# L.A. Relations Aff

## L.A. Relations Solvency

### Removing Embargo Key to U.S.-L.A. Relations

#### Lifting the embargo improves the perception of the U.S. in Latin America.

Carlos **PASCUAL** Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy The Brookings Institution **AND** Vicki **HUDDLESTON** Visiting Fellow The Brookings Institution **‘9** (April 2009, Cuba: A New Policy of Critical and Constructive Engagement,

http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2009/4/cuba/0413\_cuba.pdf)

Cuba policy should be a pressing issue for the Obama administration because it offers a unique opportunity for the president to transform our relations with the hemisphere. Even a slight shift away from hostility to engagement will permit the United States to work more closely with the region to effectively advance a common agenda toward Cuba. By announcing a policy of critical and constructive engagement at the April Summit of the Americas in Trinidad and Tobago, the president can prove that he has been listening to the region. He can underline this commitment by removing all restrictions on travel and remittances on Cuban Americans, and engaging in dialogue with the regime, as promised during his campaign. By reciprocally improving our diplomatic relations with Cuba, we will enhance our understanding of the island, its people, and its leaders. However, while these measures will promote understanding, improve the lives of people on the island, and build support for a new relationship between our countries, they are insufficient to ensure the changes needed to result in normal diplomatic relations over time. If the president is to advance U.S. interests and principles, he will need a new policy and a long term strategic vision for U.S. relations with Cuba. If he is prepared to discard the failed policy of regime change and adopt one of critical and constructive engagement, he and his administration will lay the foundations for a new approach toward Cuba and the latin America. like his predecessors, president Obama has the authority to substantially modify embargo regulations in order to advance a policy of engagement that would broaden and deepen contacts with the Cuban people and their government. He has the popular support—domestic and international—to engage Cuba, and, by so doing, to staunch our diminishing influence on the island and recapture the high road in our relations with the hemisphere. Although it will take Cuban cooperation to achieve a real improvement in relations, we should avoid the mistake of predicating our initiatives on the actions of the Cuban government. The United States must evaluate and act in its own interests. We must not tie our every action to those of the Cuban government, because doing so would allow Cuban officials to set U.S. policy, preventing the United States from serving its own interests.

The majority of Cuban Americans now agree with the American public that our half-century-old policy toward Cuba has failed. For the first time since Florida international University (FiU) began polling Cuban American residents in 1991, a December 2008 poll found that a majority of Cuban American voters favor ending current restrictions on travel and remittances to Cuba, and support a bilateral dialogue and normal diplomatic relations with the Cuban regime by substantial margins.

### **L.A. Key to U.S. Softpower**

#### **US-Latin American relations solve climate change and soft power**

Valenzuela 11- Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs (Arturo Valenzuela, January 6, 2011, .S.-Latin American Relations: A Look Ahead, http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/rm/2011/154105.htm)

Since its first days in office, the Obama Administration has worked very hard to shift the balance in the U.S.-Latin American relationship in a positive and constructive direction – and we are confident that our approach is achieving results. I see so many here who, like me, have spent the better part of their careers studying the Americas, or U.S. policy in the region. For us, in particular, these are fascinating times. That’s because we are seeing the convergence of two powerful and positive trends: the consolidation of successful market democracies that are making big strides in meeting their peoples’ needs, and the growing global integration of Latin America. These trends are fundamentally reordering our interaction with each other. Indeed, our greatest regional challenges – including inequality, the impunity of power, lack of rights, ineffective institutions, lack of opportunity – are receding in most countries in the Americas. And nations of the hemisphere are realizing their stake in new global challenges, like food security, climate change, transnational crime, and economic competitiveness. Most importantly, they are realizing their capacity to act, on a global level, to address these issues. So there is a whole new set of incentives for democratic societies to adjust national policies, pursue greater regional integration, and join in new networks of partnership around the world in order to help meet the tests of our times. Therefore, any discussion of U.S. policy in the Americas has to start from the recognition that the world has changed. It’s getting harder to extrapolate from the past to predict what’s around the corner, or to advance our interests based on traditional ways of doing business. These considerations are at the core of the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, also known as the QDDR, that the State Department just unveiled. Secretary Clinton initiated the groundbreaking QDDR process to enhance our capacity to lead through civilian power. As she has emphasized, advancing American interests and values will require leading other nations in solving shared problems in the 21st century. Therefore, we must increase our reliance on our diplomats and development experts as the first face of American power. In 2011, the concepts underpinning the QDDR will also guide our approach of “dynamic engagement” that seeks to advance U.S. interests in partnership with Latin America as a whole, while recognizing the value of accommodating diverse needs and interests. The Obama Administration has focused our efforts on four over-arching priorities critical to people in every society: promoting social and economic opportunity for everyone; securing a clean energy future; ensuring the safety and security of all of our citizens; and building effective institutions of democratic governance. All this we seek to achieve while harnessing and strengthening multilateral and regional institutions, especially the Organization of American States. Our priorities are based on the premise that the United States has a vital interest in contributing to the building of stable, prosperous, and democratic nations in this hemisphere that can play a pivotal role in building a rules-based international system capable of meeting today’s global challenges. Achieving that objective has required an important shift in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. As President Obama and Secretary Clinton have said, policy must be conducted on the basis of mutual respect and co-responsibility through dialogue and engagement. The United States must be a more effective and determined partner in helping countries throughout the Americas achieve their own chosen paths as determined by their own people. With this in mind, we have developed collaborative platforms like Pathways to Prosperity and the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas, which invite partner governments to join us in addressing key elements of the hemispheric agenda. We are also pursuing diplomatic initiatives to support racial and ethnic inclusion in the hemisphere and look forward to increasing these efforts during 2011, which the United Nations has named the International Year for People of African Descent. Today, we remain very optimistic about the state of the hemisphere. Indeed, the Western Hemisphere is experiencing a period of economic and political health that is a far cry from the troubles of the past. Not only did the region avoid the worst effects of the financial crisis, but current growth rates are projected to exceed five percent this year. And politically speaking, we welcome the reduction in tensions between Colombia and its neighbors, and note the smooth transfer of power that has occurred in many countries throughout the Americas. Moreover, the Obama Administration’s new strategy of engagement has contributed to a shift in Latin American public opinion. In the 2010 poll by the public opinion research firm *Latinobarometro*, two-thirds of the population in most countries had favorable attitudes toward the United States – an increase of 10 to 20 points from 2008 levels. The role of the United States in Latin America is also overwhelmingly viewed as positive. This suggests that the Obama Administration’s strategy has prompted an important replenishment of U.S. soft power in Latin America, thereby reversing the dangerous depletion of good will toward the United States that had occurred during the prior decade. Indeed, the region’s reaction to the recent Wikileaks cables incident, far from disrupting our regional relations, has actually highlighted their renewed strength. While the United States deeply regrets the disclosure of any information that was intended to be confidential, we are also heartened by the support and understanding that has been offered by most of our regional partners. We also recognize the central role played by economic integration in our hemispheric relations. In 2009, total U.S. merchandise trade between the United States and Latin America and the Caribbean reached $524 billion and more than 40 percent of the region’s exports flowed to the United States, making us the region’s single largest export destination – as well as the largest source of foreign direct investment – and the Western Hemisphere, including Canada, absorbs 42 percent of U.S. exports. Around 84 percent of our overall trade with the region takes place with our FTA partners. Half of our energy imports come from the Western Hemisphere.

### Softpower Key to US Leadership

#### Soft power key to US security

O’Hanlon and Petraens 13- Director of Research, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/foreign-policy) (Michael E. O’Hanlon, April 30th 2013, Fund - Don't Cut - U.S. Soft Power, http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/04/30-us-soft-power-ohanlon-petraeus)

Such an outcome would be bad for our nation’s security. As each of us has testified on Capitol Hill in past years America’s ability to protect itself and advance its global interests often depends as much on its “softer” power as it does on our nation’s armed forces. For example, though Latin American countries were themselves primarily responsible for their progress, the headway many of them made in stabilizing their countries in recent years has been a big plus for American security, too — and American aid had a role in that progress. That is part of why we have supported a budget deal that would repeal sequestration and achieve most further deficit reduction through savings in entitlement spending with similar increases in revenue generation. Implicit in our approach was the thinking that lawmakers should avoid the temptation to gut foreign aid just because it generally lacks a strong constituency in the United States.

#### Soft Power is more important for U.S. security than hardpower.

Bev 12- Serial Entrepreneur, Publisher, Chief Editor, Author, Columnist, Book Reviewer. Forbes (Jennie S. Bev, 5/23/12, The Power of American "Soft Power", http://www.forbes.com/sites/85broads/2012/05/23/the-power-of-american-soft-power/)

The mammoth has gotten back up, but it is always the memory of one’s fall that lingers in mind. We all remember that one fateful day when we attended the 341(a) bankruptcy hearing to meet creditors and not the thousands of days of financial stability. Just like we all remember vividly the day our loved one was buried six-feet under when he died and not the beautiful decades he shared his life with us. Failure and losing hurt, thus they are recorded for eternity in our long-term memory.  It is just how our brain works, thanks to millions of years of evolution. The world was so shocked with the fall of USA, that its gradual rise hasn’t yet created a lasting mental image. Good news, American “soft power” is more powerful than any fiscal policy and political maneuver. Joseph Nye of [Harvard University](http://www.forbes.com/colleges/harvard-university/) Kennedy School of Government says “soft power” refers to the ability to get through attraction rather than coercion or payments. By “to get” it means to receive favorable treatments based upon attractiveness of a country’s culture, ideals, and policies. For instance, inspired by TV series about medical doctors, some children in Taiwan aspire to study medicine at an American university. Infatuated by the idea of a fair trial, an Indonesian dissident aspires to become a lawyer. “Soft power” can be hardcore power. And the American brand is still the best out there. Also, thanks to low US dollar value, a record 62 million foreign tourists visited USA in 2011. In 2010, some 1.04 million immigrants applied for permanent residency, following 1.13 million in the previous year, which reflects the world’s insatiable faith in the US brand. The people of the world still believe that the USA is the place to visit, to reside, and to prosper.

### Anti-Americanism 🡪 Terrorism

#### Anti-Americanism increases the risk of terrorism- extremists like al Qaeda

Walt 05 professor of international affairs at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government (Stephen M. Walt, October 2005, Taming American Power, http://www.jstor.org/stable/info/20031709)

Disagreement with U.S. foreign policy does not mean the policy is wrong, but it does mean U.S. actions come with a price. When foreign populations disapprove of U.S. policy and are fearful of U.S. dominance, their governments are less likely to endorse Washington's initiatives and more likely to look for ways to hinder them. Rising anti-Americanism also increases the number of extremists who can be recruited into violent movements such as al Qaeda. The United States may still be able to gain others' compliance and overcome overt resistance, but achieving success will be more difficult and more expensive. Regardless of whether they disagree with U.S. policy or with the simple fact of U.S. power, can other states do anything to tame the American colossus? Historian Niall Ferguson has argued that the central issue is whether Americans have a "will to power" equal to their global responsibilities. President Bush, for his part, has downplayed the risk of going it alone: "At some point we may be the only ones left. ... That's okay with me. We are America." Such statements imply that the United States can overcome any international resistance to its agenda so long as its resolve is firm.

But this confidence is unwarranted. Although other states cannot diminish U.S. primacy in the near term, there are still many ways they can rein in U.S. power. Some countries seek to manipulate the United States for their own purposes, using accommodation to gain Wash ington's trust, support, and protection. Others are more confrontational, attempting to oppose and undercut U.S. interests. In either case, the United States' ability to defend or advance its own foreign policy agenda is impaired.

The United States is in a global struggle for hearts and minds, and it is losing. If anti-Americanism continues to grow, Washington will face greater resistance and find it harder to attract support. Americans will feel increasingly threatened in such a world, but trying to counter these threats alone will merely exacerbate the fear of U.S. power and isolate the United States even more.

#### Anti-Americanism fuels terrorism and sparks violence

LINDBERG and NOSSEL ‘5- The Princeton Project: Lindberg = American political expert and a research fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution. His research focuses on political theory, international relations, national security policy, and American politics. Nossel = executive director of PEN American Center. She served as Executive Director of Amnesty International USA (Tod Lindberg and Suzanne Nossel, REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON ANTI-AMERICANISM CO-CHAIRS, <http://www.princeton.edu/~ppns/conferences/reports/fall/aa_exec.pdf>) SA

The effects of anti-Americanism

Several potential effects of anti-Americanism are of greatest concern: 1) anti-Americanism can feed terrorism and violence toward the United States, 2) anti-Americanism can harm U.S. commercial interests abroad, and 3) anti-Americanism can harm U.S. political interests by making it more difficult to rally support for specific U.S. policy objectives.

Anti-Americanism can fuel violence by motivating terrorist recruits, making people more willing to harbor and assist terrorists, and undermining global counterterrorism cooperation. Looking at evidence from the Middle East, anti-Americanism does appear to play a significant role in the recruitment of some participants in violent terrorist movements and in the choice of others to abet terrorism. Because many other countries share an interest in combating terrorism, it is not clear that anti-Americanism has hampered U.S. counterterrorism efforts.

There exists considerable debate and limited empirical evidence on whether anti-Americanism has significantly affected U.S. economic interests. Some corporate chief executive officers, such as the founders of Business for Diplomatic Action, are seriously concerned about the economic impact of anti-Americanism. While available evidence does not demonstrate negative economic consequences resulting from anti-Americanism, there are signs that perceptions of U.S. companies and brands are affected by attitudes toward the U.S. Accordingly, the possibility that persistent negative perceptions of the United States will erode American economic influence is hard to dismiss.

Similarly, evidence demonstrating that anti-Americanism compromises U.S. political influence is mixed. That the political impact of anti-Americanism is difficult to isolate reflects the fact that the foreign policies of other countries are determined by many factors. The U.S.’s economic and military strength mean that other countries may opt to cooperate with Washington despite anti-American attitudes at home. Nevertheless, there are signs that anti-Americanism inhibits U.S. policymaking by causing the United States to scale back its requests in inhospitable environments, rather than risk possible rejection. In parts of the Muslim world especially, the discourse of anti-Americanism helps to fuel a culture of anti-modernity because key ideals of modernity are associated with the United States. Anti-Americanism has also contributed to a climate in which other powers whose interests are not aligned with Washington have succeeded in expanding their economic and political influence around the globe. In these ways, anti-Americanism can interfere with the achievement of U.S. foreign policy objectives writ large.

### L.A. Prolif

#### Brazil and Argentina are important potential proliferators.

Poblete 13 (Jason Poblete, Poblete Tamargo LLP May 10th 2013, Latin American Nuclear Powers Ink Cooperation Deal, <http://jasonpoblete.com/2013/05/10/latin-american-nuclear-powers-ink-cooperation-deal/>) - ShireenA

Does the title of this blog post seem a little odd sounding, [“Latin American” Nuclear Powers](http://nuclearexportcontrols.blogspot.it/2013/05/brazil-argentina-sign-agreement-to.html" \t "_blank)? A close friend was somewhat shocked when I told him earlier this week that Brazil and Argentina are the two more advanced nuclear powers in the Western Hemisphere. Mexico operates several reactors as well, but Argentina and Brazil are the regional nuclear trendsetters. My colleague, as is the case with most Americans, had no idea that there were reactors and ongoing nuclear research programs in various Latin American countries. Move over Iran. We have nuclear proliferation concerns right here in the Americas. Most policy experts in this town say there is no reason to really be concerned. I’m a little less sanguine. It is not that these nations should not be trusted with nuclear technology. If a country wants to pursue a nuclear program for peaceful purposes. have at it. The question is, can these two particular nations be trusted to do the right thing? The same questions we ask of regimes such as Iran and North Korea, are just as valid for [Brazil](http://www.aeb.gov.br/" \t "_blank) and [Argentina](http://www.conae.gov.ar/principal.html" \t "_blank). Alright, the latter are not controlled by rogue regimes; however, the programs are anything but as transparent as they should be. And what about their cozy relationship, especially Brazil, with Iran? Brazil and Argentina used to be more than soccer rivals. These two countries have been nuclear competitors, and at times, nuclear efforts have been the source of some tension. Realizing that they needed to work together, the past few decades has seen more cooperation in this field including the seemingly successful Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control of Nuclear Materials ([ABACC](http://www.abacc.org.br/?page_id=5&lang=en" \t "_blank)). Brazil — one of the Left’s poster child nations for green energy — has two nuclear reactors online for energy generation and four additional research reactors. Argentina, the first Latin American nation to use nuclear power, has four reactors online for energy generation and five research reactors. Should we care? Should we be worried? Concerned? Yes. Yes. And, hell yes. Pursuant to a treaty and various other international protocols, Latin America is supposed to be a nuclear-free weapons zone. There is no evidence that either country is pursuing a weaponized nuclear program. This does not mean that they have not tried to do so in the past. They did. I’ve think we’ve trusted them way too much with nuclear technology. Considering that both countries have rocket launch capabilities, we should be a little more than vigilant. Both countries have space agencies that used to be under military control. That was the case with the nuclear programs. Brazil is reportedly building nuclear submarines now. Argentina and Brazil relations with [Iran](http://jasonpoblete.com/2010/08/18/brazils-rocket-envy-aside-iran-ally-nets-50000000-worth-of-sensitive-u-s-technology/" \t "_blank) should be reason enough to ask tough questions of our regional allies. The International Atomic Energy Agency ([IAEA](http://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/brazils-nuclear-ambitions/" \t "_blank)) – the global UN watchdog for these matters – has yet to be granted full access to [either](http://jasonpoblete.com/2009/09/26/no-nukes-then-allow-iaea-inspectors-in-brazil/" \t "_blank) nuclear program. What do they have to hide? There are bigger issues at play here than just Brazil and Argentina tinkering with nuclear energy. Think, Iran, for starters. And regional democracies are concerned about it, but will not say so in polite company. It is DC you know. But the U.S. Congress need not worry about being polite or diplomatic. They need to chime in.

Nuclear proliferation in Latin America would trigger an arms race.

ACA 2013 [ACA – Arms Control Association; “Latin America Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaty (Treaty of Tlatelolco)”; http://www.armscontrol.org/documents/tlatelolco] RahulNambiar

That the incalculable destructive power of nuclear weapons has made it imperative that the legal prohibition of war should be strictly observed in practice if the survival of civilization and of mankind itself is to be assured, That nuclear weapons, whose terrible effects are suffered, indiscriminately and inexorably, by military forces and civilian population alike, constitute, through the persistence of the radioactivity they release, an attack on the integrity of the human species and ultimately may even render the whole earth uninhabitable, That general and complete disarmament under effective international control is a vital matter which all the peoples of the world equally demand, That the proliferation of nuclear weapons, which seems inevitable unless States, in the exercise of their sovereign rights, impose restrictions on themselves in order to prevent it, would make any agreement on disarmament enormously difficult and would increase the danger of the outbreak of a nuclear conflagration, That the establishment of militarily denuclearized zones is closely linked with the maintenance of peace and security in the respective regions, That the military denuclearization of vast geographical zones, adopted by the sovereign decision of the States comprised therein, will exercise a beneficial influence on other regions where similar conditions exist, That the privileged situation of the signatory States, whose territories are wholly free from nuclear weapons, imposes upon them the inescapable duty of preserving that situation both in their own interest and for the good of mankind, That the existence of nuclear weapons in any country of Latin America would make it a target for possible nuclear attacks and would inevitably set off, throughout the region, a ruinous race in nuclear weapons which would involve the unjustifiable diversion, for warlike purposes, of the limited resources required for economic and social development, That the foregoing reasons, together with the traditional peace-loving outlook of Latin America, give rise to an inescapable necessity that nuclear energy should be used in that region exclusively for peaceful purposes, and that the Latin American countries should use their right to the greatest and most equitable possible access to this new source of energy in order to expedite the economic and social development of their peoples,

### AT: No Capability (Latin America)

#### Latin American countries have the capability to proliferate.

Trinkunas 9-1-2011 [Harold A. Trinkunas - Associate Professor and Deputy Director for Academic Affairs @ Naval Post-Graduate School; “Latin America: Nuclear Capabilities, Intentions and Threat Perceptions”; http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=whemsac] RahulNambiar

Three key states are relevant in considering future nuclear proliferation in Latin America: Argentina, Brazil, and Venezuela. Argentina and Brazil are critical because of their relatively advanced nuclear capabilities. For historical and geopolitical reasons, neither Argentina nor Brazil is likely to reactivate nuclear weapons programs. Venezuela’s President, Hugo Chávez, has repeatedly demonstrated interest in developing a nuclear program, yet Venezuela lacks any serious nuclear expertise. Even if it had the managerial and technological capacity, the lead-time to develop an indigenous nuclear program would be measured in decades. Acquisition of nuclear technology from international sources would be difficult because members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group would insist on safeguards, and potential non-Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) suppliers are highly surveilled, risking the exposure of such a program before Venezuela could put a deterrent into place.

#### Venezuela willing to proliferate

Trinkunas 9-1-2011 [Harold A. Trinkunas - Associate Professor and Deputy Director for Academic Affairs @ Naval Post-Graduate School; “Latin America: Nuclear Capabilities, Intentions and Threat Perceptions”; http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=whemsac] RahulNambiar

Venezuela has taken positions on proliferation issues that run directly against the mainstream of international public opinion, pursuing a highly publicized rapprochement with Iran, a potential nuclear supplier, and supporting both Iran‟s right to pursue nuclear technology without constraints and North Korea‟s periodic missile tests. It has also opposed international sanctions over nuclear issues on both powers.11 Venezuela‟s stated concern of a U.S. invasion has led it to officially orient its Armed Forces towards a policy of prolonged popular war and asymmetric warfare. This has translated into changes in doctrine and educational programs, and the creation of a militia.12 Certainly, nuclear forces would be the ultimate deterrent against outside intervention. Taken together, these factors have led some outside observers to claim that Venezuela is a potential nuclear proliferation risk. If we evaluate the contemporary domestic and international political context, it seems unlikely. At the international level, Argentina and Brazil have reacted very cautiously to the Venezuelan nuclear proposal. On the one hand, they would like the business for economic reasons, but on the other they are concerned about Chávez‟s ambitions. As members of the NPT and the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSP), Argentina and Brazil are likely to insist on strong international safeguards on any nuclear technology sold to Caracas.13 However, neither the Argentine nor the Brazilian governments have opposed Venezuela‟s nuclear ambitions publicly, both because they are vulnerable domestically on their left flank, where Hugo Chávez has numerous sympathizers, and because internationally they still have common economic interests with Venezuela.

#### Latin American seeks nuclear technology

Trinkunas 9-1-2011 [Harold A. Trinkunas - Associate Professor and Deputy Director for Academic Affairs @ Naval Post-Graduate School; “Latin America: Nuclear Capabilities, Intentions and Threat Perceptions”; http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=whemsac] RahulNambiar

Argentina and Brazil are likely to remain nuclear technology powers and continue to pursue further research in this domain. Nationalist leaders in both countries are interested in sustaining their nuclear programs as an economic resource and a means to demonstrate sovereignty and technological independence. However, they currently have no interest in introducing nuclear weapons into the region, and they are likely to continue supporting a reasonable international nonproliferation regime. Given their proven ability to develop nuclear technology to a substantial level of sophistication, Argentina and Brazil remain potential nuclear proliferators because they have capability to move towards weaponization in years rather than decades.

## Climate Change

### U.S.-L.A. Relations Solve Climate Change

#### US-Latin American cooperation only way to combat climate change- new research and technology

West 12 former Fulbright fellow, is a frequent contributor to NAFSA’s award-winning International Educator magazine. (Charlotte West, 2012, New Approaches to Cooperation with Latin America, http://www.nafsa.org/uploadedFiles/Chez\_NAFSA/Find\_Resources/Publications/Periodicals/Epublications/epub\_latin\_america.pdf)

One place where Latin America has a distinct research advantage is in the area of climate change. For example, a recent survey from MIT showed that 95 percent of major cities in Latin America are planning for climate change, compared to only 59 percent of such cities in the United States. Quito, Ecuador is considered a global leader in areas such as studying the effects of global warming on nearby melting glaciers and developing ways of dealing with potential water shortage.

José Lever, Mexico coordinator at the University of Arizona, said that his institution has focused efforts on developing bilateral research in areas where they have a lot in common with Mexican institutions, such as biotechnology, environmental sciences, climate change, and pharmacology. Other areas where they are active include business, technology transfer, and innovation. Through partnerships with Mexican centers of excellence, they are trying to foster a better understanding of how innovation works, identify business opportunities from emerging technologies, and help market them in order to foster better economic prospects in the region. They are also building a network of U.S. university representatives, including institutions such as the University of Southern California, the State University of New York, and Texas A&M.“[We want to] work together with not only with Mexican higher education, but also with the Mexican National Council on Science and Technology (CONACYT— Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología),26 to address regional challenges and identify ways to bring faculties together to discover some of the best places to do research on these topics,” Lever said.

### Multilateralism Solves Climate Change

#### **Only cooperation solves warming- there needs to be an agreement**

MACKEY and LI 07- Pacific Ecologists (Brendan Mackey and Song Li, 2007, Win the Struggle Against Global Warming, <http://www.pacificecologist.org/archive/15/earth-charter.pdf>) SA

Addressing the root causes of global warming will require a level of national and international cooperation not seen since the Allied nations’ response during World War II. So it’s not unreasonable to speak of ‘winning the war against global warming,’ although the analogy is imperfect as in this war the enemy is ourselves. Mandela said: “If you want to make peace with your enemy, you have to work with your enemy. Then he becomes your partner.

Global warming can only be solved through partnership and the cooperation of all sectors and nations. We are all aware of the need to reduce our greenhouse emissions from fossil fuel use. But what critical steps must we now take to ensure our efforts are not wasted? Voluntary agreements and agreements that include only some of the world’s nations will not solve the problem. The sad fact is any benefits to the global climate system gained from reducing your greenhouse gas emissions by double-glazing your home’s windows, or cycling rather than driving a car to work, can and will be offset by greenhouse gas emissions from dirty factories in Australia, deforestation in Brazil, or cars driven in Beijing. Unless there is an agreed target and timetable for reducing greenhouse gas emissions to a safe level there can be no guarantee our efforts will help solve the problem.

### **AT: Warming Irreversible**

#### Emissions cuts immediately reduce climate change.

Desjardins 13- Senior Advisor, External Communications at Concordia University. Damon Matthews - associate professor in the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment. (Clea Desjardins, April 2nd 2013, Global Warming: Irreversible but not Inevitable, <http://www.concordia.ca/now/what-we-do/research/20130402/global-warming-irreversible-but-not-inevitable.php>) SA

There is a persistent misconception among both scientists and the public that there is a delay between emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) and the climate’s response to those emissions. This misconception has led policy makers to argue that CO2 emission cuts implemented now will not affect the climate system for many decades. This erroneous line of argument makes the climate problem seem more intractable than it actually is, say Concordia University’s Damon Matthews and MIT’s Susan Solomon in a recent Science article.

The researchers show that immediate decreases in CO2 emissions would in fact result in an immediate decrease in the rate of climate warming. Explains Matthews, professor in the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment, “If we can successfully decrease CO2 emissions in the near future, this change will be felt by the climate system when the emissions reductions are implemented – not in several decades."

“The potential for a quick climate response to prompt cuts in CO2 emissions opens up the possibility that the climate benefits of emissions reductions would occur on the same timescale as the political decisions themselves.”

In their paper, Matthews and Solomon, Ellen Swallow Richards professor of Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Science, show that the onus for slowing the rate of global warming falls squarely on current efforts at reducing CO2 emissions, and the resulting future emissions that we produce. This means that there are critical implications for the equity of carbon emission choices currently being discussed internationally.

Total emissions from developing countries may soon exceed those from developed nations. But developed countries are expected to maintain a far higher per-capita contribution to present and possible future warming. “This disparity clarifies the urgency for low-carbon technology investment and diffusion to enable developing countries to continue to develop,” says Matthews.

“Emission cuts made now will have an immediate effect on the rate of global warming,” he asserts. “I see more hope for averting difficult-to-avoid negative impacts by accelerating advances in technology development and diffusion, than for averting climate system changes that are already inevitable. Given the enormous scope and complexity of the climate mitigation challenge, clarifying these points of hope is critical to motivate change.”

# L.A. Relations – Neg

### No L.A. Prolif

#### Venezuela can’t proliferate

Trinkunas 9-1-2011 [Harold A. Trinkunas - Associate Professor and Deputy Director for Academic Affairs @ Naval Post-Graduate School; “Latin America: Nuclear Capabilities, Intentions and Threat Perceptions”; http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=whemsac] RahulNambiar

In the Venezuelan case, despite the intentions of its leadership, there is a low risk for successful nuclear proliferation because of strong international and domestic constraints. Venezuela lacks any serious domestic nuclear development program, and starting and operating such programs is expensive and requires a lead-time of decades before achieving success. Given the resources that Chávez has at his disposal, a small possibility remains that Venezuela could acquire nuclear technology through some sort of turn key arrangement with an existing supplier. If this were to be provided by a member of the NSG, then the probability of diversion of this technology for non-peaceful purposes is low because of the scarcity of Venezuela‟s managerial and technical capacity and absence of nuclear expertise. If a non-member of the NSG, which would not require international safeguards, provided it, then Venezuela and its supplier would face the risk of discovery well before a fully functional nuclear weapons program could be established. This gap between discovery and the acquisition of a deterrent would leave Venezuela highly vulnerable to action by the international community.

#### Security communities solve prolif

Trinkunas 9-1-2011 [Harold A. Trinkunas - Associate Professor and Deputy Director for Academic Affairs @ Naval Post-Graduate School; “Latin America: Nuclear Capabilities, Intentions and Threat Perceptions”; http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=whemsac] RahulNambiar

The developing security community in the Southern Cone, taking the form of UNASUR in its latest evolution, means that any territorial defense or deterrence rationales for nuclear weapons acquisition have faded. The resolution of all territorial disputes between the major regional powers (Argentina, Brazil, Chile), and ongoing mutual confidence- building measures, limit the possibility that new conflict dynamics will lead States in the region to seek nuclear weapons. Of the two powers with indigenous nuclear technology industries, Brazil‟s constitution bans the development of nuclear weapons, and both Argentina and Brazil are committed to sophisticated nuclear safeguards through the ABACC. 4