ for future resource use. Scientists have discovered a mere fraction of Earth’s species¶ (perhaps fewer than 10%, or even 1%) and understood the biology of even fewer¶ (Novotny et al. 2002). As species vanish, so too does the health security of every¶ human. Earth’s species are a vast genetic storehouse that may harbor a cure for¶ cancer, malaria, or the next new pathogen – cures waiting to be discovered.¶ Compounds initially derived from wild species account for more than half of all¶ commercial medicines – even more in developing nations (Chivian and Bernstein¶ 2008). Natural forms, processes, and ecosystems provide blueprints and inspiration¶ for a growing array of new materials, energy sources, hi-tech devices, and¶ other innovations (Benyus 2009). The current loss of species has been compared¶ to burning down the world’s libraries without knowing the content of 90% or¶ more of the books. With loss of species, we lose the ultimate source of our crops¶ and the genes we use to improve agricultural resilience, the inspiration for¶ manufactured products, and the basis of the structure and function of the ecosystems¶ that support humans and all life on Earth (McNeely et al. 2009). Above and beyond¶ material welfare and livelihoods, biodiversity contributes to security, resiliency,¶ and freedom of choices and actions (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005).¶ Less tangible, but no less important, are the cultural, spiritual, and moral costs¶ inflicted by species extinctions. All societies value species for their own sake,¶ and wild plants and animals are integral to the fabric of all the world’s cultures¶ (Wilson 1984). The road to extinction is made even more perilous to people by the loss of the broader ecosystems that underpin our livelihoods, communities, and economies(McNeely et al.2009). The loss of coastal wetlands and mangrove forests, for example, greatly exacerbates both human mortality and economic damage from tropical cyclones (Costanza et al.2008; Das and Vincent2009), while disease outbreaks such as the 2003 emergence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome in East Asia have been directly connected to trade in wildlife for human consumption(Guan et al.2003). Other consequences of biodiversity loss, more subtle but equally damaging, include the deterioration of Earth’s natural capital. Loss of biodiversity on land in the past decade alone is estimated to be costing the global economy $500 billion annually (TEEB2009). Reduced diversity may also reduce resilience of ecosystems and the human communities that depend on them. For example, more diverse coral reef communities have been found to suffer less from the diseases that plague degraded reefs elsewhere (Raymundo et al.2009). As Earth’s climate changes, the roles of species and ecosystems will only increase in their importance to humanity (Turner et al.2009).¶ In many respects, conservation is local. People generally care more about the biodiversity in the place in which they live. They also depend upon these ecosystems the most – and, broadly speaking, it is these areas over which they have the most control. Furthermore, we believe that all biodiversity is important and that every nation, every region, and every community should do everything possible to conserve their living resources. So, what is the importance of setting global priorities? Extinction is a global phenomenon, with impacts far beyond nearby administrative borders. More practically, biodiversity, the threats to it, and the ability of countries to pay for its conservation vary around the world. The vast majority of the global conservation budget – perhaps 90% – originates in and is spent in economically wealthy countries (James et al.1999). It is thus critical that those globally ﬂexible funds available – in the hundreds of millions annually – be guided by systematic priorities if we are to move deliberately toward a global goal of reducing biodiversity loss.¶ The establishment of priorities for biodiversity conservation is complex, but can be framed as a single question. Given the choice, where should action toward reducing the loss of biodiversity be implemented ﬁrst? The ﬁeld of conservation planning addresses this question and revolves around a framework of vulnerability and irreplaceability (Margules and Pressey2000). Vulnerability measures the risk to the species present in a region – if the species and ecosystems that are highly threatened are not protected now, we will not get another chance in the future. Irreplaceability measures the extent to which spatial substitutes exist for securing biodiversity. The number of species alone is an inadequate indication of conserva-tion priority because several areas can share the same species. In contrast, areas with high levels of endemism are irreplaceable. We must conserve these places because the unique species they contain cannot be saved elsewhere. Put another way, biodiversity is not evenly distributed on our planet. It is heavily concentrated in certain areas, these areas have exceptionally high concentrations of endemic species found nowhere else, and many (but not all) of these areas are the areas at greatest risk of disappearing because of heavy human impact.¶ Myers’ seminal paper (Myers1988) was the ﬁrst application of the principles of irreplaceability and vulnerability to guide conservation planning on a global scale. Myers described ten tropical forest “hotspots” on the basis of extraordinary plant endemism and high levels of habitat loss, albeit without quantitative criteria for the designation of “hotspot” status. A subsequent analysis added eight additional hotspots, including four from Mediterranean-type ecosystems (Myers 1990).After adopting hotspots as an institutional blueprint in 1989, Conservation Interna-tional worked with Myers in a ﬁrst systematic update of the hotspots. It introduced two strict quantitative criteria: to qualify as a hotspot, a region had to contain at least 1,500 vascular plants as endemics (¶ >¶ 0.5% of the world’s total), and it had to have 30% or less of its original vegetation (extent of historical habitat cover)remaining. These efforts culminated in an extensive global review (Mittermeier et al.1999) and scientiﬁc publication (Myers et al.2000) that introduced seven new hotspots on the basis of both the better-deﬁned criteria and new data. A second systematic update (Mittermeier et al.2004) did not change the criteria, but revisited the set of hotspots based on new data on the distribution of species and threats, as well as genuine changes in the threat status of these regions. That update redeﬁned several hotspots, such as the Eastern Afromontane region, and added several others that were suspected hotspots but for which sufﬁcient data either did not exist or were not accessible to conservation scientists outside of those regions. Sadly, it uncovered another region – the East Melanesian Islands – which rapid habitat destruction had in a short period of time transformed from a biodiverse region that failed to meet the “less than 30% of original vegetation remaining” criterion to a genuine hotspot.

### 1ac --- plan

#### The United States federal government should substantially normalize its trade relations with Cuba.

### 1ac --- relations

#### Advantage 2 is relations:

#### Two scenarios:

#### First is OAS ---

#### US-Latin American relations have grown distant --- renewed policy key to effective relations and cooperation

**Inter-American Dialogue 12** - the Inter-American Dialogue is the leading US center for policy analysis, exchange, and communication on issues in Western Hemisphere affairs(“Remaking the Relationship The United States and Latin America”, April 2012, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)//HA

What is at stake is the future of inter-American relations, which today are generally cordial but lack vigor and purpose . Efforts at hemispheric integration have been disappointing . Effective cooperation in the Americas— even on widely shared problems like energy security, organized crime and the drug trade, and international economic volatility—remains limited and sporadic . It is the good news of Latin America’s progress that has most altered hemispheric relations . In the past decade, the region has posted its best economic performance in a generation and managed largely to sidestep the world financial crisis in 2008–2009 . The ranks of the middle classes have swelled . The region’s political structures have also opened up, giving way to growing participation by women, indigenous and Afro-descendant populations, and other once-excluded groups . All Latin Americans across a broadening spectrum have greater access to education and health services, consumer goods, and foreign travel . They now have real and rapidly expanding stakes in their societies. These advances have also led to new social stirrings which, along with demands and expectations, are notably on the rise . There are more and more pressures for further change and improvements . Impressive economic, political, and social progress at home has, in turn, given Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Colombia, Peru, and many other countries greater access to worldwide opportunities . Indeed, the region’s most salient transformation may be its increasingly global connections and widening international relationships . Brazil’s dramatic rise on the world stage most visibly exemplifies the shift. But other countries, too, are participating actively in global affairs and developing extensive networks of commercial and political ties. China is an increasingly prominent economic actor, but India and other Asian countries are intensifying their ties to the region as well . The United States has also changed markedly, in ways that many find worrisome. The 2008 financial crisis revealed serious misalignments in and poor management of the US economy—which, four years later, is still struggling to recover . Inequality has significantly widened in the United States, while much-needed improvements in education and infrastructure are ignored. The most ominous change in the United States has taken place in the political realm. Politics have become less collaborative . It is increasingly difficult to find common ground on which to build solutions to the critical problems on the policy agenda . Compromise, the hallmark of democratic governance, has become an ebbing art, replaced by gridlock and inaction on challenges that would advance US national interests and well-being. In part as a result of these shifts, US-Latin American relations have grown more distant . The quality and intensity of ties have diminished. Most countries of the region view the United States as less and less relevant to their needs—and with declining capacity to propose and carry out strategies to deal with the issues that most concern them. In the main, hemispheric relations are amicable. Open conflict is rare and, happily, the sharp antagonisms that marred relations in the past have subsided . But the US-Latin America relationship would profit from more vitality and direction . Shared interests are not pursued as vigorously as they should be, and opportunities for more fruitful engagement are being missed . Well-developed ideas for reversing these disappointing trends are scarce.

#### Cuba is a keystone nation in Latin America --- offensive diplomatic strategy pertaining to Cuba is key to reverse the Anti-American sentiment

**Perez 10** ­– JD, Yale Law (David, “America's Cuba Policy: The Way Forward: A Policy Recommendation for the U.S. State Department” 13 Harv. Latino L. Rev. 187, Spring, lexis)//HA

Anti-Americanism has become the political chant de jour for leaders seeking long-term as well as short-term gains in Latin American elections. In Venezuela, the anti-American rhetoric spewed by Hugo Chavez masks his otherwise autocratic tendencies, while countries like Bolivia and Ecuador tilt further away from Washington, both rhetorically and substantively. The former expelled the U.S. Ambassador in October 2008, and the latter has refused to renew Washington's lease on an airbase traditionally used for counter-narcotics missions. The systemic neglect for eight years during the Bush Administration meant that political capital was never seriously spent dealing with issues affecting the region. Because of this, President Bush was unable to get much headway with his proposal to reform immigration, and his free trade agreement with Colombia encountered significant opposition in Congress. Recent examples of U.S. unilateralism, disregard for international law and norms, and a growing financial crisis, have all been seized by a new generation of populist Latin American leaders who stoke anti-American sentiment. The region, however, is absolutely critical to our national interest and security. Over thirty percent of our oil comes from Latin America - more than the U.S. imports from the Middle East. Additionally, over half of the foreign-born population in the United States is Latin American, meaning that a significant portion of American society is intrinsically tied to the region. n1 These immigrants, as well as their sons and daughters, have already begun to take their place amongst America's social, cultural, and political elite. Just south of America's borders, a deepening polarization is spreading throughout the entire region. In the last few years ideological allies in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela have written and approved new constitutions that have consolidated the power of the executive, while extending - or in Venezuela's case eliminating - presidential term limits. In Venezuela the polarization has been drawn along economic lines, whereby Chavez's base of support continues to be poor Venezuelans. In Bolivia the polarization has been drawn along racial lines: the preamble to the new Bolivian constitution, approved in January 2009, makes reference to the "disastrous colonial times," a moment in history that Bolivians of Andean-descent particularly lament. Those regions in Bolivia with the most people of European or mixed descent have consistently voted for increased provincial autonomy and against the constitutional changes proposed by President Morales. Perhaps due to its sweeping changes, the new Constitution was rejected by four of Bolivia's nine provinces. n2 Like Bolivia, Latin America is still searching for its identity. [\*191] Traditionally the U.S. has projected its influence by using varying combinations of hard and soft power. It has been a long time since the United States last sponsored or supported military action in Latin America, and although highly context-dependent, it is very likely that Latin American citizens and their governments would view any overt display of American hard power in the region negatively. n3 One can only imagine the fodder an American military excursion into Latin America would provide for a leader like Hugo Chavez of Venezuela, or Evo Morales of Bolivia. Soft power, on the other hand, can win over people and governments without resorting to coercion, but is limited by other factors. The key to soft power is not simply a strong military, though having one helps, but rather an enduring sense of legitimacy that can then be projected across the globe to advance particular policies. The key to this legitimacy is a good image and a reputation as a responsible actor on the global and regional stage. A good reputation and image can go a long way toward generating goodwill, which ultimately will help the U.S. when it tries to sell unpopular ideas and reforms in the region. n4 In order to effectively employ soft power in Latin America, the U.S. must repair its image by going on a diplomatic offensive and reminding, not just Latin America's leaders, but also the Latin American people, of the important relationship between the U.S. and Latin America. Many of the problems facing Latin America today cannot be addressed in the absence of U.S. leadership and cooperation. Working with other nations to address these challenges is the best way to shore up legitimacy, earn respect, and repair America's image. Although this proposal focuses heavily on Cuba, every country in Latin America is a potential friend. Washington will have to not only strengthen its existing relationships in the region, but also win over new allies, who look to us for "ideas and solutions, not lectures." n5 When analyzing ecosystems, environmental scientists seek out "keystone species." These are organisms that, despite their small size, function as lynchpins for, or barometers of, the entire system's stability. Cuba, despite its size and isolation, is a keystone nation in Latin America, having disproportionately dominated Washington's policy toward the region for decades. n6 As a result of its continuing tensions with Havana, America's reputation [\*192] in the region has suffered, as has its ability to deal with other countries. n7 For fifty years, Latin American governments that hoped to endear themselves to the U.S. had to pass the Cuba "litmus test." But now the tables have turned, and the Obama Administration, if it wants to repair America's image in the region, will have to pass a Cuba litmus test of its own. n8 In short, America must once again be admired if we are going to expect other countries to follow our example. To that end, warming relations with Cuba would have a reverberating effect throughout Latin America, and would go a long way toward creating goodwill.

#### Cuba policy destroys OAS effectiveness --- increased relations with Cuba is vital to OAS credibility, including Cuba key reverse that trend

Ellsworth 12 (Brian Ellsworth- Senior Correspondent, Brazil at Reuters, “Despite Obama charm, Americas summit boosts U.S. isolation,” Rueters 4/16/12, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/16/us-americas-summit-obama-idUSBRE83F0UD20120416)//HA

(Reuters) - President Barack Obama sat patiently through diatribes, interruptions and even the occasional eye-ball roll at the weekend Summit of the Americas in an effort to win over Latin American leaders fed up with U.S. policies. He failed. The United States instead emerged from the summit in Colombia increasingly isolated as nearly 30 regional heads of state refused to sign a joint declaration in protest against the continued exclusion of communist-led Cuba from the event. The rare show of unity highlights the steady decline of Washington's influence in a region that has become less dependent on U.S. trade and investment thanks economic growth rates that are the envy of the developed world and new opportunities with China. It also signals a further weakening of the already strained hemispheric system of diplomacy, built around the Organization of American States (OAS) which has struggled to remain relevant during a time of rapid change for its members. Seen as an instrument of U.S. policy in Latin America during the Cold War, the OAS has lost ground in a region that is no longer content with being the backyard of the United States. "It seems the United States still wants to isolate us from the world, it thinks it can still manipulate Latin America, but that's ending," said Bolivian President Evo Morales, a fierce critic of U.S. policy in Latin America and staunch ally of Venezuela's leftist leader Hugo Chavez. "What I think is that this is a rebellion of Latin American countries against the United States." NEWFOUND UNITY White House officials disagreed with the notion that the failure to agree on issues like Cuba signaled a new dynamic to U.S. relations within the hemisphere. "We've had disagreements on those issues for decades," a senior Obama aide said. "They are built into the equation. They are about theater -- not substance." In fairness to Obama, the lack of consensus had little to do with his conduct or even that of Secret Service agents whose indiscreet encounter with prostitutes in the beachside city of Cartagena, Colombia, overshadowed much of the proceedings. He was in fact commended by several presidents for listening politely to political leaders, helping soften perception of U.S. officials as arrogant and domineering. "I think it's the first time I've seen a president of the United States spend almost the entire summit sitting, listening to the all concerns of all countries," said Mexican President Felipe Calderon. "This was a very valuable gesture by President Obama." At a joint news conference with Colombian President Juan Manuel Santos, Obama emphasized that his administration had made some changes to its policy toward Cuba already and was open to more if it saw more signs of democratic reforms. "I'm not somebody who brings to the table here a lot of baggage from the past, and I want to look at all these problems in a new and fresh way," he said. But Obama's staid charm was unable to paper over growing differences with the region. Facing a tough re-election race this year, Obama had no room to compromise on the five-decade-old U.S. embargo on Cuba that is widely supported by conservatives in the United States, and particularly the anti-Castro exile community in Florida, a key state in a presidential vote. U.S. insistence that Havana undertake democratic reforms before returning to the hemispheric family led to a clash with a united front of leftist and conservative governments that see Washington's policy toward Cuba as a relic of the Cold War. The unexpected result was a diplomatic victory for Havana. The newfound regional unity on Cuba may augur a growing willingness across the political spectrum to challenge the U.S. State Department on thorny issues for years considered taboo. That could include insistence that the United States assume greater responsibility for reducing consumption of illegal narcotics as an alternative to the bloody war on drugs and its rising toll on Latin America. "From the so-called Washington consensus ... toward a nascent consensus without Washington for a united Latin America," tweeted Venezuela's foreign ministry, referring to orthodox economic policies advocated by Washington in the 1990s. NEW DIPLOMACY, NEW ECONOMY The stark divide over Cuba - with 32 nations in favor of inviting it to future summits and only the United States and Canada opposed - will fuel arguments that the OAS is an outdated institution for regional diplomacy. The OAS already faces competition from alternative forums such as the Union of South American nations (Unasur) and the Chavez-backed Community of Latin American and Caribbean states (Celac). Despite the new winds blowing in regional diplomacy, economics is driving the changes as much as politics. Once seen as monolithic block of basket-case economies dependent on U.S. support, Latin American countries are coveted investment destinations with sophisticated financial systems that have innovated in areas ranging from energy to aviation. Chinese companies eager to pump oil, harvest soy and build badly needed infrastructure are showering them with offers of investment and financing. With the U.S. economy still struggling to stay above water and foreign aid budgets seen dwindling, Washington has fewer sticks to brandish and fewer carrots to offer. "This summit was a reminder, a wake-up call, that the traditional way of doing business vis-a-vis the region is eroding," said Geoff Thale, program director at the Washington Office on Latin America

#### The plan sends a clear signal to improve Latin American relations and reinvigorate the OAS

**White 13**-Senior fellow at the Center for International Policy and former U.S. ambassador to Paraguay and El Salvador (Robert, “After Chávez, a Chance to Rethink Relations With Cuba”, New York Times, 3/7/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/08/opinion/after-chavez-hope-for-good-neighbors-in-latin-america.html?pagewanted=all)//TL&\_r=1&)//HA

FOR most of our history, the United States assumed that its security was inextricably linked to a partnership with Latin America. This legacy dates from the Monroe Doctrine, articulated in 1823, through the Rio pact, the postwar treaty that pledged the United States to come to the defense of its allies in Central and South America. Yet for a half-century, our policies toward our southern neighbors have alternated between intervention and neglect, inappropriate meddling and missed opportunities. The death this week of President Hugo Chávez of Venezuela — who along with Fidel Castro of Cuba was perhaps the most vociferous critic of the United States among the political leaders of the Western Hemisphere in recent decades — offers an opportunity to restore bonds with potential allies who share the American goal of prosperity. Throughout his career, the autocratic Mr. Chávez used our embargo as a wedge with which to antagonize the United States and alienate its supporters. His fuel helped prop up the rule of Mr. Castro and his brother Raúl, Cuba’s current president. The embargo no longer serves any useful purpose (if it ever did at all); President Obama should end it, though it would mean overcoming powerful opposition from Cuban-American lawmakers in Congress. An end to the Cuba embargo would send a powerful signal to all of Latin America that the United States wants a new, warmer relationship with democratic forces seeking social change throughout the Americas. I joined the State Department as a Foreign Service officer in the 1950s and chose to serve in Latin America in the 1960s. I was inspired by President John F. Kennedy’s creative response to the revolutionary fervor then sweeping Latin America. The 1959 Cuban revolution, led by the charismatic Fidel Castro, had inspired revolts against the cruel dictatorships and corrupt pseudodemocracies that had dominated the region since the end of Spanish and Portuguese rule in the 19th century. Kennedy had a charisma of his own, and it captured the imaginations of leaders who wanted democratic change, not violent revolution. Kennedy reacted to the threat of continental insurrection by creating the Alliance for Progress, a kind of Marshall Plan for the hemisphere that was calculated to achieve the same kind of results that saved Western Europe from Communism. He pledged billions of dollars to this effort. In hindsight, it may have been overly ambitious, even naïve, but Kennedy’s focus on Latin America rekindled the promise of the Good Neighbor Policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt and transformed the whole concept of inter-American relations. Tragically, after Kennedy’s assassination in 1963, the ideal of the Alliance for Progress crumbled and “la noche mas larga” — “the longest night” — began for the proponents of Latin American democracy. Military regimes flourished, democratic governments withered, moderate political and civil leaders were labeled Communists, rights of free speech and assembly were curtailed and human dignity crushed, largely because the United States abandoned all standards save that of anti-Communism. During my Foreign Service career, I did what I could to oppose policies that supported dictators and closed off democratic alternatives. In 1981, as the ambassador to El Salvador, I refused a demand by the secretary of state, Alexander M. Haig Jr., that I use official channels to cover up the Salvadoran military’s responsibility for the murders of four American churchwomen. I was fired and forced out of the Foreign Service. The Reagan administration, under the illusion that Cuba was the power driving the Salvadoran revolution, turned its policy over to the Pentagon and C.I.A., with predictable results. During the 1980s the United States helped expand the Salvadoran military, which was dominated by uniformed assassins. We armed them, trained them and covered up their crimes. After our counterrevolutionary efforts failed to end the Salvadoran conflict, the Defense Department asked its research institute, the RAND Corporation, what had gone wrong. RAND analysts found that United States policy makers had refused to accept the obvious truth that the insurgents were rebelling against social injustice and state terror. As a result, “we pursued a policy unsettling to ourselves, for ends humiliating to the Salvadorans and at a cost disproportionate to any conventional conception of the national interest.” Over the subsequent quarter-century, a series of profound political, social and economic changes have undermined the traditional power bases in Latin America and, with them, longstanding regional institutions like the Organization of American States. The organization, which is headquartered in Washington and which excluded Cuba in 1962, was seen as irrelevant by Mr. Chávez. He promoted the creation of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States — which excludes the United States and Canada — as an alternative. At a regional meeting that included Cuba and excluded the United States, Mr. Chávez said that “the most positive thing for the independence of our continent is that we meet alone without the hegemony of empire.” Mr. Chávez was masterful at manipulating America’s antagonism toward Fidel Castro as a rhetorical stick with which to attack the United States as an imperialist aggressor, an enemy of progressive change, interested mainly in treating Latin America as a vassal continent, a source of cheap commodities and labor. Like its predecessors, the Obama administration has given few signs that it has grasped the magnitude of these changes or cares about their consequences. After President Obama took office in 2009, Latin America’s leading statesman at the time, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, then the president of Brazil, urged Mr. Obama to normalize relations with Cuba. Lula, as he is universally known, correctly identified our Cuba policy as the chief stumbling block to renewed ties with Latin America, as it had been since the very early years of the Castro regime. After the failure of the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion, Washington set out to accomplish by stealth and economic strangulation what it had failed to do by frontal attack. But the clumsy mix of covert action and porous boycott succeeded primarily in bringing shame on the United States and turning Mr. Castro into a folk hero. And even now, despite the relaxing of travel restrictions and Raúl Castro’s announcement that he will retire in 2018, the implacable hatred of many within the Cuban exile community continues. The fact that two of the three Cuban-American members of the Senate — Marco Rubio of Florida and Ted Cruz of Texas — are rising stars in the Republican Party complicates further the potential for a recalibration of Cuban-American relations. (The third member, Senator Robert Menendez, Democrat of New Jersey, is the new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but his power has been weakened by a continuing ethics controversy.) Are there any other examples in the history of diplomacy where the leaders of a small, weak nation can prevent a great power from acting in its own best interest merely by staying alive? The re-election of President Obama, and the death of Mr. Chávez, give America a chance to reassess the irrational hold on our imaginations that Fidel Castro has exerted for five decades. The president and his new secretary of state, John Kerry, should quietly reach out to Latin American leaders like President Juan Manuel Santos of Colombia and José Miguel Insulza, secretary general of the Organization of American States. The message should be simple: The president is prepared to show some flexibility on Cuba and asks your help. Such a simple request could transform the Cuban issue from a bilateral problem into a multilateral challenge. It would then be up to Latin Americans to devise a policy that would help Cuba achieve a sufficient measure of democratic change to justify its reintegration into a hemisphere composed entirely of elected governments. If, however, our present policy paralysis continues, we will soon see the emergence of two rival camps, the United States versus Latin America. While Washington would continue to enjoy friendly relations with individual countries like Brazil, Mexico and Colombia, the vision of Roosevelt and Kennedy of a hemisphere of partners cooperating in matters of common concern would be reduced to a historical footnote.

#### Falklands dispute intensifying --- negotiations are at a standstill

Gladstone 13

(Rick Gladstone, New York Times, “Dispute Over Falklands Intensifies,” 6/20/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/21/world/americas/dispute-over-falklands-intensifies.html?\_r=0)//HA

The protracted dispute between Britain and Argentina over the Falkland Islands appeared to harden further on Thursday, as the British side dismissed any thought of inviting the new Argentine pope to help mediate, and the Argentines rejected a March referendum that showed the islanders want to remain British. Both sides made their positions known after an annual meeting of the United Nations Decolonization Committee, which called on Britain and Argentina to negotiate. Britain has said any negotiations must include a representative from the Falklands, a condition rejected by Argentina, which calls the islands, in the South Atlantic, Las Malvinas. More than 30 years after the Argentines invaded the islands and British forces retook them, the emotions of the dispute appear to be reinvigorated. They were stoked this year when Argentina’s president, Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, sought to enlist Pope Francis, the former archbishop of Buenos Aires, to advance the cause. But the idea of papal intervention did not sit well with Michael Summers, a Falklands representative who attended the Decolonization Committee’s meeting. “I think the last thing we need is religion inserted into this dispute,” he said at a news conference. At a separate news conference, Argentina’s foreign minister, Héctor Timerman, rejected Britain’s contention that Argentina has no claim to the islands. Mr. Timerman also ridiculed the British insistence on including an island representative in any talks. “I need to meet with the foreign minister,” he said. “Kings meet with kings, and queens meet with queens. Usually that is the way it works.”

#### OAS is key to negotiations resolving the Falkland’s conflict

MercoPress 12 (“OAS calls on Argentina/UK to find peaceful way to solve Malvinas sovereignty dispute,” 6/6/12, http://en.mercopress.com/2012/06/06/oas-calls-on-argentina-uk-to-find-peaceful-way-to-solve-malvinas-sovereignty-dispute)//HA

On the last day of session the organization urged both nations “to retake negotiations in order to soon find a peaceful way to solve the Malvinas Islands sovereignty dispute” that caused a war between London and Buenos Aires in 1982. Foreign Minister Héctor Timerman invited the British representative in the OAS assembly to immediately engage in dialogue in order to find a definitive solution to the conflict. “I would like to offer Great Britain the opportunity to meet in a room. The OAS secretary general can be present. I want to negotiate with Great Britain. I want to find a peaceful solution to this colonial conflict,” he said during the fourth session of the meeting. Timerman regretted that London chose to ignore the 39 resolutions passed by the UN urging both nations to solve the bilateral conflict. Before the final approval of the draft resolution several Foreign ministers read aloud similar statements in support of Argentina from Unasur, Mercosur and Celac calling for diplomatic negotiations on the Malvinas issue. However Canada pointed out that it is for the Falkland Islands people to decide on their future adding that it did not agree with some chapters of the OAS resolution. Likewise and as had been anticipated the US delegation adopted a neutral stance but also accepted the call for a peaceful solution to the bilateral dispute. The draft resolution was presented to the general assembly by Brazil’s Deputy Secretary for International Policy, Vera Machado, and was approved by acclamation on request from the Uruguayan delegation. The resolution reads as follows: Considering its repeated statements that the Question of the Malvinas Islands is a matter of enduring hemispheric concern; Recalling its resolution AG/RES. 928 (XVIII-O/88), adopted by consensus on November 19, 1988, in which it requested the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find, as soon as possible, a peaceful solution to the sovereignty dispute; Bearing in mind that in its resolution AG/RES. 1049 (XX-O/90), it expressed satisfaction over the resumption of diplomatic relations between the two countries; Recognizing that the accreditation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, under CP/RES. 655 (1041/95), as a permanent observer of the OAS reflects principles and values shared by that country and OAS member states, which facilitate greater mutual understanding; Noting with satisfaction that the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland maintain important political, cultural and trade ties, share common values and are also engaged in close cooperation both bilaterally and in international fora; Bearing in mind that, despite those ties and shared values, it has not yet been possible to resume the negotiations between the two countries with a view to solving the sovereignty dispute over the Malvinas Islands, Georgia del Sur y Sandwich del Sur Islands and the surrounding maritime areas in the framework of resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25 of the United Nations General Assembly, the decisions adopted by the same body on the same question in the Special Committee on Decolonization, and the reiterated resolutions and declarations adopted at this General Assembly; and Having heard the presentation by the head of delegation of the Argentine Republic, Welcomes the reaffirmation of the will of the Argentine Government to continue exploring all possible avenues towards a peaceful settlement of the dispute and its constructive approach towards the inhabitants of the Malvinas Islands. Reaffirms the need for the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume, as soon as possible, negotiations on the sovereignty dispute, in order to find a peaceful solution to this protracted controversy. Decides to continue to examine the Question of the Falkland Islands at its subsequent sessions until a definitive settlement has been reached thereon.

#### Draws major powers in --- goes nuclear

Press TV 12 (“'Argentina to get Malvinas Islands back',” 1/20/12, http://presstv.com/detail/222072.html)//HA

\*\*\*Quotes Gretchen Small – Executive Intelligence Review

Press TV: This row has been escalating for a year, since oil was found. Is this all about oil? After all, there are about 8.3 billion barrels of oil in the waters around the Malvinas Islands (Falkland Islands), which is three times the amount of the UK's reserves. Small: Oh, I think this the far greater stakes even the oil involved. The British Empire and it still exists, and it is based on its monetarist system, its control of world finances, they are bankrupt aren't they? Their system is breaking down. That's the issue in Europe today. And they are using war as their main response. Yes they use their current control of the United States, which we are contesting, as the military might. Because the British military might is pathetic, like the idea of having a monarchy is still today. But they're going for war. Their beef for Argentina, in particular is in 2003, the Kirchner government demonstrated, that a nation can and must reassert the principle, that people, the nation, economic development, looking good in the future, is far more important, and must be defended against pieces of papers of debt. And they forced a write down of their debt, 60-75 percent, which the Greeks are studying today, and the Italians are looking at. So this Malvinas war, thirty years ago when this happened, my editor, the founder of the magazines, Mr. Lyndon Larouche, said the Malvinas war was a precedent for NATO out of area deployment for collection of the debt. That the financial system was at the root of it! And today boy, that financial system is far more gone than it was before. So I think that's some of the background here. Press TV: During William Hague's most recent visit to Argentina, Argentina's foreign secretary said he made it clear that all Latin American nations backed Argentina's claim. Why is William Hague claiming then that aside from some saber-rattling from Argentina, the rest of Latin America is interested in trade and development with the UK? Small: Well their trying to make a comeback, I mean Hague are saying we are good. Their going back to the days when they ran Latin America! And they control it largely through the debt. This question of were British control lies is extremely important, is through their control over monetary system. And they are, you know, they are making a big push for Brazil, for control over Brazil right now to go back to the days when Brazil was their sort of control point over the area. But the stakes are much bigger, and I come back to this question, the issues before Latin America, the issue before Hague and Cameron. These guys, the British financial system is going down. If the Greeks, the Italians, the Spaniard and the United States, did what Argentina did, of saying, look, you control, you put the principle, all the derivatives, all the financial speculative, wipe it off. Here in the United States, that would be the return to Franklin Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall Act. What do you think happens to the British Empire at that point? What happens to the City of London? They're wiped out! These guys are going for war, wherever they could get it. That's what's behind the Syria question, that's what's behind the attack on Iran. And their desire, I mean this is really serious, and it may seem chatty that people have to think about this. Their desire, the British desire is to use Syria and Iran as a pretext, to set up thermonuclear war, between the United States, Russia and China, because the transatlantic financial system which is the core of the City of London, Wall Streets just a part of that If we're going down, they can't afford Russia and China, Asia as a whole, rebuild. And that's the stakes behind this. The Malvinas are part of that. Press TV: Let's go with your statements about the UK and the US being on the downslide, economically speaking, while Latin America is on the rise, we can mention Brazil, we can mention Argentina. If the UK would decide to make a move, would they have anybody on board with them? And of course the first country to come to mind would be the United States. Small: Well, what their… first off all, I don't think anybody in Argentina is interested in retaking the islands. This is a smart government, the Christina Fernandez; the Kirchner government is a smart government. Their interested in going out into space, their interested in developing their nuclear capability, their interested in crushing this monetary that they barely survived! So now, as for what the US, the fight right now… in the US, whether they would go with the UK or not, really hangs much more around, will they, will President Obama be removed from office, before he gets the US lined up with the UK in the war, in the new cockpit for global thermonuclear war, which is the, the new Balkan today is in the Middle East. And I think that from a strategic standpoint, is far higher on the agenda. I think the British are moving on the Argentine question, because they want to smash sovereignty everywhere as a principle. But I think their control of the United States, the game now that we are looking at and being watched, is what happens over the immediate threat of a thermal nuclear war, in which there are many, many institutional people, including the highest level of the US military, who absolutely want this stopped! They do not want that war, in the Middle East, and the idea of getting them involved in Latin America is just of the chart! Press TV: If there is a move made on the islands, whether it's from the Argentina, which would be the likely case, what's going to happen? What would the likely reaction by the UK be? There have been reports, a few months back, saying that, again I mention that Argentina has plans, thinking that this is the best time since the defense capabilities of the UK has been reduced. Small: I think that those stories must come out of London, because I think the Argentines are much smarter than that. They are going to get the Malvinas back, because this evidence, as the other speaker said, is ludicrous in this situation. But they can get it out, understanding, I think they have a much clearer understanding that the issues here do not really revolve around the Malvinas, it isn't as rightful as Argentina's claim is!

#### Second is China ---

#### US-Cuba relations check Chinese influence in the region

Benjamin-Alvadaro ‘6 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “The Current Status and Future Prospects for Oil Exploration in Cuba: A Special,” <http://cri.fiu.edu/research/commissioned-reports/oil-cuba-alvarado.pdf>)

Additionally, Venezuela remains the fourth largest importer of oil to the United States and one can surmise that the existing trade arrangements between the U.S. and Venezuela will remain intact, the evolution of the Bolivarian revolution under Chavez and a growing Chinese presence in the region notwithstanding. Additionally, pursuing such a path would allow United States policymakers to take advantage of what Cuba has to offer in the following areas: domestic technical capabilities; continuing human capital development; strategic positioning in the Caribbean, and an improved diplomatic stature. Cuba, by any measure, possesses a largely untapped technical capacity owing to advanced training and education in the core mathematic and scientific areas. This was clearly demonstrated by its attempt to develop a nuclear energy capability in the 1980s and 1990s whereby thousands of Cubans pursued highly technical career paths leaving Cuba with among the highest ratios of scientists and engineers to the general population in all of the Americas. Moreover, the foundation of Cuba’s vaunted public education system remains intact and increased investment under various scenarios suggests that Cuba will continue to produce a welleducated workforce that will be critical to its future economic vitality. This raises an important consideration that being the role that Cuba will play in the region in the 21st century. It suffices to say that Cuba remains the strategically important state by virtue of its geographical location alone, in efforts against drug and human trafficking and related national and regional security matters. The extent to which a stable Cuban government has cooperated with the U.S. in drug interdiction efforts in the past suggests that the results from improved diplomatic relations between neighbors would have the effect of improving national security concerns related to terrorist activity, illicit weapons transfers and the like. Ultimately, a successful normalization of relations between the U.S. and Cuba in these areas may well enhance and stabilize regional relations that could possibly lessen (or at a minimum, balancing) fears of a Chinese incursion in hemispheric affairs. To lessen those fears it may be useful to review the present structure of joint-venture projects in the energy sector in Cuba to ascertain the feasibility and possible success of such an undertaking become available to American firms. Moreover, it is interesting to note that U.S. firms in the agriculture sector have successfully negotiated and consummated sales to Cuba totaling more than $1 billion dollars over the past four years under conditions that are less than optimal circumstances but have well-served the commercial interests of all parties involved.

#### US influence in the region is critical to deter conflict – China is trying to displace the US

Dowd ‘12 (Alan, Senior Fellow with the American Security Council Foundation, “Crisis in the America's,” <http://www.ascfusa.org/content_pages/view/crisisinamericas>)

Focused on military operations in the Middle East, nuclear threats in Iran and North Korea, and the global threat of terrorism, U.S. policymakers have neglected a growing challenge right here in the Western Hemisphere: the expanding influence and reach of China.¶ Eyeing energy resources to keep its economy humming, China is engaged in a flurry of investing and spending in Latin America.¶ In Costa Rica, China is funding a $1.24-billion upgrade of the country’s oil refinery; bankrolling an $83-million soccer stadium; backing infrastructure and telecommunications improvements; and pouring millions into a new police academy.¶ In Colombia, China is planning a massive “dry canal” to link the country’s Pacific and Atlantic coasts by rail. At either terminus, there will be Chinese ports; in between, there will be Chinese assembly facilities, logistics operations and distribution plants; and on the Pacific side, there will be dedicated berths to ship Colombian coal outbound to China.¶ In mid-January, a Chinese-built oil rig arrived in Cuba to begin drilling in Cuba’s swath of the Gulf of Mexico. Reuters reports that Spanish, Russian, Malaysian and Norwegian firms will use the rig to extract Cuban oil. For now, China is focusing on onshore oil extraction in Cuba.¶ New offshore discoveries will soon catapult Brazil into a top-five global oil producer. With some 38 billion barrels of recoverable oil off its coast, Brazil expects to pump 4.9 million barrels per day by 2020, as the Washington Times reports, and China has used generous loans to position itself as the prime beneficiary of Brazilian oil. China’s state-run oil and banking giants have inked technology-transfer, chemical, energy and real-estate deals with Brazil. Plus, as the Times details, China came to the rescue of Brazil’s main oil company when it sought financing for its massive drilling plans, pouring $10 billion into the project. A study in Joint Force Quarterly (JFQ) adds that Beijing plunked down $3.1 billion for a slice of Brazil’s vast offshore oil fields.¶ The JFQ study reveals just how deep and wide Beijing is spreading its financial influence in Latin America: $28 billion in loans to Venezuela; a $16.3-billion commitment to develop Venezuelan oil reserves; $1 billion for Ecuadoran oil; $4.4 billion to develop Peruvian mines; $10 billion to help Argentina modernize its rail system; $3.1 billion to purchase Argentina’s petroleum company outright. The New York Times adds that Beijing has lent Ecuador $1 billion to build a hydroelectric plant.¶ There is good and bad to Beijing’s increased interest and investment in the Western Hemisphere. Investment fuels development, and much of Latin America is happily accelerating development in the economic, trade, technology and infrastructure spheres. But China’s riches come with strings.¶ For instance, in exchange for Chinese development funds and loans, Venezuela agreed to increase oil shipments to China from 380,000 barrels per day to one million barrels per day. It’s worth noting that the Congressional Research Service has reported concerns in Washington that Hugo Chavez might try to supplant his U.S. market with China. Given that Venezuela pumps an average of 1.5 million barrels of oil per day for the U.S.—or about 11 percent of net oil imports—the results would be devastating for the U.S.¶ That brings us to the security dimension of China’s checkbook diplomacy in the Western Hemisphere.¶ Officials with the U.S. Southern Command conceded as early as 2006 that Beijing had “approached every country in our area of responsibility” and provided military exchanges, aid or training to Ecuador, Jamaica, Bolivia, Cuba, Chile and Venezuela.¶ The JFQ study adds that China has “an important and growing presence in the region’s military institutions.” Most Latin American nations, including Mexico, “send officers to professional military education courses in the PRC.” In Ecuador, Venezuela and Bolivia, Beijing has begun to sell “sophisticated hardware…such as radars and K-8 and MA-60 aircraft.” The JFQ report concludes, ominously, that Chinese defense firms “are likely to leverage their experience and a growing track record for their goods to expand their market share in the region, with the secondary consequence being that those purchasers will become more reliant on the associated Chinese logistics, maintenance, and training infrastructures that support those products.”¶ Put it all together, and the southern flank of the United States is exposed to a range of new security challenges.¶ To be sure, much of this is a function of China’s desire to secure oil markets. But there’s more at work here than China’s thirst for oil. Like a global chess match, China is probing Latin America and sending a message that just as Washington has trade and military ties in China’s neighborhood, China is developing trade and military ties in America’s neighborhood.¶ This is a direct challenge to U.S. primacy in the region—a challenge that must be answered.¶ First, Washington needs to relearn an obvious truth—that China’s rulers do not share America’s values—and needs to shape and conduct its China policy in that context.¶ Beijing has no respect for human rights. Recall that in China, an estimated 3-5 million people are rotting away in laogai slave-labor camps, many of them “guilty” of political dissent or religious activity; democracy activists are rounded up and imprisoned; freedom of speech and religion and assembly do not exist; and internal security forces are given shoot-to-kill orders in dealing with unarmed citizens. Indeed, Beijing viewed the Arab Spring uprisings not as an impetus for political reform, but as reason “to launch its harshest crackdown on dissent in at least a decade,” according to Director of National Intelligence James Clapper.¶ In short, the ends always justify the means in Beijing. And that makes all the difference when it comes to foreign and defense policy. As Reagan counseled during the Cold War, “There is no true international security without respect for human rights.”¶ Second, the U.S. must stop taking the Western Hemisphere for granted, and instead must reengage in its own neighborhood economically, politically and militarily.¶ That means no more allowing trade deals—and the partners counting on them—to languish. Plans for a hemispheric free trade zone have faltered and foundered. The trade-expansion agreements with Panama and Colombia were left in limbo for years, before President Obama finally signed them into law in 2011.¶ Reengagement means reviving U.S. diplomacy. The Wall Street Journal reports that due to political wrangling in Washington, the State Department position focused on the Western Hemisphere has been staffed by an interim for nearly a year, while six Western Hemisphere ambassadorial posts (Uruguay, Venezuela, Ecuador, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Barbados) remain empty.¶ Reengagement means reversing plans to slash defense spending. The Joint Forces Command noted in 2008 that China has “a deep respect for U.S. military power.” We cannot overstate how important this has been to keeping the peace. But with the United States in the midst of massive military retrenchment, one wonders how long that reservoir of respect will last.¶ Reengagement also means revitalizing security ties. A good model to follow might be what’s happening in China’s backyard. To deter China and prevent an accidental war, the U.S. is reviving its security partnerships all across the Asia-Pacific region. Perhaps it’s time to do the same in Latin America. We should remember that many Latin American countries—from Mexico and Panama to Colombia and Chile—border the Pacific. Given Beijing’s actions, it makes sense to bring these Latin American partners on the Pacific Rim into the alliance of alliances that is already stabilizing the Asia-Pacific region.¶ Finally, all of this needs to be part of a revived Monroe Doctrine.¶ Focusing on Chinese encroachment in the Americas, this “Monroe Doctrine 2.0” would make it clear to Beijing that the United States welcomes China’s efforts to conduct trade in the Americas but discourages any claims of control—implied or explicit—by China over territories, properties or facilities in the Americas. In addition, Washington should make it clear to Beijing that the American people would look unfavorably upon the sale of Chinese arms or the basing of Chinese advisors or military assets in the Western Hemisphere.¶ In short, what it was true in the 19th and 20th centuries must remain true in the 21st: There is room for only one great power in the Western Hemisphere.

#### US-China conflict escalates to Nuclear catastrophe

**Goldstein ‘13**

[Avery Goldstein is the David M. Knott Professor of Global Politics and International Relations, Director of the Center for the Study of Contemporary China, and Associate Director of the Christopher H. Browne Center for International Politics at the University of Pennsylvania, “First Things First: The Pressing Danger of Crisis Instability in U.S.-China Relations,” International Security, Vol. 37, no 4, Spring, 2013, pp 49-89]

In a crisis, the U.S. and Chinese interests at stake will be high, and either¶ side could decide that the risk of escalation introduced by conventional, space,¶ or cyberattacks was worth running. Even though no stake in a crisis would be¶ high enough for either the United States or China to choose an unrestrained¶ nuclear exchange, some stakes might be high enough for either one to choose¶ to initiate military actions that elevate the risk of escalation to such a disastrous¶ outcome.88 As discussed above, both China and the United States have¶ important interests over which they could find themselves locked in a warthreatening¶ crisis in the Western Paciªc. The recent pattern of pointed Chinese¶ and U.S. statements about the handling of persistent disputes in the South¶ China Sea, for example, suggests that both sides attach a high and perhaps increasing¶ value to their stakes in this region. Whether that value is high enough¶ to contribute to crisis instability is an empirical question that cannot be answered¶ in advance. The most worrisome source of instability, however, is¶ clear—the temptation to use nonnuclear strikes as a way to gain bargaining¶ leverage, even if doing so generates an unknowable risk of nuclear catastrophe¶ that both China and the United States will have incentives to manipulate.

#### Recent cyber attacks indicate possibility of war is high

**Feldman ‘13**

[Noah Feldman, constitutional and international law professor at Harvard University, “The Coming Cool War With China,” Bloomberg, 6/02/2013, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-02/the-coming-cool-war-with-china.html]

Someone steals your most sensitive secrets. Then, planning a face-to-face meeting, he says he wants to develop “a new type” of relationship with you. At what point, exactly, would you start thinking he was planning to drink your milkshake?¶ Ahead of the first summit meeting between U.S. President Barack Obama and President Xi Jinping of China on June 7, the two nations are on the brink of geopolitical conflict. As its officials acknowledge, China is a classic rising power, poised to challenge U.S. dominance. In historical terms, the sole global superpower never gives up without a fight.¶ “China’s peaceful rise” was a useful slogan, while it lasted, for China’s leaders. “America’s peaceful decline” will get no one elected, whether Democrat or Republican. Geopolitics is almost always a zero-sum game. If China can copy or work around U.S. missile defenses, fighter jets and drones, the U.S.’s global position will be eroded -- and the gains will go directly to China.¶ At the same time, trade between the two rivals remains robust. Last week, Henan-based Shuanghui International Holdings Ltd. agreed to buy the U.S. pork-processing giant Smithfield Foods Inc. (SFD) for $4.7 billion. This could be the single-largest Chinese acquisition of a U.S. company, and it is reason for enthusiasm. Mutual ownership of significant corporate assets across borders doesn’t miraculously guarantee peace, nor can it make conflict disappear overnight. But it gives both sides the incentive to manage geopolitical conflict, and not let it overtake the tremendous mutual benefits created by trade.¶ Entwined Economies¶ The juxtaposition of rising tensions over cyber-attacks and the pork cooperation perfectly captures the paradoxical state of Chinese-U.S. relations -- and explains why officials on both sides are struggling to come up with a new conceptual framework to understand the change. Never before has a rising power been so economically interdependent with the nation challenging it. The ties go beyond the U.S.’s 25 percent market share for Chinese exports or China’s holdings of 8 percent of the outstanding U.S. national debt. They include about 200,000 Chinese studying in the U.S. and perhaps 80,000 Americans living and working in China.¶ The combination of geopolitical competition and economic interdependence sets the terms for the struggle that won’t be a new Cold War so much as a Cool War. If the Soviet Union and the U.S. avoided all-out conflict because of mutually assured nuclear destruction, the relations between China and the U.S. today could be defined by the threat of mutually assured economic destruction. The economic costs of violent conflict would be incalculably large.¶ As a practical matter, however, we mustn’t assume that economic interdependence precludes the possibility of old-fashioned violence. On the positive side, China is urging North Korea to re-engage with the six-party talks and denuclearize the Korean Peninsula -- a sign that the government in Beijing realizes that its unruly ally could do significant damage to regional stability. On the negative side, North Korea seems perfectly content to ignore its mentor’s directives. As we learned during the Cold War, proxies don’t always behave the way their would-be masters want them to. It is far from clear that the Americans and the Soviets wanted their allies in the Middle East to go to war in 1967, 1973 or 1981.