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Articles

It’s Only Environmental  
—  
Article on Resolution #2 by Emily Erickson

Understanding the Scope of Resolution #2

Growing up in California and Colorado is like being fed chocolate covered strawberries your entire life. If you have never had a chocolate covered strawberry, you won’t know what I’m talking about. But if you’ve ever pulled over while driving along I-25 and taken five minutes to look at the Rocky Mountains, hiked in Yosemite Park or driven through the Redwood Forest, you would understand. My entire existence has been surrounded by sights so beautiful they have left observers breathless for hundreds of years.

Maybe this is why the concept of environmental protection was foreign to me. The air in Colorado is so clean you could scrub floors with it, the climate in California so rich you could grow a garden capable of feeding a family of six almost by accident. The word “environment,” hasn’t brought these pictures to my mind. Usually, I think of people holding signs outside of courthouses, and save the whales t-shirts. Perhaps that is why when I heard the resolution announced, my immediate thought was, “affirmatives are going to clean house, who wouldn’t want a strong economy over environmentalism?”

As I pondered this resolution more, I realized there was a lot more to it than came to mind. When sitting down to write, I kept running into a huge roadblock that has to be navigated in order to understand, let alone debate this resolution. What is the environment anyways? I took for granted the fact that the environment is more than polar ice caps and its protection is for more than minnows. The environment and ‘environmental protection’ have various dictionary definitions and also subcategories of real world definitions.

The natural world is a mammoth of a topic, and in this article we are going to divide it into three categories: air, water and land.

Hopefully this article will broaden your understanding of what the environment is, how is can be protected, and why that matters.

# Dictionary Definitions

First, let’s look at the dictionary definitions for the environment, and environmental protection.

**Environment:**  
Oxford Dictionary:

* The surroundings or conditions in which a person, animal, or plant lives or operates.

American Heritage:

1. The totality of the natural world, often excluding humans…
2. A subset of the natural world; an ecosystem: the coastal environment.
3. The combination of external physical conditions that affect and influence the growth, development, behavior, and survival of organisms…[[1]](#endnote-1)

Collins English Dictionary:

1. external conditions or surroundings, esp those in which people live or work
2. (ecology) the external surroundings in which a plant or animal lives, which tend to influence its development and behavior.[[2]](#endnote-2)

Merriam Webster:

* the conditions that surround someone or something : the conditions and influences that affect the growth, health, progress, etc., of someone or something
* the environment : the natural world[[3]](#endnote-3)

**Environmental Protection:**

* USDA National Agricultural Library: Environmental protection includes prevention (avoidance) strategies to protect the environment from future damage or degradation; and control measures to restore and maintain environmental quality.[[4]](#endnote-4)
* Business Dictionary: Policies and procedures aimed at conserving the natural resources, preserving the current state of natural environment and, where possible, reversing its degradation.[[5]](#endnote-5)

In summary, the environment is basically the entire natural world, and environmental protection is self explanatory: It is the protection of the entire natural world.

Now let’s dig into the three categories: air, water and land.

# 1. Air

It was December 5th of 1952. London was always cold, but this winter was unusually frigid. The typical smog from factories filled the air but time progressed a toxic fog filled the city, so severe that it hid the sun and engulfed the great city in chaos for days. It’s estimated that 4000 people died because of the London fog, whether they were people already suffering from respiratory ailments or the young and elderly who’s frail bodies could not handle the toxic smog. Transportation halted. People walking in the street looked like chimney sweeps by the time they arrived home. Christopher Klein writes that, “The detrimental effects lingered, however, and death rates remained above normal into the summer, which have caused some experts to estimate the Great Smog claimed as many as 12,000 lives.”[[6]](#endnote-6)

Many people think that air pollution is just a part of the past, perhaps exaggerated in stories like the Jungle and (story during industrial revolution) but that isn’t completely true. While the United States and other developed countries have greatly improved, many countries are still stuck in hazardous cycles. Air pollution is defined by National Geographic as, “any substance that people introduce into the atmosphere that has damaging effects on living things and the environment.” This is primarily from the release of greenhouse chemicals such as carbon dioxide, methane and sulfur dioxide which scientists have charged with causing global warming. While global warming is a controversial subject in politics and science, the dangerous effects of air pollution on human health is virtually undisputed. CBS writes that, “Air pollution threatens the health of human beings and other living things on our planet. While often invisible, pollutants in the air create smog and acid rain, cause cancer or other serious health effects…” [[7]](#endnote-7) ScienceDaily records several different ailments associated with air pollution ranging from blood thickening to pneumonia. “Exposure to air pollutants, particularly ozone, was associated with a modest increased risk of developing appendicitis,”[[8]](#endnote-8) Various studies also link air pollution with kidney failure, strokes, heart failure and other ailments, not to mention the long known connection through air pollution and respiratory disease such as tuberculosis, asthma and even lung cancer. While looking at any map of air pollution, the United States looks pretty well off, but areas such as China and Indonesia are red warnings of dangerous climate. Air pollution is by no means an issue of the past.

## Impact to Resolution:

The most important thing isn’t how many people died in 1952 or what conditions are like in the United States, however. Air pollution in developing countries is what’s important. Before looking at any sources or statements, let’s just think for a moment. Developing countries do not have the same precaution when it comes to air pollution and therefore suffer the consequences most severely. The main contributors to air pollution are everyday households using coal like in London until the 1950s, old automobiles (which exert far more carbon monoxide than our cars which have to go through a smog check in the United States,) and, waste being burnt in inhabited areas. Frequently, third world countries import old technology from the United States to burn it there. The fumes released in this process are highly toxic. The World Health Organization estimates that over 7 million people die each year as a result of indoor and outdoor air pollution—that is one out of every eight deaths.[[9]](#endnote-9)

# 2. Water

Thomas Fuller once said that, “We never know the worth of water until the well has run dry.”[[10]](#endnote-10) On a recent trip to California I was stunned to see the effects the drought has had on the entire state. Parks aren’t just brown patches of grass, in many areas there wasn’t enough water for grass to grow and then turn brown in the first place. We panic when a state goes without water, and millions of people in developing countries go without sufficient water every day.

Water is essential for human survival. When in drought the land suffers and infrastructure dwindles. When polluted, it can plague those who drink it with numerous diseases, many of which result in death. It is estimated that close a billion people don’t have access to clean water, and Water.org claims that 840,000 people die every year from a water related disease.[[11]](#endnote-11) That is more than if the entire population of San Francisco died every single year. The main problem isn’t just drought or supply of water, but water pollution. Water is polluted primarily by runoff from mines, construction sites, factories or even roofs, the lack of proper sewage treatment facilities, poorly managed agriculture sites, and other chemicals such as insecticides and herbicides.

## Impact to Resolution:

As with air pollution, water pollution is most severe in developing countries, especially those experiencing rapid industrialization. Countries like the United States are careful about water, but developing countries often choose not to spend money on things like water filters or forcing companies to clean the chemicals they introduce into the water supply. The cost of polluted water may be even higher than bothering to pay for clean water practices, a 2010 article on water and sanitation claims that 2.4 million lives could be saved yearly if everyone practiced healthy sanitation and had access to clean drinking water.[[12]](#endnote-12) In fact, most of the diseases that plague developing countries are caused by drinking or touching infected water: malaria, cholera, diarrhea, and typhoid are only a few of many.

# 3. Land

While air and water pollution are the most discussed forms of pollution, land pollution is an important issue nonetheless. Britannica defines land pollution as, “deposition of solid or liquid waste materials on land or underground in a manner that can contaminate the soil and groundwater, threaten public health, and cause unsightly conditions and nuisances.”[[13]](#endnote-13)

Deforestation, or cutting and burning down forested areas for farming, logging or development is claimed to threaten not only the animals living in the environment but permanently damage the land. Herbicides and pesticides used in farming, as well as other chemicals poison the soil, and threaten surrounding wildlife when used in excess. The primary cause of land pollution is garbage. While those living with excess, such as Americans most likely create more garbage per person, the danger arises when landfills are not lined and monitored properly and recycling is nonexistent. Open landfills attract a leviathan of diseases, especially when the trash is burnt close to homes, as discussed under air pollution.

## Impact to Resolution:

In every area of pollution the story is the same: Prevention is the best form of treatment. It is better to prevent an oil spill or chemical runoff, or permanently poisoned land then to deal with the aftermath. Eventually developing countries will get to the United States is today: with every person generating 4.3lbs of garbage a day (as estimated by Duke University[[14]](#endnote-14)), thousands of mines containing dangerous acidic waste that can destroy water sources in a matter of hours, and other problems as a result of industrialization. It isn’t that industrialization is a bad thing, but if developing countries are at least somewhat careful when it comes to pollution, it will save them in the long run.

# Conclusion:

I didn’t think that the glass of water I just drank, or the clean air I breathe every day were a matter of environmental protection until I sat down to think about it. While day to day we think little of the environment, or perhaps negatively when we picture lobbyists or extremists who think that mankind is evil, but at the end of the day the environment isn’t just a thing, its our homes, our neighborhoods, our states, our nations. I’m privileged to live in a state where access to clean water isn’t an issue, and I never have to worry about inhaling fumes from electronic waste. Unfortunately millions of people living in developing countries are afflicted with diseases and even death every day because of the issues discussed in this article. I was wrong, and this resolution is by no means a push over.
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What is a Developing Country?  
—  
Article on Resolution #2 by Scott Lowery

Countries often try to work together to reach good. Organizations like the UN and the EU were established in the hope that countries could some day become almost as one. But as David Cameron, the prime minister of the United Kingdom, said, “Countries are different. They make different choices. We cannot harmonise everything.”

As Mr. Cameron wisely points out, all countries are different. They have different circumstances, different people, and different levels of development. In other words, all countries are equal…some countries are just more equal than others.

The second resolution focuses on these differences in development, asking what developing countries should do when faced with a choice between economic growth and environmental protection. One of the most important questions is, “What is a developing country?”

When a claim is made that a country is “developing,” it means that a country is below a certain international standard of economic and societal development. Investopedia defines a developing country as, “A country with a weak industrial base.”[[15]](#footnote-1) Another way to phrase it is a country that is below a certain threshold of economic prosperity and individual quality of life.

The three key pieces of a technical definition of a developing country include life expectancy, income and education of a country.

Let’s explore each of these pieces.

# 1. Life Expectancy

Life expectancy is, quite simply, how long people are expected to live. At first, it may seem strange to have something like life expectancy be such an integral part of development. But high life expectancy communicates several important things. For instance, high life expectancy means improved air quality and more purified water. It means more public services designed to improve the quality of life of its citizens. Furthermore, it makes a strong statement about the state of healthcare and medicine, as they’re less likely to be ravaged by disease or malnutrition. It even has distinct economic ramifications, as the longer people live, the more money they can re-invest into the economy. In other words, life expectancy is all about people being safe.

## How does this apply?

The resolution is a clash between economic growth and environmental protection, and both sides can gain or lose traction in a round on this issue. The Affirmative side places the priority on economic growth, which plays a big role in increasing life expectancy. You can’t have better healthcare or sanitation standards if you don’t have money to supplement them. Safety isn’t free, and to have a safe country, it takes a lot of resources that many developing countries just don’t presently have.

The Negative side, on the other hand, places the priority on environmental protection, which also has its benefits. Environmental protection directly improves life expectancy by making air more breathable, water more drinkable, and food more edible. Environmental protection can ensure that some of the tens of thousands of people who die due to air pollution every day can be kept safe. It can reverse the trend of nearly twenty million children who die every year from contaminants in water.

Both Affirmative and Negative have a great deal of ground on this issue.

# 2. Income

Income is the second pillar of a developed country. Income is calculated in the Gross National Income (GNI), which is an indicator of a country’s economic strength. The GNI is a combination between a country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and the average income of domestic and foreign residents. The GNI allows for organizations like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and the UN to classify different countries by economic strength. The following table represents the classifications established by World Bank. (For reference, the United States has a GNI per capita of $55,200)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Low Income Economies | GNI per capita of $1,045 or less |
| Lower-Middle Income Economies | GNI per capita between $1,045 and $4,125 |
| Upper-Middle Income Economies | GNI per capita between $4,125 and $12,736 |
| High Income Economies | GNI per capita of $12,726 or more |

Analyzing the GNI allows an objective view as to how strong an economy truly is. For instance, Norway has a GNI of $103,000, while the majority of African nations have a GNI of less than $1,000. A stronger economy means that your citizens are more stable. They’re more likely to have a job, they’re more likely to be prosperous, and usually have a significantly higher quality of life.

## How does this apply?

Income is most likely going to be one of the main focuses for the Affirmative throughout the entire year. Income varies directly with economic growth. In fact, an argument can be made that the two are almost synonymous. A country clearly has to grow economically to develop economically, and clearly showing this link with such an integral part of the very definition of development can be huge for the Affirmative.

As the Negative, it’s first of all important to point out that it’s impossible for a country to economically grow if millions in a country are dying due to air pollution and Ebola. But don’t be afraid to use this argument either. Heavily agricultural countries rely heavily on a stable environment for their livelihoods, and in such situations (and many others like it). Environmental protection will often make certain processes more efficient, and less wasteful, such as technologies to turn industrial waste into fuel to power industrial plants. The more efficient an economy is, the more it grows, and environmental protection makes sure that happens.

# 3. Education

Education is one of the greatest divides between the developed and undeveloped, and it is so for a very good reason. If a country’s people aren’t educated, there are three distinct economic possibilities:

1. They will work a low paying job. When too many people work low paying jobs, it means that not enough people are working the high paying jobs, which oftentimes stifles economic growth.
2. They will begin to run out of low paying jobs in their home country, and will be forced to emigrate to more developed countries. This severely cripples their former homeland, which loses its economic lifeblood every time jobs are sent to other countries.
3. They will work no job at all, which basically just deadweights an economy. Furthermore, an uneducated populus will stifle healthcare, suck money out of sanitation and public services, and cripple environmental efforts. This will massively affect life expectancy.

Also, more educated countries usually have stronger and more ingrained human rights. The more the people are educated, the more developed a country will be.

## How does this apply?

The Affirmative can apply a very similar argument to this principle as it did to the principle of life expectancy. If you don’t have money, you can’t educate people. There’s no such thing as free education. You have to develop to a certain economic level before you can dedicate resources to education.

The Negative also has a strong argument here, however, as environmental protection can directly take the form of education. Environmental protection makes a country more economically efficient, and less reliant on industrial bases of income, inspiring people to seek higher paying jobs that require education. The more you effectively protect the environment, the more people will become educated.

# Types of Developing Countries

All of the above factors deal with what defines a developing country, but variations in the above three categories will lead to several different types of developing countries. They are as follows:

* Least Developed Countries (LEDC) – These countries are the poorest of the poor. This class includes countries like Ethiopia (whose GDP is 0.3% of the United States), and Liberia (where almost 2/3 of the population is below the international poverty line). These countries are most likely struggling to survive because there is simply no money. These countries may need a more immediate focus on economic growth, just to stay afloat.
* Less Developed Countries (LDC) – LDCs have a weaker economy than most countries, but they have at least some ability to support their people economically. Examples of LDCs are Russia (whose GDP per capita is about half of the US), and the majority of the Middle Eastern countries, such as Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan. These are countries that will have the most clash when brought up in a round, because, while they have the economic resources to focus on protecting the environment, they also still have room to economically grow.
* Newly Industrialized Countries (NIC) – NICs are countries who, while lacking behind in areas like life expectancy and education, are some of the most economically developed economies in the world. Examples of this are China (one of the largest importer and exporter of goods and a world superpower), and South Africa (The only country in Africa with a classification above LDC). NICs are great examples of developing countries that need to prioritize environmental protection. These countries have strong economies, but are lacking in life expectancy and education, which can be secured by focusing on environmental protection.

# Notable Developing Countries

There are a lot of developing countries. Sifting through all of them to try to find a great application can be painstaking. There are some countries that stand a head and shoulders above the rest in how useful they can be in a round. I’ve chosen one from each category (LDC, LDEC, and NIC) that can be particularly relevant.

## LDEC: Yemen – Focus: Affirmative

Yemen is specifically interesting because of its current place in international politics. Yemen has become a hotbed for violence and terrorist activity, and for the last year, has been the root of a great deal of instability in the Middle East. Much of their economic decline has come from their prior reliance on oil; a resource which is now dwindling. Their growth rate has dropped steadily as they have become more and more embroiled in violence. Yemen is the epitome of a LDEC that needs to reorient itself by reviving its economy before it can even think about environmental protection.

## LDC: Ivory Coast – Focus: Neutral

The Ivory Coast has seen an economic revival over the last five years, as their economy has grown almost 10%.[[16]](#footnote-2) This massive rise in production has been due to two different factors: environmental protection and economic growth. The Ivory Coast has always had a heavy focus, as with much of Africa, upon agriculture, and protecting the environment and establishing more efficient and safe methods for farming has revolutioned their economy. Furthermore, they have also made economic strides by increasing international trade. They’ve pursued both economic growth and environmental protection, and this has worked out beautifully for their economy. This application specifically supports a balance kritik negative case – that says that economic growth and environmental protection should be valued equally. It can also be used as an Affirmative response to the idea that by growing the economy, you necessarily hurt the environment. The Ivory Coast is a great application that can be used in either direction.

## NIC: India – Negative Focus

The very definition of an NIC is that they’re already developed economically, but are lacking in other areas. This makes the NIC category a virtual gold mine for the Negative, and India is no exception. India has been plagued by poor sanitation, water and air pollution, and greenhouse gas emmissions that have destroyed their agricultural base. They most focus on environmental protection if they are to become a fully developed country.

# Conclusion

In summation, there’s more to a developing country than just that it needs to develop. All developing countries need to develop in the three key areas: education, income, and life expectancy. These countries must achieve these goals to protect their people. Understanding what a developing country is is pivotal to understanding that some types of countries, like LDECs, need more economic growth, while others, like NICs, desperately need to protect their environment. Every country is different. And you have to know how they’re different to ever effectively argue for them.

## 

Cases

“Personal Opportunity”  
—  
Affirmative Case (R2) by Scott Lowery

# Introduction

The United States of America has been a successful experiment. It has been an experiment in liberty, an experiment in economy, and most importantly, an experiment in opportunity. Woodrow Wilson once said, “America lives in the heart of every man everywhere who wishes to find a region where he will be free to work out his destiny as he chooses.” The greatest development of America is not seen in its GDP, or its number of imports and exports. The greatest development of American economic growth is the opportunity that each man and woman has to grow themselves.

It is because of this principle that I strongly urge the resolution, that developing countries ought to prioritize economic growth over environmental protection.

# Value: Personal Opportunity

With the resolution in mind, I would like to present the highest value in today’s debate round. That value is personal opportunity, which is defined as “a good position, chance, or prospect, as for advancement or success.”[[17]](#footnote-3) In other words, everyone must have the opportunity, if they so choose, to make their living situation better.

I would also like to present the following definitions to clarify the resolution.

* **Developing Countries:** A country with a weak industrial base.[[18]](#footnote-4) A full list of developing countries from the International Monetary Fund can be provided upon request.
* **Prioritize:** To [decide](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/decide) in what [order](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/order_1) you should do [things](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/thing), [based](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/base_2) on how [important](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/important) or [urgent](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/urgent) they are[[19]](#footnote-5)
* **Economic Growth:** An increase in the capacity of an economy to produce goods and services.[[20]](#footnote-6)
* **Environmental Protection:** Environmental [guardianship](http://thelawdictionary.org/guardianship/) based on [policies and procedures](http://thelawdictionary.org/policies-and-procedures/).[[21]](#footnote-7)

Before I jump into my contentions, it’s important to realize the end goal of a developing country, and I’d like to analyze this in my first framework point.

## Framework: Develop

The end goal of a developing country is to become a fully developed country. It’s when a country becomes more developed that it is more able to promote personal opportunity. Furthermore, a fully developed country has more ability to dedicate resources to causes such as environmental protection. The best way for a developing country to become a developed country is to prioritize economic growth, and I will be proving this in my contentions.

# Contention 1: Indifference Stifles Opportunity

It was economist Milton Friedman who proposed the idea that “political freedoms go hand in hand with economic development.”[[22]](#footnote-8) In other words, if you have no economic development, you will necessarily have no political freedoms, such as personal opportunity, and even others like the freedom of speech and of religion. An indifference towards economic growth and development in order to favor environmental protection will stifle personal opportunity, and the ability for a country to develop.

# Contention 2: Economic Growth Stimulates Personal Opportunity

While an indifference towards economic growth stifles opportunity, the converse is true. If economic growth is made the priority, personal opportunity thrives. People feel the safest, and have the best access to stable livelihoods when economic growth is achieved. This concept is clearly shown by the following application.

## Application I. The Ivory Coast

In 2010, the Ivory Coast was in turmoil. Controversy surrounded the elections that were taking place, and deadly violence erupted after ten years of military and political tensions. These tensions claimed over 3,000 lives. The administration took charge of a deteriorating society, and an economy that was in shambles. The administration responded by seeking more trade relationships with strong countries to bolster their own economy, and by pursuing economic freedoms. 5 years later, the economy of Ivory Coast has grown by approximately 10%, and the upcoming elections, once a source of fear and instability, are expected to pass peacefully. More men and women are employed than ever, and poverty numbers have plummeted. The Ivory Coast is a perfect example of how focusing on economic growth can not only grow your economy, but also lead to more personal freedom, security, and opportunity.[[23]](#footnote-9)

# Contention 3: Expanded Environmental Efforts

Prioritizing economic growth provides an amazing benefit. When you prioritize economic growth, it allows for you to have the economic resources to dedicate to protecting the environment. Environmental protection isn’t free. As explored earlier, if economic growth isn’t prioritized, environmental protection will suck resources from the economy, which will destroy personal opportunity. Environmental protection is only justified after solid economic growth has been attained. Furthermore, when individuals have more of an opportunity to a safe and stable career because the economy is strong, they are substantially more likely to sacrifice time and money to aid in the cause of environmental protection.

## Application I. The KORUS Free Trade Agreement

The US - South Korea Free Trade Agreement in 2007 created a great deal of economic growth in both countries. That’s not all it did, however, as the Free Trade Agreement also led to an increase of environmental protection. But it did so without ever mentioning or mandating any policies that protected the environment. How? The Competitive Enterprise Institute answered this question by saying, “Yet the best way to improve environmental and labor conditions in developing countries is not through uniform environmental and labor standards, but by increasing productivity and economic growth...If developing nations are forced to set higher standards than what the current level of productivity allows, their workers will eventually be penalized in the world market.”

# Conclusion

Personal opportunity is the true mark of a free nation. Environmental protection on its own is unable to provide these benefits. When economic growth is prioritized, however, it allows for not only the protection of personal opportunity, but also gives a unique opportunity to have enough resources to protect the environment. Promoting environmental protection isn’t bad, but prioritizing it misses the point. A focus on economic growth will help to develop countries to find new, safer, more stable horizons that will stay in place for generations to come.

——

# Affirmative Addendum: Personal Opportunity

There are three fundamental arguments that you must prove to successfully run this case. As early as the first cross-examination by the negative, you want to start hammering these three points home as much as possible. These three arguments will set up a more solid round,

## i) Framework

The Framework point was that the end goal of developing countries ought to be to become a developed country. While this may seem obvious, practically any Affirmative value is going to hinge on this one argument. If the goal of a developing country isn’t to develop, then any realistic need for either economic growth or environmental protection is mostly taken away, and the debate becomes meaningless. Nobody likes a meaningless debate, so make sure you establish the necessity of the framework of development.

## ii) Priority

The word ‘prioritize’ in the resolution is one of its most important components. It’s vital to realize that the resolution is not asking you to exclude economic growth or environmental protection. If that were true, either position would be positively preposterous. So don’t let the Negative spout out examples of when people ignored the environment and how harmful it was, because those arguments miss the point. Your job is not to exclude the environment; it’s to clearly and rationally show that more resources ought to be dedicated right now to growing the economy than protecting the environment.

## iii) The Root of Personal Opportunity

As personal opportunity is the value, that’s clearly one of the most important issues in the round. But just as important is making the link very clear between that value and economic growth. The Ivory Coast example demonstrates this well. Use this as a launching pad to find more examples of economic growth having a similar result, and the crux of this case will be supported.

——

# Negative Brief: Personal Opportunity

This case is built upon the value of personal opportunity. But the best way to attack this case is not through the value, it’s through the path to the value. To undermine the value, you must call into question whether personal opportunity is necessarily linked to economic growth. That general idea is communicated through the following two points.

Newly Industrialized Countries (NICs) are the most advanced form of developing countries. These are countries like China and India, countries that have plenty of economic flow, but are still considered ‘developing countries’ because of quality of life issues. Personal opportunity is still stifled in these NICs, but the solution is not economic growth, because there’s already plenty of that. The solution is directly improving their quality of life by improving environmental standards engineered to protect the people.

One of the primary arguments of the Affirmative is that prioritizing economic growth will allow for later environmental protection. However, countries that rely heavily on agriculture, such as the Ivory Coast, can’t just allow water and sanitation standards to degrade and destroy their livelihood. Sometimes, environmental protection is necessary. Use this argument to cast a shadow of a doubt on the absolute priority claimed by the Affirmative Team.

“Got Development?”  
—  
Affirmative Case (R2) by Michael Tant

# Summary (Not to be Read in the Round)

This Affirmative case is a little similar to the affirmative case I ran in a different league last year, NCFCA, on economic freedom. The key to running this case well is in sticking to the framework and impacting the evidence in the contentions to the judge very clearly. Here’s how this case works.

The value of societal welfare is a broad functional value, which allows the focus of the debate to be on the contentions and analysis rather than on the value level. The value shouldn’t be a big deal in this case. The framework establishes that a developing country is one that’s not doing so hot in any department. Financially inability and instability are rampant, standards of living are down and unemployment is up. There’s very little infrastructure and the country is agriculturally poor.

This sets the stage for economic growth to come in. What the case argues is that economic growth solves these problems and effectively moves the country from being developing to being developed. Once a country is developed, THEN we can begin making policies that protect the environment. When people are dying of starvation, however, we don’t have the ability or necessity to give priority to the environment.

The evidence and applications help to prove this but it’s important to stick to this framework throughout the debate and establish that economic growth is our first consideration. Only when we give priority to economic growth and a country develops are we able to even begin considering protecting the environment.

——

# Introduction

My life is usually pretty awesome, the comforts of which I have I often taken for granted. I have the luxury of a warm bed, the blessing of a hot shower and financial ability enough to pay for delicious food of my own choosing. I have the luxury of a car and nice clothes and I’m able to afford good schooling. I never have to sacrifice luxury simply to stay alive because the basic needs in my life are provided for.

But for some people this is not the case. When times get rough and the paychecks come in fewer and fewer, those extra luxuries are slowly stripped away and the bare necessities are the ones that must be given priority. It’s because people must first focus their finances on basic human needs that I am resolved: *Developing countries ought to prioritize economic growth over environmental protection.*

Before examining why I affirm the resolution, it’s important to understand what we are debating. For the purpose of clarity let’s define some terms.

**Developing Country:** “A poor agricultural country that is seeking to become more advanced economically and socially.”[[24]](#footnote-10)

**Economic growth: “**A positive change in the level of production of goods and services by a country over a certain period of time.”[[25]](#footnote-11)

**Environmental Protection:** “Policies and procedures aimed at conserving the natural resources, preserving the current state of natural environment and, where possible, reversing its degradation.” [[26]](#footnote-12)

**Resolutional Analysis:** *“In Developing Countries”*

Because the resolution gives us a specific context for debate, it’s important to understand what the parameters of the resolution are. While offering a dictionary definition of what a developing country is fine, it’s crucial to understand contextually what we’re debating and what were not.

A developing country is not a country like the USA, where most people are financially blessed and life is generally pretty chill. What were discussing are countries with little to no national financial ability, minimal industrialization in the technological world, and lower levels of living for the people within those countries, including high unemployment rates, national poverty, and little economic stability. With this in mind, let’s examine the...

# Value: Societal Welfare

The value for this debate round will be that of **Societal Welfare.** All this means is that we should evaluate the items in the resolution based on what is best for society and the people that make it up.

The reason this is the best measure of the resolution can be tagged as the

## Value Link: Robust measure

The value of Societal Welfare is a simple idea: Everyone’s well-being should be accounted for. Because we are measuring multiple nations as well as their individual economies and environmental policies, we need a value powerful to cover every aspect of the topic. A broad resolution calls for a robust value, and Societal Welfare accomplishes just that. With this in mind, let’s examine 2 contentions that demonstrate what that measure tells us.

# Contention 1: Developing Countries Can’t And Don’t Protect The Environment

In developing countries, people are more worried about what to eat at the next meal then they are about protecting the environment. When living conditions are poor, less priority is given to environmental considerations. It is only when issues like poverty and low standards of living are addressed, that we can begin to see any legitimate concern for environmental issues. In an analysis of environmental protection in modern countries, A university study found that poorer and undeveloped countries aren’t and can’t be concerned with environmental problems. They say:

“We found – in line with our expectations – “that global environmental issues seem uniformly important for every country, though in the two poorest countries (in the study) (India and China), the proportion of those who could not answer the questions, was quite high. In poorer countries people are more concerned about local problems than in the rich countries, but they are right, as they really have local problems. We found furthermore that in poorer countries the intention to make monetary sacrifice to prevent pollution and actual environment friendly acts are less frequent, despite a higher level of threat perception, which shows that poverty and its consequence, the dominance of survival values overwrite the worry about environment.”[[27]](#footnote-13)

In a developed country, food, water, shelter and other fundamental concerns are primarily taken care of, so environmental protection is something that can be pursued. But In a developing country, those basic needs are unfulfilled, leaving any commitment to the environment literally impossible.

# Contention 2: Economic Growth Develops Countries And Upholds Societal Welfare

As stated by the UK Department of International Development:

“Economic growth is the most important means of raising people’s incomes and reducing poverty in the developing world – it creates jobs and opportunities for poor people to support their families and build more stable futures.”[[28]](#footnote-14)

This principle is demonstrated in

## Application 1: India

Between the years of 1947 and 1995, India was failing as a country. Largely undeveloped, it had high rates of poverty, high rates of unemployment, and overall low standards of living. Because people were more concerned with staying alive than they were with protecting the environment, their environment inevitably suffered. But in the late 90’s India started a resurgence and began growing economically. Analysis offered from the World Bank Group on India’s development says that:

*“Between 2005 and 2012, India lifted 137 million people out of poverty. Poverty declined by 2.2 percentage points per year, as the poverty rate fell sharply from 37 percent to 22 percent during this period. At this pace, accelerated progress against poverty since economic reforms began in earnest in the early 1990s signals the emergence of a (statistically) robust new trend. Poverty decline has been widespread, with both rural and urban poverty rates falling to 26 percent and 14 percent in 2012.” [[29]](#footnote-15)*

When India struggled as an undeveloped nation, they could barely supply the needs of its people much less protect the environment. When economic growth occurred and India developed. Because they weren’t worried about their people dying of starvation, India was able to create policies focused on solving environmental problems. As a result, environmental assessment studies by World Bank experts between 1995 and 2010 show that India made some of the fastest progress in the world in addressing its environmental concerns and ridding the country of pollution.[[30]](#footnote-16) Economic growth is necessary to have any hope for a sustainable environment.

# Conclusion

Developing countries are fiscally unable to justify protecting the environment at the expense of the lives of its people. Only when a country develops, can policies be focused towards safeguarding nature. A vote for economic growth affirms and achieves the importance of both sides in this debate round; it improves human well-being by developing countries, reducing poverty and destroying economic deficiency, while enabling people and countries to work to protect and preserve the environment effectively.

——

# Negative Brief

The key to beating this case will be in giving solid framework analysis on what a developing country is and what the assumptions that this case is making. Push in CX for what exactly a developing country is and what definitions support that interpretation. Winning the framework battle is important.

As far as the value is concerned, Societal Welfare is simply what we call a buffer value. The case is not value-centric, but instead it focuses the debate on the analysis of the resolution and the contentions. Engaging in a value debate usually won’t help you because Societal Welfare is so broad and all encompassing. If I were attacking this case, I would agree with the value but then use arguments to show why environmental protection upholds societal welfare more than economic growth. The real debate that can be had here is in the meat of the contentions and framework so that’s where you should attack it.

This case hits hard that economic growth is the first consideration in a developing country. It basically says that environmental protection is important but can’t be accomplished until economic growth occurs. This is what needs to be and can be challenged. A couple things can help accomplish this. The first thing is to expand to the judge what it means to protect the environment, and what economic growth can look like in a lot of cases. This case paints economic growth in an exclusively positive light but the reality is that it can be pretty tough. Remember, all economic growth means is that someone’s making money. People make money doing lots of bad stuff, and mere profit is not always good. I would also challenge the link that economic growth develops countries. Sometimes growth can be harmful to development because profits only reach so far.

The same goes for environmental protection. You want to establish that this isn’t some radical notion but rather common sense restraints that can be accomplished in countries that are developing. This is where the debate will be won.

Do your research on the applications and you’ll find that lots of developing countries are able to have environmental protection policies enacted successfully. Expand your knowledge of real world incidents because this is a very prevalent topic to our time and there’s lots of good knowledge out there.

“Neg doesn’t hug trees”  
—  
Negative Case (R2) by Adam Densmore

# Summary (Not to be Read in the Round)

Stoa’s second resolution claims that, “In developing countries, economic stability ought to have priority over environmental protection.” It asks the question, “between economic stability and environmental protection, which is more important?” But there’s something else that both sides of the resolution, affirmative and negative, ought to understand. As in life, if an entity can have two good things, there is no reason for them to choose; they would only choose when in conflict. Thus, the resolution ought to be debated only in the context of when said developing country couldn’t attain both economic stability and environmental protection simultaneously. Here is why that conflict is created: it is cheaper and easier to manufacture/produce economically stimulating goods in a polluting and destructive way.

Environmental protection is something that can be easily painted in a less positive light, or a less important light. If your opponent can make you look like a Prius driving, tree hugging, paper hating, grass kissing, flower lover (nothing against any of those things, but compared to capitalism they don’t stack up very high), you won’t win. Good news though: you don’t have to be that person, you can be a very practical and reasonable person, and even value the economy. Don’t let your opponent cast an image of religious environmentalism on you while they bang their capitalism bible, walk away with the ballot, and leave you wondering why you never win negative rounds.

Instead, show the judge that your opponent is fairly short sighted. This is the crux of this case: *environmental damage is not reversible, whereas a slow economy can always speed up*. If you can weigh this impact to the judge effectively, you can most likely knock your opponent’s promises of high GDP and standards of living right off their podium, and paint the two extreme alternatives of the round. The first option is a booming economy and high export numbers of items that are produced with pollution and environmental destruction; the second option is a country that is slower getting onto its economic feet, but one that doesn’t hastily destroy its air and water supplies in permanent or long lasting ways. If you can winsomely explain that to the judge from an apparently objective standpoint, you can probably pull off a negative win.

This case is what could accurately be referred to as a flex neg. In case you’re not familiar, you use the contentions as you need them, and in the order you see best fit for that specific round. This allows you to tailor fit this case to best hit your opponent’s case. I didn’t put much in it for applications, though I did one with thorough research and citations, so you should probably research and find your own applications if you decide they would help your case. I don’t recommend reading my writing verbatim, make it your own, make it fit, and make it work. At the top is a brief opening statement similar to what I might use if I were running this case, and then the contentions.

——

# Some Things Just Make Sense

The idea of environmental protection is often cast into the category of laughable—people in their pale blue Priuses with peace signs on their bumper and organic apple juice in their cup holder cruising around criticizing students for using so much paper and so many disposable water bottles. Nothing against any of those traits, of course, but that isn’t at all what the negative, myself, in this round advocates. Instead, allow me to provide you with what I would advocate: don’t damage things that can’t be restored for the sake of an immediate GDP spike or short term economic perks. Let’s take a look at this through a few points.

# Contention 1: Environmental Damage Lasts

There are things that are complicated, and things that aren’t. Lucky for us all, this argument falls into the latter category—it’s very simple. When a water source is polluted, it lasts. When the air is filled with smog, it lasts. When an entire forest is wiped out, its no longer there, and doesn’t grow back overnight. Decisions that we make matter, and they don’t just affect us. They matter to the next generation, the one following that, and so on.

# Contention 2: Environmental Damage Matters

I’m not going to start spouting over-dramatized global-warming theories or gloom-and-doom prophecies at you to make you vote for me, but I want to present you with some facts. One in particular: If the environment is destroyed, its tenants pay the price. That is something I cannot emphasize enough—our health suffers, our scenery suffers, and ultimately as I’ll discuss in my third contention, our economic inputs suffer as well.

Take China for example, in **Application 1: Chinese Pollution**. China has stunningly bad air, and BBC recently reported that, “Pollution has soared to hazardous levels in Beijing, reaching 20 times the limit recommended by the World Health Organization. (BBC, 2015)“ Where does this come from? China is the second largest manufacturing and exporting country in the world, and their factories belch out ghastly amounts of pollution. Much of this pollution comes in the form of disease causing PM2.5 particles—small enough to get into the lungs even through a breathing mask, these pose a serious threat to public health and safety. What for? A more stable economy. Furthermore, according to the Huffington Post, “Beijing has extended a ban on outdoor barbecues to restaurants operating in some suburban areas as it tries to improve its notoriously poor air quality. (Reuters, 2015)“ Not only does the pollution reach levels that cloud vision such that individuals can barely see 100 yards in front of them on what should be a sunny day, they cause inevitable disease, violate international standards of health, and greatly inhibit individual’s ability to enjoy a barbeque.

# Contention 3: Environment Damage Hurts Economy

Let’s talk about something everyone can easily understand—to produce things, raw ingredients are needed. Thus, to produce food, agriculture is essential. To make toys and consumer electronics, plastics and metals are needed. Where do those come from? The environment. That’s right, we tend the earth to produce the ingredients we need for the products we want. If the environment takes a hit, so do our resources, and thus so does the economy.

Not to harp on China, but allow me to briefly talk about why the issues of China’s environment I discussed earlier not only hurt people, but also the economy. It’s pretty well summed up by The Guardian, which states, “Chinese scientists have warned that the country’s toxic air pollution is now so bad that it resembles a nuclear winter, slowing photosynthesis in plants – and potentially wreaking havoc on the country’s food supply.” The Guardian also states that, “China’s worsening air pollution has exacted a significant economic toll, grounding flights, closing highways and keeping tourists at home. (Kaiman)“

To wrap up, not prioritizing environmental protection can cost future generations and us much. Our health, food supply, raw inputs and therefore economy itself, and our Sunday afternoon habit of grilling burgers. Let us not destroy our habitat and resources, let’s encourage developing countries to prioritize environmental protection over economic stability.
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“Penguins & Pollution”  
—  
Negative Case (R2) by Emily Erickson

# Summary (Not to be Read in the Round)

Debate is its own world, a world where teenagers wear suits and talk about politics. The purpose of this case is to make a concept that is otherwise even more detached from our everyday lives come a bit closer home. General Welfare doesn’t just apply to the EPA, USDAA, Stoa, or any abbreviation you throw in. General Welfare when it comes to environmental protection is our backyards, our playgrounds, our families and our homes. The key to running this case successfully is showing your judge that environmental protection isn’t something we protect at the cost of our livelihoods—it is our livelihoods.

——

# Introduction

Jim Clyburn stated, “You can’t separate the impact on the environment from the impact on our families and communities.”[[31]](#endnote-15)

Many frown on the idea of environmental protection because they confuse it with the green movement. While they often overlap, this debate isn’t about penguins on the North Pole, it’s about the priorities of developing countries. Because the preservation of country for future generations is more important than the immediate gratification of economic growth, I negate this resolution.

# Value: General Welfare

My value in today’s debate round is General Welfare, operationally defined as the concern of a government for the general wellbeing of the country including health, safety and happiness.

## Value Link: General Welfare is the desire of developing countries

While strong nations might want more international influence or dominance, the concern of countries still in the early stages is simply general wellbeing. When the United States formed we didn’t try to start a new East India Trading Company, we worked on our framework as a nation from the federalist papers to the constitution.

# Contention 1: Neglecting the environment threatens health.

One of the primary responsibilities of a government is to protect its people’s health from any extreme danger. Here in the US we benefit from a system that protects our environment for the most part. Unfortunately, because developing countries often do not have the same regulations that we do, they are the dumping ground for hazardous waste. According to Greenpeace international, large clothing corporations like Banana Republic and Old Navy dump the waste from the colors in their clothing in Indonesia, where water samples reveal multiple chemicals in what is every day drinking water for thousands of Indonesians.[[32]](#endnote-16) Similar studies have revealed that companies like Levis and GAP’s factories in Lesotho, Africa release hazardous waste, endangering locals.[[33]](#endnote-17) US News reported that developing countries are allowing other countries to ship over electronic waste. Countries such as Mexico and China receive dangerous material and wantonly dump it anywhere without concern for the toxic fumes released when its burned. “Children are digging in the ash from the burned plastics…They’re breathing in the fumes. Sometimes it happens indoors when they cook the circuit boards – children are breathing all this in.”[[34]](#endnote-18)

While these two applications deal primarily with groundwater pollution, other issues like air pollution and insanitary waste management also pose serious threats to health. Economic growth is fantastic, but secondary because it cannot insure that the land we live in is safe to live in. Developing countries need to take a stand and make sure their children aren’t playing in melting plastic and old electronic waste before concerning themselves with the stock market.

# Contention 2: Neglecting the environment is shortsighted

Environmental destruction doesn’t just hurt the world we live in and the people in it, it actually costs more in the long run. Someone is going to have to clean the air, the radioactive dumps, the miles of waste in the ocean once it threatens our food supply, our very survival—that is not inexpensive. While preventing pollution does have its costs, cleaning up the waste later on can be infinitely more expensive. The EPA recently modified the Clean Air Act, of which Scott Holladay writes, “If someone offered you an investment that would pay $25 for every $1 you pay, you would probably take it…in dollars and cents the Clean Air Amendments are a good investment.”[[35]](#endnote-19) Its estimated between the difference of costs preventing air pollution cleaning air pollution later, as well as the medical costs of asthma, bronchitis and other ailments caused, some as severe as heart attacks, keeping our air clean saves money long term.   
The Great Smog of 1952 is an example of how shortsighted it is to neglect the environment. During a cold snap London homes and factories started burning large amounts of coal which combined with weather patterns resulted in smog that brought the great city to a standstill for days. Transportation halted, theaters shut down because you could not even see the stage, and 12,000 Londoners were killed.[[36]](#endnote-20)

Valuing economic growth highest means a nation prioritizes trade, expanding business and decreasing costs above all else. If developing countries truly value their economic security they can only choose to value environmental protection now to avoid environmental emergency clean up later.
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    # Affirmative Brief: General Welfare

    The key to defeating this case is the exact opposite of running it: Detach the environment from our everyday lives. If you can convince your judge that environmental protection is nothing more than excessive regulation with little impact on the real world, your job is done.

    **Value:** General Welfare is strong but vague. If you can be more specific about how economic growth practically serves a nation most judges will gravitate towards a more tangible ideal.

    **C1:** The heart of this contention is the applications, which you should probably wash. Yes, people die as a result of pollution. However, economic growth can fix the cycles that cause these deaths. In order for families to pay for ventilated housing or clean energy, clean water and sanitation, their communities need economic growth.

    **C2:** Question what the negative is actually valuing here. It sounds like they are valuing economic growth and well being. In which case, they are simply arguing for you. You can even turn the application of the London Smog. [↑](#endnote-ref-20)