

Table of Contents

***1NC SHELL	2
A. Uniqueness - The budget climate is tight and Congress will require zero-sum offsets of health and development spending	3
B. Link - Latin America is the lowest priority – it is funded now but will be cut to make up for the plan.....	4
C. Internal Link - USAID is preventing deforestation in the Amazon	5
D. Amazon collapse risks extinction	6
*** UNIQUENESS - AID STRONG NOW	7
___ US aid to Latin America is still strong.....	7
___ Aid to Latin America is still high	7
___ Bush is pledging new aid to Latin America.....	8
*** BRINK: BARELY ENOUGH AID NOW	9
___ Latin America was cut slightly in the budget but overall assistance is still ok – this evidence addresses all of their “aid to Africa increasing” arguments and proves Latin America is the most likely target	9
*** LINK - PLAN WILL CUT AID TO LATIN AMERICA	10
___ Africa and Latin America are the two lowest priority regions – the plan will put more pressure on Latin America by protecting Africa.....	10
___ Increasing aid to Africa trades off with Latin American development assistance	11
___ Development assistance is the most likely target for a tradeoff	11
___ Increasing AIDS funding risks budget tradeoffs with other health programs	12
*** IMPACT	13
___ USAID money is vital to preserving Latin American biodiversity	13
___ Development assistance is vital to Latin American biodiversity	14
___ Amazon deforestation risks extinction.....	14
___ Biodiversity loss risks human extinction	15

*****1NC SHELL**

Introduction/Thesis:

Their plan does not happen in a vacuum. The USFG only has so much funding to send abroad. This disadvantage argues that because of current budget climate in Congress funding is in a zero-sum atmosphere - new funding must balance by cutting existing funding. The most likely place this funding will be cut is towards Latin America - and with devastating consequences.

A. Uniqueness - The budget climate is tight and Congress will require zero-sum offsets of health and development spending

Sessions, 06

(analyst at the Centre for Global Development (Myra, Blog – “The PMI Turns One - How Will We Measure Success?”, Global Health Policy Blog, 7/6, http://blogs.cgdev.org/globalhealth/2006/07/the_pmi_turns_o.php)

In a July 1 editorial, the Lancet (free registration required) praised the US President's Malaria Initiative (PMI) which was celebrating the one year anniversary of its founding. Although much quieter than its older brother, PEPFAR, the PMI has slowly and softly helped revolutionize the battle against malaria by concentrating resources to make substantial gains against the disease. However, this model is not without its critics. According to the article: For PMI, the key measure of success must be whether or not it adds value independently of other organizations' efforts. As long as its existence does not jeopardize US financial support of the Global Fund, PMI's pledges to focus on what is needed, to ensure sustainability of achievements, and to empower countries to drive anti-malaria efforts themselves should win the initiative international support to expand and move forward. What is necessary now is for Congress to see PMI's potential and meet President Bush's full request. Myra comments: It is clearly true that the PMI has helped increase international attention to malaria and has transformed a notoriously under-funded and under-appreciated area of US foreign assistance for global health. However, measuring the success of this initiative should not be confined to a discussion of health outcomes and implementation strategies, although these elements are crucial. Evaluators should also look at the aid mechanism itself: is this model effective? What are the trade-offs for those countries that receive the concentrated funding and those who don't? What are the trade-offs for US global health and foreign assistance overall? Are the gains that are made cost-effective? What we need going forward is increased transparency in decision-making processes, including country selection, as well as better public knowledge about the inputs and results. We also need an understanding that this is a new and different way of doing business - a grand experiment in foreign aid - and one that needs healthy scrutiny from time to time. COMMENTS For me, one of the most encouraging parts of the PMI is its effort to involve the host government and other development partners from the initial stages of program planning. Hopefully, early success using this more inclusive model will have spillover effects to other USAID programs. Myra - when you ask about the possible tradeoffs for global health, what exactly are you referring to? Do you believe PMI spending is crowding out other potential health spending? Posted by: Michael Bernstein at July 6, 2006 02:04 PM Thanks for the comment and question, Michael. I have not done the analysis of the data to see if the PMI is having a negative impact on the funding levels of other health initiatives-- and given all of the other changes in the US foreign assistance budget I am not sure it would ever be possible to isolate the impact of the PMI. However, during a recent CGD event, Congressman Kolbe talked at length about the future challenges in maintaining foreign assistance funding levels in light of increasing domestic federal expenditures. Mark Lippert, the Director of Foreign Policy for Senator Barak Obama also touched on this key issue at an April CGD event about the future of MCA. The message from each of these speakers was that funding levels for any particular initiative or priority should be looked at in the broader context-- and that the appropriations process is essentially a zero-sum game full of trade-offs. In today's tight budget climate, I think that there is no doubt that funding for the PMI and other new initiatives will detract from real or potential funding for other areas of the foreign aid budget-- and that that reality should be a part of the conversation about the successes and opportunities of the initiatives.

B. Link - Latin America is the lowest priority – it is funded now but will be cut to make up for the plan

Sanchez 2006

(Marcela, “Linking foreign aid and security”, San Diego Tribune, 1/28,
http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20060128/news_1z1e28sanchez.html

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice last week announced that the U.S. diplomatic corps would be repositioned to more volatile countries, with foreign aid gaining new prominence and focus within the administration, all to ensure long-term U.S. security. These changes, part of her new vision of “transformational diplomacy,” are based on the notion that the greatest threat to U.S. security comes from within states that have failed, not from states at war with each other. Aid experts inside and outside the government worry that making U.S. security interests the litmus test for foreign assistance will put USAID programs at risk, particularly those in Latin America. Rep. Jim Kolbe, R-Ariz., who as chairman of the House foreign operations subcommittee has long had a leading role in determining levels of U.S. foreign aid, warned that the agency could lose its policy direction as its mission changed “from one of poverty alleviation and economic development ... (to one) much more narrowly focused on our national security objectives.” With the exception of Colombia, U.S. aid to Latin America has been declining significantly since the end of the Cold War. Under the new plan, the region would seem to be even less a priority, slipping well behind the Middle East, Southeast Asia and even Africa, which are more likely breeding grounds for Islamic terrorists. Rice’s “transformational diplomacy,” however, does not necessarily spell the demise for aid to Latin America. Nancy Birdsall, president of the Center for Global Development, believes Rice’s plan reinvigorates development, the core mission of USAID, by making it “a national security imperative.” Indeed, Rice herself argues for development, only her emphasis is on U.S. security, not poverty alleviation. “Our foreign assistance must help people get results,” Rice said in a speech last week. “The resources we commit must empower developing countries to strengthen security, to consolidate democracy, to increase trade and investment, and to improve the lives of their people.”

C. Internal Link - USAID is preventing deforestation in the Amazon

Franco 2004

(Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, USAID (Adolfo, "Foreign Assistance Priorities for the Western Hemisphere," 3/2, <http://www.ciponline.org/colombia/040302fran.htm>)

Overall, USAID is programming its development assistance in the LAC region to help our trading partners to prepare for trade negotiations, and implement trade agreements. Additionally, USAID-supported programs help to ensure that all USAID investments in areas such as small business development and rural diversification maximize the economic growth and poverty reduction benefits from their participation in free trade. USAID is implementing the President's Initiative against Illegal Logging, which seeks to address the negative impacts of the illegal timber trade on economic, social, and political stability. In Peru, where illegal loggers have developed a symbiotic relationship with resurgent terrorist groups in remote areas, USAID is supporting national efforts to enforce laws and regulations related to protected areas, assisting communities to manage forests and certify wood products, and promoting alliances with U.S.-based mahogany retailers and Peruvian mahogany exporters. In Brazil's Amazon Basin, a largely unexplored biodiversity treasure, USAID is helping to develop management systems that maintain a balance between development and protection of natural resources. Other USAID programs have contributed to the conservation of millions of hectares of land and passage of key laws such as the Special Law for the Galapagos. USAID's sustained support helped develop sustainable timber harvest, and reduced significantly the rate of deforestation in several South American protected reserves.

D. Amazon collapse risks extinction

Takacs, 1996

(teaches environmental humanities (history, ethics, justice, politics) in the Institute for Earth Systems Science and Policy at California State (David, "The Idea of Biodiversity: Philosophies of Paradise," 1996, pg. 200-201)

So biodiversity keeps the world running. It has value and of itself, as well as for us. Raven, Erwin, and Wilson oblige us to think about the value of biodiversity for our own lives. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper trope makes this same point; by eliminating rivets, we play Russian roulette with global ecology and human futures: "It is likely that destruction of the rich complex of species in the Amazon basin could trigger rapid changes in global climate patterns. Agriculture remains heavily dependent on stable climate, and human beings remain heavily dependent on food. By the end of the century the extinction of perhaps a million species in the Amazon basin could have entrained famines in which a billion human beings perished. And if our species is very unlucky, the famines could lead to a thermonuclear war, which could extinguish civilization."¹³ Elsewhere Ehrlich uses different particulars with no less drama:

What then will happen if the current decimation of organic diversity continues? Crop yields will be more difficult to maintain in the face of climatic change, soil erosion, loss of dependable water supplies, decline of pollinators, and ever more serious assaults by pests. Conversion of productive land to wasteland will accelerate; deserts will continue their seemingly inexorable expansion. Air pollution will increase, and local climates will become harsher. Humanity will have to forgo many of the direct economic benefits it might have withdrawn from Earth's wellstocked genetic library. It might, for example, miss out on a cure for cancer; but that will make little difference. As ecosystem services falter, mortality from respiratory and epidemic disease, natural disasters, and especially famine will lower life expectancies to the point where cancer (largely a disease of the elderly) will be unimportant. Humanity will bring upon itself consequences depressingly similar to those expected from a nuclear winter. Barring a nuclear conflict, it appears that civilization will disappear some time before the end of the next century - not with a bang but a whimper.¹⁴

***** UNIQUENESS - AID STRONG NOW**

___ US aid to Latin America is still strong

Hindustan Times, 07

(Indo-Asian News Service, "Bush to increase Latin American aid ahead of visit", 3/6, factiva)

Indo-Asian News Service Washington, March 6 -- US President George W. Bush has announced plans for additional US aid initiatives in Latin America days before a six-day, five-nation tour to boost the US image in the region.

In a speech to members of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce here Monday, Bush decried widespread poverty in the region and pledged additional US programmes to boost education, health care, home ownership and business.

"The working poor of Latin America need change, and the US is committed to that change," Bush said. "It is in our national interests, it is in the interest of the US to help the people in democracies in our neighbourhood succeed."

Bush emphasised that US aid to Latin America had increased to \$1.6 billion last year from \$860 million per year when he became president in 2001.

___ Aid to Latin America is still high

Dale, 07

(director of the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation (Helle, The Washington Times, "U.S.-Latin America dance ; Bush takes lead with aid and trade policies," 3/14, factiva)

There is a world of difference between acknowledgement (or even knowledge) of what the United States does for Latin America in terms of foreign aid, counternarcotics efforts, remittances, free trade, etc., and gratitude. Where foreign policy and national interests are concerned, gratitude doesn't buy you a cup of coffee. That said, it is also important to take a look at the Bush administration's actual record on Latin America, which is far from paltry. It is far from one of neglect. In fact, the media, which have failed to make any note of it, might more aptly fit the charge. First of all, Mr. Bush began his presidency with a trip to Mexico for a summit with then-Mexican President Vicente Fox (much to the chagrin of the Europeans, who thought they were more important). It was followed by six other trips to the region, and now by Mr. Bush's week-long, five-country tour, covering Brazil, Colombia, Uruguay, Guatemala and Mexico. That makes eight visits in six years, more than any other president. Second, is myth over fact. It is not true, as one myth would have it, that Mr. Bush is avoiding public venues for fear of protesters. On his current visit, Mr. Bush has been in the heart of the region's population centers in Brazil, Colombia and Mexico. Third, is aid. In terms of foreign aid to Latin America, it has doubled during the two Bush terms, from \$800 million to \$1.6 billion today. This includes grants from the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which links aid money to good-governance practices.

_____ **Bush is pledging new aid to Latin America**

UPI, 2007.

(March 5, Washington “Bush pledges new aid to Latin America”)

President George Bush, saying the United States has not forgotten **Latin America**, Monday said Washington is expanding aid for housing, healthcare and education. "The working poor of Latin America need change and the United States of America is committed to that change," Bush said in a speech to business leaders of the Hispanic Chamber at the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center. Bush said in coming years \$885 million in new U.S. foreign aid would go to Latin America.

***** BRINK: BARELY ENOUGH AID NOW**

____ Latin America was cut slightly in the budget but overall assistance is still ok – this evidence addresses all of their “aid to Africa increasing” arguments and proves Latin America is the most likely target

Oppenheimer, 07

(Andres, The Miami Herald, “The Oppenheimer Report column: Reducing U.S. aid unwise move”, 6/24, factiva)

What an outrage! Only three months after President Bush's trip to Latin America, where he prided himself on doubling foreign aid to the region, Congress last week approved a Bush administration-proposed bill that actually cuts U.S. economic assistance to the region by more than 8 percent. Before we look into how Washington's aid compares with Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez's checkbook diplomacy, let's take a quick look at the U.S. economic assistance budget for 2008 that the House approved on Thursday. While the House's \$34 billion worldwide foreign aid bill for next year amounts to a nearly 10 percent increase over last year's foreign assistance budget, its \$1.5 billion earmarked for Latin America amounts to an 8.5 percent decrease in aid to the region over the same period. Comparatively, the Bush administration-proposed bill includes a 54 percent increase in foreign aid to Africa, a nearly 7 percent increase for South Asia, a nearly 4 percent increase for the Middle East and a 25 percent drop in assistance to Eastern Europe. “Latin America was cut more than any other region, except Eastern Europe,” says Adam Isacson, of the Center for International Policy, a Washington, D.C., think tank. “It's a big mistake, at a time when Latin Americans are becoming frustrated with democracy, Chavez is increasing his foreign aid, coca cultivation is growing, organized crime is out of control in Mexico and Central America and immigration is continuing.” When President Bush visited Brazil in March, he disputed claims that the United States has forgotten about Latin America after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, saying that Washington has doubled its economic assistance to the region since 2001. MISLEADING But many experts said that Bush's figures were misleading because 2001 had been a statistically low year, given that Congress had just approved a two-year budget for Plan Colombia a year earlier. In fact, U.S. foreign aid to Latin America has remained stagnant during the Bush administration, critics say. U.S officials concede that the Bush administration's 2008 foreign aid request for Latin America is below last year's levels, but stand by their claim that on average U.S. foreign aid to the region has gone up. “Foreign assistance has nearly doubled under President Bush,” Erik Watnik, a State Department spokesman, told me Friday. “For seven years prior to the [2000] Plan Colombia, foreign assistance to the region averaged \$800 million. Since fiscal year 2001, foreign assistance to the region has averaged \$1.55 billion.” And this does not include \$898 million in U.S. Millennium Challenge Fund money for El Salvador, Nicaragua and Honduras, Watnik added. Still, one has to wonder whether U.S. economic aid levels are adequate at a time when Venezuela's narcissist-Leninist President Chavez makes big headlines with promises of mega-donations to the region. In a March 15 speech, Chavez said that Venezuela is giving \$1.6 billion a year just in oil subsidies to foreign countries, mostly in Latin America. Several studies cited in a May 20 report by Grupo Diarios de America, a group of 11 Latin American newspapers, estimate the total figure of Venezuela's foreign largess -- including government loans, bonds purchases and investments -- at more than \$5.5 billion a year. My opinion: Granted, most of Chavez's foreign aid commitments will never see the light of the day. And sure, if you count U.S. investments, U.S. trade and family remittances to Latin America, the U.S. economic presence in Latin America dwarfs that of Venezuela. (Only in remittances, Latin Americans in the United States send \$45 billion a year to their native countries.)

*** LINK - PLAN WILL CUT AID TO LATIN AMERICA

___Africa and Latin America are the two lowest priority regions – the plan will put more pressure on Latin America by protecting Africa

Menendez and Fore 2007

(chair of Senate International Development Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and administer of USAID (Robert and Henrietta, Federal News Service, 6/12, “EFFICACY OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE REFORM”, lexis)

SEN. MENENDEZ: Thank you, Madame Secretary. And let me say that we have two panels and, depending upon many of our colleagues are here, we'll start off with a round of seven minutes and then if necessary, we'll revisit. I'll start off with myself. I'm enthused to hear some of what you said, that this is the beginning of the F-process -- if that's the case good. I'm glad to hear about the consultations and your outreach, particularly to the development community. That's good. I'm glad to hear that you're talking about transparency and also about this not wanting to preside over the demise of USAID. So that's all music to my ears and I'm glad to hear it. Let me pursue however some of these things with some questions. The administration proposed a 15 percent cut to the FY '08 operating expense budget for USAID, that's the funding that runs our operations that USAID missions, and cutting it ultimately I think would mean closing missions. We have specifically heard that there are discussions about closing a number of missions in Latin America and Africa. Had there been any such discussions about closing missions in these regions and if so, exactly which ones.

MS. FORE: I believe Mr. Chairman that there has been the beginning of discussions on a number of issues that have to do with the operating expense funds. AID as you know has struggled to fund enough of their operating expenses to support their people, to hire enough people and to be able to have them be well-supported when they are at work in the field, of facing tight budgets and very restricted budgets, the agency came to several discussions in which they were talking about ways that they could save operating expense money. And they have begun discussions on how they can better structure the organization. I have just begun reading in on those discussions, I know that they are on-going, I know the decisions have not yet been made. So I am interested to hear of your interest in it --

Increasing aid to Africa trades off with Latin American development assistance

Menendez, 2000

(US Senator (Robert, Testimony before HOUSE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE, Federal News Service, 6/28, lexis)

I have proposed a Development Fund for Latin America and the Caribbean, and I will soon introduce a bill that would authorize the fund. In the period 1985 to 1990, U.S. non-military, non-narcotics assistance to the region averaged more than 1.5 billion per year. In the period 1995-2000, the average yearly assistance was only \$600 million. Latin America is too important to our own national well-being to allow this hemorrhaging of assistance to continue. Don't get me wrong, there are numerous other regions of top importance too - the Middle East; Russia, Ukraine, Armenia and the other states of the former Soviet Union; humanitarian and peace-keeping needs in Africa; are among the most prominent. But nearly every time an emergency comes up, when funding is needed elsewhere, Latin America funds get redirected to meet the need. We're robbing Peter to pay Paul. And it will come back to haunt us.

Development assistance is the most likely target for a tradeoff

Atwood 1999

(Head administrator for USAID (Brian, "The Future of the U.S. Foreign Assistance Program", remarks given to the Overseas Development Council, June 29, <http://www.ciaonet.org/pbei/odc/atj01.html>)

The budget pressures within the international affairs accounts have made people more aggressively parochial than ever. If you don't have the money to do your job, then you look around for someone else's money. The easiest target in town is the development assistance account. I would argue that this account represents the future, but if you sit at the State Department you have to believe the future is now. State's crisis orientation is natural, but it does crowd out the more prospective vision. That is why an AID sitting in the State Department would in time find itself crowded out. I am grateful to Madeleine Albright for appreciating this reality. The focus in Washington during much of my tenure was on the reorganization plan that moved USAID into State. What would really have advanced the cause of development would have been a plan to give USAID responsibility for the oversight of the World Bank.

___Increasing AIDS funding risks budget tradeoffs with other health programs

Morrison et al, 2007

(J. Stephen, Director of the Africa Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, “Advancing U.S. Leadership on Global HIV/AIDS Opportunities in the PEPFAR Reauthorization Process”, May, http://www.csis.org/media/csis/pubs/070504_pepfar.pdf)

Future success is not a foregone conclusion. Rising budgetary needs for HIV/AIDS come into direct conflict with growing pressures to constrain budget growth across all sectors of the U.S. government. Budget pressures also arise from the fact that the U.S. currently provides about half the funds donated by all nations for HIV/AIDS, a proportion that is not sustainable. Even as budget constraints threaten the continued rapid expansion of PEPFAR, there is growing concern in Congress and among advocates that traditional global health programs—maternal and child health, family planning, and infectious disease— are declining in real terms, potentially undermining the positive impact of PEPFAR.

*** IMPACT

USAID money is vital to preserving Latin American biodiversity

Watson, 2000

(VICE PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY (Alexander, HEARING OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, "THE IMPACT OF LATIN AMERICA'S ECONOMIC GROWTH ON THE ENVIRONMENT", Federal News Service, 7/25, lexis)

But we have long recognized the need to work with the world's greatest biodiversity which is beyond our borders, chiefly in the tropics. The Conservancy operates in 19 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean as well as others in Asia, Oceania and in Canada. We also work indirectly in a couple of other western hemisphere countries such as El Salvador and Argentina through regional projects and liaison relationships without having formal conservation programs in those countries.

Since the beginning of our international program in 1981, we have helped protect more than 74 million acres of biologically significant land in Latin America and the Caribbean. Funding for the Conservancy's work is 92 percent from private sources. In fact, we are currently engaged in a campaign to raise 1 billion private dollars for conservation.

Nevertheless, it is important to underscore that the funding that the Conservancy receives from the Agency for International Development is crucial to our success in Latin America and the Caribbean. And we urge members of the committee to support appropriations requests for international conservation in the AID budget as well as to fund the U.S. contribution to the global environment facility mentioned by the representative from the Department of Treasury a minute ago. And also to expand the excellent and growing international programs of such U.S. agencies as the Fish and Wildlife Service, United States Forest Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as well as the Environmental Protection Agency.

Development assistance is vital to Latin American biodiversity

Watson, 2000

(VICE PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATION, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY (Alexander, HEARING OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, "THE IMPACT OF LATIN AMERICA'S ECONOMIC GROWTH ON THE ENVIRONMENT", Federal News Service, 7/25, lexis)

Of course, the Conservancy strongly supports economic development in Latin America and the Caribbean and other developing regions. And we do not believe that development has to be at the expense of conservation of countries' natural resources.

In fact, we believe that development and conservation are mutually dependent. Unless biological and other resources are managed carefully and protected, development in countries highly dependent on natural resources, as most developing countries are, will soon run dry.

And yet, unless development provides economic alternatives for the poor, they will be forced to consume natural resources on an unsustainable basis and conservation efforts will be thwarted. So we all must thrive to assure that development and conservation are mutually supportive.

Amazon deforestation risks extinction

O'Neil, 97

(Martin, "Rain Forest Depletion", 5/5,
<http://www.northern.wvnet.edu/~tdanford/bio1/RAINFO.htm>)

There are some really amazing facts about the Amazon rain forest. The Amazon alone covers 54% of all the world's rain forests, thus making it literally the lungs of the Earth. We can say this because trees produce oxygen while they use carbon dioxide to maintain their respiration. Rain forests cover about 7% of the Earth's surface, but host about 50-90% of the plant and animal population of the entire world. The Amazon River has more species of fish than the entire Atlantic Ocean does. In less than 25 acres of rain forest there are more species of trees than the entire continent of North America. A tree found in Peru was found to be the host to 43 different species of ants. There are more species of birds on a Peru reserve than the entire United States has. A fact that is very highly regarded about the Amazon rain forest is that of the 3000 species of plants that have been discovered there, 70% of these plants have anti-cancerous properties. Also, 25% of these plants are now used to combat cancer. So as humankind continues to harvest the Amazon rain forest which covers 1.2 million acres and 9 countries, they should also try to consider the devastating effects that it is having on our race along with all the biological effects that it also carries. Although 1.2 million acres seems like a very large number, in the past four decades that number was reduced in half to the current figure, so we see that this can not keep happening with out some type of governing on what is occurring. If it does we may become an endangered species.

_____ **Biodiversity loss risks human extinction**

Takacs, 1996

(teaches environmental humanities (history, ethics, justice, politics) in the Institute for Earth Systems Science and Policy at California State (David, "The Idea of Biodiversity: Philosophies of Paradise," 1996, pg. 200)

"Habitat destruction and conversion are eliminating species at such a frightening pace that extinction of many contemporary species and the systems they live in and support ... may lead to ecological disaster and severe alteration of the evolution process," Terry Erwin writes. And E. O. Wilson notes: "The question I am asked most frequently about the diversity of life: if enough species are extinguished, will the ecosystem collapse, and will the extinction of most other species follow soon afterward? The only answer anyone can give is: possibly. By the time we find out, might be too late. One planet, one experiment.",¹²