## 1AC

### Plan

#### Plan Text: The United States federal government should substantially increase its renewable energy integration with the United Mexican States via grid integration and wind and solar energy development.

### Advantage 1: Warming

#### Renewable development on the border will remain limited through 2030, but join cooperation between the US and Mexico can boost the industry

Al Sweedler et al, 2012, The U.S.-Mexican Border Environment: Progress and Challenges for Sustainability (eds., Erik Lee and Paul Ganster), "Chapter 11: Energy for a Sustainable Border Region in 2030," p. 321-322

Energy poses a formidable challenge to those working to achieve ¶ sustainable development goals. Energy is needed to alleviate poverty, ¶ promote economic growth, and foster social development. But as ¶ more energy is consumed, stress is placed on the environment at ¶ the local, regional, and transboundary levels. While there are no ¶ absolute answers and solutions vary by region, by country, and even ¶ by locality, a common thread in reaching solutions is being able to ¶ ask and answer the right questions. Based on an analysis of existing ¶ information and forecasts, some conclusions and recommendations ¶ are given for the border region regarding energy and use of renewable ¶ sources of energy for 2030.¶ The total primary energy consumption in the border region will ¶ increase on both sides of the border, with faster growth in Mexico. ¶ Furthermore, the fuel mix for both countries will be based very ¶ much on fossil fuels; it is expected that natural gas will increase ¶ its importance in the border fuel mix, particularly in Mexico. It is ¶ therefore urgent to concentrate on modernizing the current energy ¶ infrastructure and implementing a massive energy efficiency program.¶ Performance of existing power plants and openings of new ¶ installations should be better controlled for their potential ¶ environmental impacts, particularly on the air and water. For this ¶ measure to be effective, a binational environmental management ¶ mechanism with broad public participation and a solid variety of ¶ instruments, strategies, and joint actions will be necessary.¶ The use of **renewable energy sources contributes to the sustainability ¶ of the border region** and, because of this, their use should be ¶ encouraged. The U.S. side of the border is taking firm steps to this ¶ end, but **still there is room for improvement given the vast array of ¶ renewable resources available locally. Mexico should be encouraged ¶ to enter the renewable market** through financial and regulatory ¶ measures. However, any renewable energy implementation should ¶ be complemented by a significant increase in energy efficiency, ¶ diversification of energy sources, and a combination of wide area power generation and decentralized power generation, or a ¶ “SuperSmart grid.”¶ **By 2030, the use of renewables in the border region will be ¶ modest**, still in an introductory stage, but already contributing to the ¶ sustainable development of the region. **Additional coordinated efforts ¶ are needed** on both sides of the border for the renewables market to mature and thus set the foundations of a low-carbon U.S.-Mexican ¶ border region.

#### The plan makes the United States and Mexico the epicenter of clean energy innovation – that causes global modeling

Shaun Tandon, 7/19/2010, Phys.org, "nations to seek clean energy cooperation," <http://phys.org/news198745778.html>

Major economies have been at loggerheads over the shape of the next climate treaty, with developed nations seeking binding commitments from emerging economies such as China to cut carbon emissions blamed for global warming.¶ Clean energy has been considered one area of common interest. Obama signed a five-year, 150 million-dollar plan during a trip to China last year for the world's two biggest polluters to collaborate on developing electric cars and clean coal.¶ "**The development of clean energy and energy-efficient technologies could spur the greatest economic opportunity of the 21st century**," US Commerce Secretary Gary Locke said at the White House on Friday.¶ "The race is wide open for which country will become the epicenter of clean energy innovation, and the destination for the capital, businesses and jobs that come with it."¶ The Obama administration has often bemoaned that **the U**nited **S**tates **is behind many European and Asian nations in developing green technology**. But it said the meeting will look at ways in which nations can work together.¶ Areas for discussion include energy-efficiency standards, solar and wind power, and ways to provide energy to those without, said David Sandalow, the US assistant secretary of energy for international affairs.¶ Alden Meyer, director of strategy and policy at the Union of Concerned Scientists, doubted the meeting would sort out thorny issues in the talks to succeed the Kyoto Protocol, whose obligations run out in 2012.¶ "But if this is the low-hanging fruit that can show that **countries** can cooperate to get something done together, that could improve the mood," he said.

#### And we will isolate three modeling links:

#### First, US action is necessary for modeling – drives down the price of tech and gets China and India on board. Now is key

**Pascual and Zambetakis 2010** (Carlos [US Ambassador to Mexico, Served as VP of foreign policy @ Brookings] and Evie [Brookings]; The Geopolitics of Energy: From Security to Survival; Energy Security; 26-27; kdf)

Among these groups, **the United States has the capacity to play a pivotal**¶ **role**. **China and India will not move toward more proactive domestic**¶ **policies if the United States does not set the example**. Along with Europe¶ and Japan, the United States has the capacity to demonstrate that green¶ technology and conservation can be compatible with growth and a foreign¶ policy that is more independent of energy suppliers. The **United States also stands to benefit from accelerated commercialization of green technologies**¶ **and the development of global markets in energy-efficient and**¶ **clean energy technologies**. The ability of the United States to lead, however,¶ will depend on domestic action-on whether it will undertake on a¶ national basis a systematic strategy to price carbon and curb emissions. If¶ it does the scale and importance of the U.S. market can be a driver for¶ global change. **If it fails to act, then the United States will find that over**¶ **time the opportunity for leadership to curb climate change will be replaced**¶ **by the need for crisis management as localized wars, migration, poverty,**¶ **and humanitarian catastrophes increasingly absorb international attention**¶ **and resources.** Eventually**, its failure to act will come back to U.S.**¶ **borders in a way that will make the Katrina disaster seem relatively tame.**

**Second Mexican leadership leads to GLOBAL climate agreements, México’s G20 status guarantees**

**O’Neill 13** – PhD in Government @ Harvard, senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization

(Shannon, “Mexico Makes It: A Transformed Society, Economy, and Government,” Foreign Affairs, 92.2)

**If Mexico addresses these challenges, it will emerge as a powerful player on the international stage.** A democratic and safe Mexico would attract billions of dollars in foreign investment and propel the country into the world's top economic ranks. Robust growth would both reduce northbound emigration and increase southbound trade, benefiting U.S. employers and employees alike. **Already influential in the G-20 and other multilateral organizations, Mexico could become** even more of **a powerbrokerin global institutions and** help **construct new international financial, trade, and climatechange accords**.

#### Getting the G20 on board with the climate agenda is key to establishing a “Global Green New Deal”

Edward Barbier, 2010, United Nations Environment Programme, A Global Green New Deal ("Chapter 6: Promoting a Global Governance," p. 182-183.

Improving global governance is crucial for meeting the financial, trade and policy coordination challenges to implementing the Global Green New Deal. The key question is whether there is an appropriate global policy forum that can provide the leadership necessary to overcome these global challenges and facilitate the GGND over the next several years. To date, the most likely global policy forum for promoting urgent international action on the GGND is the G20 forum of the world’s twenty largest rich and emerging economies, although all international fora, and especially the UN system, have a role to play in promoting, developing and enhancing the GGND. There are several reasons why the G20 constitutes the appropriate environment for coordinating and innovating international policy in support for the GGND. First, **the G20 has emerged as the global forum for coordinating policy action during the immediate economic crisis**. The G20 is therefore well placed to consider the proposed GGND actions as part of its response to the current crisis. The indications from the Washington and London summits of the G20 are that it has the capacity to take on this role. For example, some experts on global governance have already recommended that it do so: “The communiqué of the November 15, 2008 Summit locked in the next G20 summit and hence ordained a sequel that appears to have enshrined the G20 as the new format to address the current global financial and economic crisis over the coming months and perhaps years…[W]e strongly believe that **it is best for the** new **US** administration to **focus its attention on making the G20 summit format work, in** terms of its ability to address the immediate crisis, and in **terms of** subsequently **dealing with** other pressing problems, such as **global warming** and global poverty. Although the following summit failed to address all these concerns, it appears that the London G20 meeting on 2 April 2009 was “a sincere attempt by the leaders of the G20 countries to come up with a multilateral and coherent set of proposals to deal with the problems that the world economy is facing.” At the April meeting, **the G20 demonstrated this global governance ability by promoting the International Monetary Fund to a lead role in the current world recession,** by tripling its lending capacity, allocating more resources to the IMF and endorsing recent institutional changes to its facilities. The G20 has thereby demonstrated that it has the capability to turn into action the promise made to its London communiqué: “We will identify and work together on further measures to build sustainable economies.”

#### New green deal is key to spread of clean tech

Edward Barbier, 2010, United Nations Environment Programme, A Global Green New Deal ("Chapter 6: Promoting a Global Governance," p. 27-29.

The multiple crises facing the world today demand the same kind of government leadership as shown by Roosevelt’s New Deal in the 1930s, but at the global scale and embracing a wider vision. Efforts to revive the world economy should not stop at simply recreating the same pattern of global economic development of the past. Instead, serious **consideration must be given to** new and bold measures that not only stimulate economic growth and employment opportunities but also **move the world economy further along the path of more environmentally sustainable development**. There is a need to “green” the world economy as we revive it, not rebuild the old “brown” one. For developed countries, the objective should be to revive economic prosperity while demonstrating the restructuring the economy with a view to reducing carbon dependency and environmental impacts is feasible. For developing countries, the objective should be to ensure the moving to a more sustainable economy will at the same time help achieve the Millennium Development Goals. AS the economist Jeffrey Sachs has argued, we must not lose sight of the global objective of ending extreme poverty by 2025. In sum, what the world needs urgently today is not just increased public spending to quicken economic recovery and create employment opportunities. Such an injection of spending, even if it is the US $3 trillion of fiscal stimulus that has been spent so far during the current recession, is necessary but not sufficient. Indeed, what is called for is **a** new “**Global Green New Deal**” to meet the multiple global challenges. The package of policy, investment and incentive measures comprising a GGND **must** therefore have three principal objectives: - revive the world economy, create employment opportunities and protect vulnerable groups; - r**educe carbon dependence, ecosystem degradation** and water scarcity; - further the Millennium Development Goals of ending extreme world poverty by 2025. Achieving these objectives will require national actions by governments as well as global coordination of these efforts and additional international actions. Such a worldwide policy initiative is imperative. As noted above, **the green stimulus initiatives of some G20 countries economies are a promising start** but they do not on their own comprise a GGND. **A** concerned and **coordinated global effort could**, however, **achieve such a GGND** over the next couple of years. The aim of a GGND strategy should be to revive the international economy and to forge a new global economic development model based on reducing environmental harm and scarcities, training workers for twenty-first century skills, creating new employment opportunities and reducing the carbon dependency of all economies. The scale of investments and spending required will be large and the timeframe for implementing such measures is short. Nonetheless, the opportune moment for instigating the Global Green New Deal is now.

#### Solar and wind energy are key to reduce CO2 emissions

Gramlich et al, senior vice president for public policy at the American Wind Energy Association, 2009

(Rob, Michael Goggin and Katherine Gensler, February, American Wind Energy Association and the Solar Energy Industries Association, “Green Power Superhighways: Building a Path to America’s Clean Energy Future,” <http://www.awea.org/documents/issues/upload/GreenPowerSuperhighways.pdf>, EB)

The DOE’s report estimated that **obtaining 20 percent of U.S. electricity from wind would reduce** carbon dioxide (CO2 ) **emissions by 7.6 billion tons** between now and 2030. **CO2 emissions would be reduced by 825 million tons in the year 2030 alone**, an amount equal to 25 percent of all electric sector CO2 emissions in that year **or the equivalent of taking 140 million cars off the road**. These benefits stem from the fact that **the use of renewable energy offsets the use of fossil fuels**. The DOE study estimated that the 20 percent wind scenario would reduce electric sector coal use by 18 percent, electric sector natural gas use by 50 percent, and avoid the construction of 80,000 MW of new coal-fired power plants.5 **Similar penetrations of solar, geothermal, hydroelectric, and other renewable technologies would displace comparable amounts of emissions and fuel use – if this power can be transported to where it is needed**. Renewable energy also avoids the other harmful environmental effects of fossil fuel use, including emissions of SO2, NOX , mercury, and particulate matter; habitat destruction caused by the mining and drilling of fossil fuels; and massive water use in power plant cooling systems.

#### CO2 is the biggest internal link into warming – outweighs all the others

Science Daily, 10/15/10, "Carbon dioxide controls Earth's temperature, new modeling study shows," http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/10/101014171146.htm

A companion study led by GISS co-author Gavin Schmidt that has been accepted for publication in the Journal of Geophysical Research shows that **carbon dioxide accounts for about 20 percent of the greenhouse effect**, water vapor and clouds together account for 75 percent, and minor gases and aerosols make up the remaining five percent. However, it is **the 25 percent non-condensing greenhouse gas component, which includes carbon dioxide**, that **is the key factor in sustaining Earth's greenhouse effect**. By this accounting, carbon dioxide is responsible for 80 percent of the radiative forcing that sustains the Earth's greenhouse effect.

#### Warming is real and if unstopped could result in the destruction of humanities life support of earth

Deibel ‘7 (Terry L. Deibel, professor of IR at National War College, 2007, Foreign Affairs Strategy, Conclusion: American Foreign

Indeed **not one of** more than **900 articles on climate change** published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 **doubted** that **anthropogenic warming is occurring**. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But **the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback** from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “**humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system**. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to het the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then **everything will collapse**.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possible end life on this planet. **Global warming is the** post-Cold War era’s **equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically**. Over the long run it puts dangers from terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. **It is a threat** not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially **to the continued existence of life on this planet.**

### Advantage 2 is forest ecosystems

#### South American deforestation is critical, but they need economic incentives

Moutinho et al, Ph.D. in Ecology, Executive Director of the Amazon Environmental Research Institute, 2005

(Paulo, Stephan Schwartzman, And Marcio Santilli, Amazon Institute for Environmental Research, “Tropical Deforestation and Climate Change,” <http://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/4930_TropicalDeforestation_and_ClimateChange.pdf>, p. 8, EB)

The continuity, and **effectiveness of the Kyoto Protocol, will depend on** Annex I **countries adopting more stringent reductions** after 2012 than were agreed for the first commitment period. To this end, **mechanisms to facilitate broader participation of developing countries in global emissions reduction efforts will be necessary**. The concept of “compensated reduction” of tropical deforestation – the idea that **tropical countries might reduce national deforestation** under an historical baseline **and be allowed** internationally **tradable carbon offsets** having demonstrated reductions – emerged out the polemical debates surrounding forests between the approval of Kyoto and the Marrakech accords. All perspectives in this debate have **contributed to considerable growth and development in our understanding and analysis of forest-climate relationships**, as the appearance of this book, and most particularly the diverse list of distinguished international scientists and experts who contributed to it, attests. There is now broad consensus on some previously contentious or unclear issues. The importance of addressing emissions from tropical deforestation, as distinct from the sequestration of carbon in “sinks”, is widely accepted. Scientists, policy makers and environmentalists agree that reducing tropical deforestation is a critical piece of any international emissions reduction regime, in particular if atmospheric concentrations of CO2 are to remain below the often-cited figure of 450 ppm. There is broad agreement that tropical nations need some form of economic incentive to reduce deforestation, and that developed countries should compensate countries that control deforestation. Most importantly, a group of tropical nations led by Papua New Guinea have put deforestation on the agenda of the 11th Conference of the Parties, and are calling for means to address the issue in the context of the UNFCCC. The Brazilian Foreign Ministry, formerly reluctant to engage the issue, has declared its intention of beginning substantive discussions on it within the Convention.

#### Alternative energy resolves cost and tech barriers to stopping South American deforestation

Cárdenas, Minister of Energy for Colombia, director of the Latin America Initiative at Brookings, 2009

(Mauricio, 10-23-9, Bookings, “Climate Change and Latin America: The Long Way to Copenhagen,” <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2009/10/23-climate-change-latin-america-cardenas>, accessed 7-8-13, EB)

To make matters worse, the last 20 years of deforestation should be a matter of concern. Emissions from land-use change and forestry represent a quarter of greenhouse gas emissions in middle-income countries and 50 percent in low-income countries. In Latin American alone, 686,000 square kilometers of forest were lost between 1990 and 2005. By a large margin, Latin America is the world’s region where more forests have been destroyed since the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was adopted in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. Although there is some hope based on the recent actions adopted by Brazil and Mexico to curb **deforestation**, this **remains Latin America’s top environmental challenge**. The region is still a long way to reverse the trend and begin making positive contributions by gaining and not losing forest areas. Widespread deforestation can bring problems in other areas apart from the environment. The U.S. Congress is considering a border tax on goods produced in countries that do not observe environmental standards. Although many question these measures as disguised protectionism—the idea is appealing to some politicians who worry about the costs U.S. firms will face resulting from the new climate change legislation. Keeping out competitors who do not adopt similar environmental practices seems to be the logical thing to do. Others worry about the lack of enforcement mechanisms in international agreements. Here again, tariffs seem to be the magic bullet. This should be a serious concern for Latin America—a region that depends heavily on trade with the U.S.—mainly because the track record in terms of emissions control is not favorable to the region. But U.S. legislation also provides opportunity. The proposed U.S. Senate legislation—as well as the bill that was passed by the House this past summer—includes provisions regarding international offsets to control costs (the estimates indicate that without offsets, carbon prices will double). This is a key mechanism that could allow Latin America to tap additional resources needed for climate change mitigation and adaptation. But how offsets will work is far from clear at this point. One of the few things that is known is that international offsets will have less value than domestic ones—1 unit of reforestation in the U.S. will count the same as 1.25 units abroad. Foreign governments should oppose this provision, which is at odds with the fact that the environment is truly a global public good. Latin America will not be heard in the U.S. Congress or in international deliberations in Copenhagen unless it forms a solid bloc and pushes for greater equity in the allocation of commitments and resources to deal with climate change. Finally, **the costs of limiting environmental degradation can be significantly reduced if clean technologies are developed. Innovation in the North will be insufficient to prevent an environmental disaster unless those technologies are readily available in the South. Coordination and cooperation is critical if Latin America wants** to play a role in the development of technologies that use **renewable** sources of **energy**. **The region is in a unique position to supply biomass and geothermal energy**.

#### Influence from Climate partnerships with the developing countries solves defo

Zaleski, Undersecretary of State, Ministry of the Environment, Poland, 2008

(Janusz, 12-6-8, Ministerial Conference on the Protection of Forests in Europe, “Forests for Climate,” <http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/cop/cop14/presentations/02/side_event_materials.pdf>, accessed 7-8-13, EB)

**Strengthening of institutional systems in the countries that will accept deforestation reduction targets is indispensable**. In the first place, we need high-quality information and systemic monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of our actions. It is clear that **only the combined efforts of developed and developing countries can** help **stop deforestation**. It is worth mentioning that demand for timber is responsible, among other things, for the cutting of tropical forests, and that 16% of timber on the European Union market comes from forests which are not managed on a sustainable basis. We also need to remember that 1.6 million people live from forests and 60 million can exist only in the forest environment. Deforestation poses a threat to their lives. Sustainable forestry taking into account the needs of all those whose sustenance and work is associated with forests can be an answer to these questions. Sustainable forest management is also a method of carbon sequestration and counteracting global warming. **Sustainable forest management has for many years been a dominant European forestry model**.

#### Forests are critical to maintaining biodiversity—impacts are terminal

NRDC ‘07

[largest US environmental action group of over a million members (Good Wood: How Forest Certification Helps the Environment, http://www.nrdc.org/land/forests/qcert.asp]

Forests are more than a symbolic ideal of wilderness, more than quiet places to enjoy nature. **Forest ecosystems** -- trees, soil, undergrowth, all living things in a forest -- **are critical to maintaining life on earth**. Forests help us breathe **by creating oxygen** and **filtering pollutants** from the air, and help stabilize the global climate by absorbing carbon dioxide, the main greenhouse gas. They soak up rainfall like giant sponges, **preventing floods and purifying water** that we drink. **They provide habitat for 90 percent of the plant and animal species that live on land**, as well as homelands for many of the earth's last remaining indigenous cultures. Forests are commercially important, too; they yield valuable resources like wood, rubber and medicinal plants, including plants used to create cancer drugs. Harvesting these resources provides employment for local communities. Healthy forests are a critical part of the web of life. Yet more than half of the earth's original forest cover has been destroyed due to human activity such as agriculture, development and logging. Much of the loss has occurred within the past three decades. **Protecting the earth's remaining forest cover is now an urgent task.**

#### Loss of biodiversity risks destruction of the planets ecosystems and human life

Diner ‘94

(Judge Advocate’s General’s Corps of US Army, David N., Military Law Review, Winter, 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161, 1994)

In past mass extinction episodes, as many as ninety percent of the existing species perished, and yet the world moved forward, and new species replaced the old. So why should **the world [should] be concerned now**? **The** prime **reason is** the world's **survival**. Like all animal life, **humans live off of other species**. At some point, the number of species could decline to the point at which the ecosystem fails, and then humans also would become extinct. **No one knows how many species the world needs to support human life, and to find out -- by allowing certain species to become extinct -- would not be sound policy**. In addition to food, species offer many direct and indirect benefits to mankind. n68 2. Ecological Value. -- Ecological value is the value that species have in maintaining the environment. Pest, n69 erosion, and flood control are prime benefits certain species provide to man. Plants and animals also provide additional ecological services -- pollution control, n70 oxygen production, sewage treatment, and biodegradation. n71 3. Scientific and Utilitarian Value. -- Scientific value is the use of species for research into the physical processes of the world. n72 Without plants and animals, a large portion of basic scientific research would be impossible. Utilitarian value is the direct utility humans draw from plants and animals. n73 Only a fraction of the [\*172] earth's species have been examined, and mankind may someday desperately need the species that it is exterminating today. To accept that the snail darter, harelip sucker, or Dismal Swamp southeastern shrew n74 could save mankind may be difficult for some. Many, if not most, species are useless to man in a direct utilitarian sense. Nonetheless, they may be critical in an indirect role, because their extirpations could affect a directly useful species negatively. In a closely interconnected ecosystem, the loss of a species affects other species dependent on it. n75 Moreover, as the number of species decline, **the effect of each new extinction on the remaining species increases dramatically**. n76 4. Biological Diversity. -- The main premise of species preservation is that **diversity is better than simplicity**. n77 As the current mass extinction has progressed, the world's biological diversity generally has decreased. This trend occurs within ecosystems by reducing the number of species, and within species by reducing the number of individuals. Both trends carry serious future implications. Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." n79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, **each new animal or plant extinction**, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, **could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction**. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, **mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.**

#### **We have an ethical obligation to prioritize ecosystem loss over human conflict**

Elliott`97

[Herschel, University of Florida Emeritus Philosophy, 1997 “A General Statement of the Tragedy of the Commons,” February 26, <http://www.dieoff.org/page121.htm>]

**Regardless of the human** proclivity to rationalize, **any system** of ethical beliefs **is mistaken if its practice would cause the breakdown of the ecosystem which sustains the people who live by it.** Indeed, biological necessity has a veto over moral behavior. Facts can refute moral beliefs Fourth, ecosystems are in dynamic equilibrium. In addition, technology and human institutions are constantly evolving in novel and unpredictable ways. Furthermore, living things must compete with each other for space and resources; yet each organism also depends symbiotically on the well-being of the whole for its own survival and well-being. Indeed **the welfare of all organisms** -- including human beings -- **is causally dependent on the health and stability of the ecosystems which sustain them**. As a consequence, **the stability and well-being of the Earth's biosystem has moral priority over the welfare of any of its parts -- including the needs and interests of human societies and individuals.**

### 1AC—War

#### **First any claims of larges scale war are a thing of the past**

#### Shared interests and cooperation checks

Robb ‘12 [Lieutenant, US Navy, “Now Hear This – Why the Age of Great-Power War Is Over”, US Naval Institute, http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2012-05/now-hear-why-age-great-power-war-over, RH]

In addition to geopolitical and diplomacy issues, globalization continues to transform the world. This interdependence has blurred the lines between economic security and physical security. **Increasingly, great-power interests demand cooperation rather than conflict.** To that end, maritime nations such as the United States and China desire open sea lines of communication and protected trade routes, a common security challenge that could bring these powers together, rather than drive them apart (witness China’s response to the issue of piracy in its backyard). **Facing these security tasks cooperatively is both mutually advantageous and common sense**. Democratic Peace Theory—championed by Thomas Paine and international relations theorists such as New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman—presumes that great-power war will likely occur between a democratic and non-democratic state. However, **as information flows freely** and people find outlets for and access to new ideas, **authoritarian leaders will find it harder to cultivate popular support for total war**—an argument advanced by philosopher Immanuel Kant in his 1795 essay “Perpetual Peace.” Consider, for example, China’s unceasing attempts to control Internet access. The 2011 Arab Spring demonstrated that organized opposition to unpopular despotic rule has begun to reshape the political order, a change galvanized largely by social media. Moreover, few would argue that China today is not socially more liberal, economically more capitalistic, and governmentally more inclusive than during Mao Tse-tung’s regime. As these trends continue, nations will find large-scale conflict increasingly disagreeable. In terms of the military, **ongoing fiscal constraints and socio-economic problems likely will marginalize defense issues.** All the more reason why great powers will find it mutually beneficial to work together to find solutions to common security problems, such as countering drug smuggling, piracy, climate change, human trafficking, and terrorism—missions that Admiral Robert F. Willard, former Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, called “deterrence and reassurance.” As the Cold War demonstrated, nuclear weapons are a formidable deterrent against unlimited war. They make conflict irrational; in other words, the concept of **mutually assured destruction—**however unpalatable—actually **had a stabilizing effect on both national behaviors and nuclear policies for decades.** These tools thus render great-power war infinitely less likely by guaranteeing catastrophic results for both sides. As Bob Dylan warned, “When you ain’t got nothing, you ain’t got nothing to lose.” **Great-power war** is not an end in itself, but rather a way for nations to achieve their strategic aims. In the current security environment, such a war **is equal parts costly, counterproductive, archaic, and improbable.**

#### And any nuclear war claims should be disregarded

#### **A) States are rational**

Tepperman 9

(Jonathon, Newsweek, staff, Learning to Love The Bomb; Obama wants to rid the world of nuclear weapons. Why that might be a big mistake., dw: 9-14-2009, da: 7-6-2011, lexis, lido)

The argument that nuclear weapons can be agents of peace as well as destruction rests on two deceptively simple observations. First, nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945. Second, **there's never been a nuclear, or even a non-nuclear, war between two states that possess them.** Just stop for a second and think about that: it's hard to overstate how remarkable it is, given the singular viciousness of the 20th century. As Kenneth Waltz, the leading "nuclear optimist" and a professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley puts it, "We now have 64 years of experience since Hiroshima. It's striking and against all historical precedent that for that substantial period, there has not been any war among nuclear states." To understand why--and why the next 64 years are likely to play out the same way--you need to start by recognizing that **all states are rational on some basic level. Their leaders may be stupid**, petty, venal, even evil, **but they tend to do things only when they're pretty sure they can get away with them**. Take war: a country will start a fight only when it's almost certain it can get what it wants at an acceptable price. Not even Hitler or Saddam waged wars they didn't think they could win. The problem historically has been that leaders often make the wrong gamble and underestimate the other side--and millions of innocents pay the price. **Nuclear weapons change all that by making the costs of war obvious, inevitable, and unacceptable**. Suddenly, when both sides have the ability to turn the other to ashes with the push of a -button--and everybody knows it--the basic math shifts. Even the craziest tin-pot dictator is forced to accept that war with a nuclear state is unwinnable and therefore not worth the effort. As Waltz puts it, "Why fight if you can't win and might lose everything?" Why indeed? The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling it's led to what's known as the nuclear peace: the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world's major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight proxy wars, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these never matched the furious destruction of full-on great-power war (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat, and there's very good reason to think they always will. **There have been some near misses, but** a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring--because **in each instance, very different leaders all came to the same safe conclusion**. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, **the U**nited **S**tates **and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both countries soon stepped back from the brink when they recognized that a war would have meant curtains for everyone**. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev's aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, "It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time." The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: **nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back**, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and co-author of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders on each side did what they had to do to avoid it.

#### (If we have time we read more cards here)

### Solvency

#### Grid integration between Mexico and the U.S. would solve transmission efficiency to spur renewable energy developments.

Wood 10, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Full Professor, Director of the Program in International Relations and Director of the¶ Canadian Studies Program at the Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM) in Mexico City, (Duncan, “Environment, Development and Growth: ¶ U.S.-Mexico Cooperation in Renewable energies,.,<http://www.statealliancepartnership.org/resources_files/USMexico_Cooperation_Renewable_Energies.pdf>, accessed 7/1/13, LLM).”

Further, this report argues that **one of the factors that currently prevent the realization of the potential¶ for integration of renewable energy markets is the absence of a comprehensive bilateral agenda for¶ developing renewable energy on the border**. Although the Border Governors Conference and the North¶ American Development Bank have made efforts in this direction, **it will require meaningful executive¶ leadership on this issue to make meaningful progress.** The emphasis by the US Department of State on a¶ “New Border Vision”, announced in March 2010, provides an opportunity to do just that. In addition to the report’s numerous recommendations specifically focusing on geothermal, wind, solar¶ and biofuels, two general recommendations stand out. First, **it is vital that financing opportunities are¶ increased for renewable energy projects**. This can be achieved through bilateral mechanisms at the¶ border, through international mechanisms such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and through¶ the Mexican government’s renewable energy fund, announced in November 2008. **Renewable energy stands out as one of the most positive items on the bilateral agenda between Mexico¶ and the US today.** Whereas the media coverage of Mexico is dominated by drugs, migration and¶ violence, **the potential for Mexican renewable energy to contribute to development, employment and¶ growth there**, as well as helping to satisfy growing demand for clean energy in the US, **should be seen as¶ a truly positive example of what can be achieved through sustained and well‐thought‐out bilateral¶ cooperation. With continued attention from agencies and firms on both sides of the border, the¶ Mexican renewable energy sector holds enormous potential to contribute even more in the future**. In April of 2009, however, Presidents Obama and Calderon, of the United States and Mexico¶ respectively, signed the U.S.‐Mexico Bilateral Framework on Clean Energy and Climate Change. **The two¶ leaders agreed on the importance of promoting clean energy**, combating climate change and the value¶ of collaborating to reach these goals. Some observers in the US may have been surprised by this¶ development because the energy issue of which most foreign observers immediately think with regards¶ to Mexico is, of course, oil. The continuing problems of PEMEX and declining production from its mature¶ fields have been one of the most important issues coming out of the country in recent years.¶ The argument of this paper is that, **though many of the opportunities created by bilateral cooperation in¶ the past have gone unexploited by US actors**, the long‐term impact of **this cooperation has been highly¶ beneficial**, both for **Mexico** as a country, **producing jobs, new sources of alternative energy, and¶ economic opportunities**. For the United States, the development of the RE sector in Mexico offers hope¶ to states such California as they seek to satisfy growing demand for renewable energy. **Continued¶ cooperation in the areas of geothermal wind, solar, and biofuels are** therefore **vital if Mexico’s true¶ potential is to be fully realized.**

#### Renewables are cheap

Weiss et al 6/13

Dr. Jurgen Weiss (energy economist, head of The Brattle Group’s climate change practice), Heidi Bishop (Senior Policy and Marketing Analyst of The Brattle Group), Dr. Peter Fox-Penner (principal and chairman), Dr. Ira Shavel (principal), “Partnering Natural Gas and Renewables in Ercot”, The Brattle Group, June 11 2013, <http://www.texascleanenergy.org/Brattle%20report%20on%20renewable-gas%20FINAL%2011%20June%202013.pdf> LN

No¶ matter how cheap natural gas becomes, renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar PV,¶ are¶ almost¶ always the¶ resource with the lowest variable cost because they have no fuel cost¶ .¶ 16¶ In¶ addition¶ , at least¶ as of today,¶ wind generators receive a¶ federal¶ production tax credit¶ typically¶ if¶ and only if they generate. These conditions mean that wind generators are will¶ ing to bid their¶ generation into the ERCOT market at a price of zero or even lower¶ to retain¶ the production tax¶ credit.¶ On the other hand, the variable cost of natural gas fired generation remains significantly¶ above zero¶ even at very low gas prices¶ –¶ at¶ or above $30/MWh even for the most efficient plants¶ at gas prices of $4/MMBtu¶ .¶ As a consequence, renewable resources are always cheaper, and will¶ be chosen to sell all their power whenever the wind blows or the sun shines regardless of¶ the¶ current price o¶ f gas. They will not be displaced by¶ gas power generation unless very specific¶ system conditions require the system operator to curtail them for reliability reasons.