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### Contention 1 is Food

#### Massive decline in global yields are inevitable – investment in biotech now is key to prevent billions from starving to death.

**Noyes 10** Katherine Noyes, staff writer, 2/11/2010, “Biotech Push Needed to Avert Global Food Crisis, Scientists Warn” Tech News World,http://www.technewsworld.com/rsstory/69321.html?wlc=1284092034

World leaders must embrace agricultural biotechnology if they are to cope with the severe food shortages likely to result from global warming in the coming decades, warns a group of scientists. Yields from some of the most important crops for human consumption begin to decline sharply when average temperatures exceed about 30 degrees Celsius, or 86 Fahrenheit, they explain in an article that will appear Friday in the journal Science. As a result, "you're looking at a 20 percent to 30 percent decline in production yields in the next 50 years for major crops between the latitudes of southern California or southern Europe to South Africa," said David Battisti, a University of Washington atmospheric sciences professor and coauthor of the article. Countries around the globe, then, need to "get beyond popular biases against the use of agricultural biotechnology," particularly crops genetically modified to produce greater yields in harsher conditions, the scientists said. 9 Billion by 2050 Even without climate change, feeding the world's population will be increasingly difficult as that population increases -- likely by more than 30 percent to 9 billion people in 2050. That alone would require doubling grain production in the tropics, Battisti said. A warmer climate, however, will reduce yields at a time when they're needed most, because many temperatures will be too high to achieve the most efficient photosynthesis. For every temperature increase of one degree Celsius, in fact, yields tend to go down by 10 percent, Battisti told TechNewsWorld. "The projected changes in temperature due to global warming will put a lot of really basic stresses on plants," he said. 'Further Stress on Plants' In the tropics and subtropics, in fact -- between roughly 30 degrees North and 30 degrees South -- the optimal temperatures for photosynthesis are already exceeded, explained Battisti. "If you add global warming on top of that, you find that it puts further stress on plants," he pointed out. Even if emissions were reduced dramatically in the coming years, it would still result in yield reductions of at least 20 percent by midcentury, he asserted, with further reductions due to increasing pressure from pests and pathogens. 'Already Taking Its Toll' "We are well aware through our emergency work responding to drought/famine/flood that climate change is already taking its toll on agricultural yields in many parts of the developing world," Jennifer Parmelee, senior spokesperson with the United Nations World Food Program (WFP), told TechNewsWorld. The WFP works to address the impact of climate change through food-for-work programs "that include agricultural rehabilitation such as building of microdams, terraces and other water catchments, and replanting of trees and shrubs to prevent further erosion and loss of precious topsoil," Parmelee explained. Places including Ethiopia and Haiti, for example, are both "massively deforested," she noted. A 'Major Starvation Catastrophe' So far, there hasn't been much attempt to breed crops resistant to heat stress, Battisti noted. The result of all these increasing pressures could lead to a "major starvation catastrophe" by the end of this century among the more than 3 billion people who live relatively close to the equator, along with a plethora of food shortages elsewhere, the report's authors warn. "I grow increasingly concerned that we have not yet understood what it will take to feed a growing population on a warming planet," said lead author Nina Federoff, who is science and technology adviser to Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and biology professor at Pennsylvania State University. What's needed are systems that have the potential to decrease the land, energy and fresh water needed for agriculture while reducing the pollution associated with agricultural chemicals and animal waste, the authors wrote. The Green Revolution The so-called Green Revolution in agriculture produced a 2 percent increase in yields per year for 20 years, Battisti noted, primarily through development of new grain varieties along with fertilizer and irrigation. "We're really asking for yield gains comparable to those at the peak of the Green Revolution, but sustained for an unprecedented length of time -- 40 years -- and at a time when climate change is acting against us," he said. Also complicating matters is that many of the institutions involved do not work together closely enough to succeed, the authors charged. Then, too, there's the continued resistance to crops such as corn and soybeans that have been genetically modified to be insect resistant and tolerant of herbicides. No Silver Bullet "There has to be a lot of creative thinking, a greater blending of biotechnology and agriculture, and better coordination between private and public research efforts throughout the world for us to keep pace with the increasing demand for food," Battisti said. "We need to be thinking about the long-term demands for food and the environmental and social ramifications of how we will produce it." There is no "silver bullet," Battisti added; rather, the solution will have to involve a combination of things. Specifically, it will mean changing agronomy, or the way humans farm, and in some cases, it will be a matter of changing varieties to more heat-tolerant versions. "That's a time-consuming process," Battisti noted. "We'll have maybe three shots before mid-century to make current varieties more resilient to heat." Sugar Cane and Teff There will also be the need for better education and irrigation, he pointed out, and "in some cases, there will have to be changes in the kinds of crops we grow." The major grains that are grown today -- including wheat, corn, soy and rice -- don't tend to do well in high heats, Battisti explained. Sorghum and sugar cane, on the other hand, tend to do pretty well if they get enough water. Teff -- a crop that's grown in parts of Africa -- is another promising candidate, he pointed out. 'Yields Will Go Down, and Soon' Reactions to the report's recommendations have generally been positive, particularly in the agricultural community, Battisti told TechNewsWorld. "Occasionally we hear from a farmer up in Canada," he noted. Even there, though, "by the time we get to the end of the century, they will have those reductions in yields too." Meanwhile, "anywhere south of San Francisco," he concluded -- "including Africa and most of Asia -- yields will go down, and soon."

#### Cuban biotech is a key model for food security

Aerni 2001, Phillip. "Aquatic Resources and Technology: Evolutionary, Environmental, Legal and Development Aspects." *Center for International Development*. Harvard University, 2001. Web. <http://www.cid.harvard.edu/archive/biotech/papers/discussion13\_aerni.pdf>.

In Cuba and China, where biotechnology is pursued as an important option in addressing food security, precaution seems to be more applied to the uncertainty regarding future adequate food supply rather than uncertain environmental risks. At the same time, these countries represent unique incubators where innovative and unorthodox domestic approaches in agriculture and aquaculture are applied. In these countries, research and development in agriculture and aquaculture are driven by the public rather than the private sector and products are not primarily designed for export markets but domestic self-sufficiency. Cuba represents a particularly interesting case: since the end of the Cold War, Cuba could no more rely on trade with other communist countries but was neither willing to join the capitalist world. In the search for a strategy to overcome food insecurity and dependence on food imports, the government launched a National Food Programme in 1989 that represents an approach, which combines the promotion of biotechnology with traditional conservation methods and with local low-input practices. In the meantime transgenic varieties of all important food crops are currently under development in Cuba. The first transgenic product that has become available as food for consumers in 2000 is a genetically modified Tilapia, a transgenic fish that grows faster [64]. It is still too early too to judge the success of Cuba’s approach but it is certain that lessons drawn from their experience will help to design appropriate strategies for other regions, which are interested in adopting a similar strategy.

#### Global food shortages risk extinction from starvation and war

Julian Cribb, Professor in Science Communication at the University of Technology Sydney, 2010

(Julian, principal of JCA, fellow of the Australian Academy

of Technological Sciences and Engineering, “The Coming Famine: The

Global Food Crisis and What We Can Do to Avoid It”, pg 10

The character of human conflict has also changed: since the early 1990s, more wars have been triggered by disputes over food, land, and water than over mere political or ethnic differences. This should not surprise us: people have fought over the means of survival for most of history. But in the abbreviated reports on the nightly media, and even in the rarefied realms of government policy, the focus is almost invariably on the players—the warring national, ethnic, or religious factions—rather than on the play, the deeper subplots building the tensions that ignite conflict. Caught up in these are groups of ordinary, desperate people fearful that there is no longer sufficient food, land, and water to feed their children—and believing that they must fight "the others" to secure them. At the same time, the number of refugees in the world doubled, many of them escaping from conflicts and famines precipitated by food and re- source shortages. Governments in troubled regions tottered and fell. The coming famine is planetary because it involves both the immediate effects of hunger on directly affected populations in heavily populated regions of the world in the next forty years—and also the impacts of war, government failure, refugee crises, shortages, and food price spikes that will affect all human beings, no matter who they are or where they live. It is an emergency because unless it is solved, billions will experience great hardship, and not only in the poorer regions. Mike Murphy, one of the world's most progressive dairy farmers, with operations in Ireland, New Zealand, and North and South America, succinctly summed it all up: "Global warming gets all the publicity but the real imminent threat to the human race is starvation on a massive scale. Taking a 10-30 year view, I believe that food shortages, famine and huge social unrest are probably the greatest threat the human race has ever faced. I believe future food shortages are a far bigger world threat than global warming."

### Contention 2 Is Switchgrass

#### Plan key to switchgrass utilization

**Kausch 10** (Albert P., Ph.D in Molecular, Cellular and Development Biology at Iowa State University and Professor in the Department of Cell and Molecular Biology @ the University of Rhode Island. Published May 29, 2010 in Environmental Management. <http://plantsciences.utk.edu/pdf/stewart_moon_env_man.pdf>)

If bioenergy platforms such as switchgrass-to-cellulosic ethanol are to be economically viable, improved feedstocks must be developed that have high yield and decreased recalcitrance for the conversion of cell walls to fermentable sugars. To attain these goals, biotechnology will likely be needed to make improvements in feedstock (Gressel 2008). Several feedstock candidates, such as Panicum virgatum (switchgrass) have a number of wild traits and are not very domesticated compared with current row crops. This being the case, rapid gains should be attainable with plant breeding, especially for traits that are based on endogenous genetic variation. These traits include yield and dwarfism, which were foundational to the Green Revolution (Fernandez and others 2009). In contrast, other traits, such those related to recalcitrance, improved processing, and introduced bioproducts might be more readily conferred by biotechnology (Jacob and others 2009; Sainz 2009). In another example where biotechnology could be revolutionary, switchgrass or other C4 grasses could receive a large biomass boost from adding a single Miscanthus gene to increase cold temperature photosynthesis. The putative mechanism by which Miscanthus 9 giganteus maintains photosynthetic efficiency at cool temperatures is the result of the expression patterns and activity of a single C4pathway enzyme, pyruvate phosphate dikinase (PPDK) (Wang and others 2008; Dohleman and Long 2009). Thus, by simply increasing the expression of the PPDK gene in switchgrass, this crop could conceivably add significant biomass at early and late stages of the plant’s growing season (Stewart and others, unpublished). Regulatory costs and concerns are important considerations that must be made when transgenic plants are released into the environment, especially for commercialization. Both process and product of transgenic plants is regulated by most governments throughout the world, including the United States and China. Therefore, one important facet regarding sustainability of growing any transgenic biomass crop, such as switchgrass, is of a regulatory nature. Therefore, when we refer to sustainability in this paper—in the context of releasing transgenic plants— we explicitly consider that there should be an absence of negative environmental or regulatory events directly associated with transgenic plants. This absence is required for them to be usable over a number of years or decades. Regulators make decisions using risk assessment, which, in general, and specifically for biotechnology, is well developed (see Wolt and others 2009).We realize that sustainability is a complex concept that is not usually applied with regards to the regulatory durability of plants derived from biotechnology, but we would like to propose that promise of regulatory-driven sustainability is a prerequisite for the release of any transgenic plants. First, without the reasonable assurance of sustained compliance to regulations, a company will likely not invest funds to protect and implement the intellectual property required in biotechnology. Secondly, and related, biotechnology would likely not be deployed if there were a reasonable chance that a transgenic plant would be deemed environmentally hazardous and not approved by regulatory officials. Two important aspects of regulation and biosafety will be addressed here, and additional regulatory and risk assessment issues of bioenergy plants are discussed elsewhere (Wolt 2009). First, increasing yield, stress tolerance and other traits could conceivably also increase invasiveness or weediness of the transgenic crop itself (Warwick and Stewart 2005). Thus, whether introduced via breeding or biotechnology, new traits must be analyzed a priori for their potential to increase invasiveness, and then, critical field experiments must be performed prior to commercialization (e.g., Halfhill and others 2005). Second, gene flow from transgenic feedstocks to non-transgenic relatives, either crop or wild (Stewart and others 2003), must be prevented or mitigated (Stewart 2007; Kausch and others 2010). In this Forum, we give an overview of several biotechnology tools that could be useful for controlling transgene flow in perennial biomass grasses. Prevention of transgene flow is especially important when species or genera are indigenous to the region of intended cultivation, such as switchgrass in the US and Miscanthus in China (Stewart and others 2003; Stewart 2007). Transgenic crops have been grown commercially for 15 years, but no transgenic dedicated bioenergy feedstocks have yet to be commercialized. It will be important to rationally design transgenic feedstocks for environmental and regulatory-driven sustainability, as well as for bioenergy goals. It is doubtful we will get a second chance to get these things right if we get them wrong the first time. It is interesting to note that environmental sustainability is a major driver for the creation of the new bioeconomy. Everyone agrees that petroleum will eventually run out, and even if that were not the case, there are dire concerns over carbon emissions. Energy derived from perennial herbaceous grass biomass promises to actually sequester more carbon than emitted (Yuan and others 2008). Thus, if biotechnology can improve a plant so that it produces more biomass without invasiveness or compromising ecological functions, then environmental sustainability of a new industry can be facilitated by biotechnology. One large impediment to this realization is that biotechnology is specifically regulated as a mode to plant improvement. In some extreme cases, transgenic plants are totally banned from being grown in some regions, especially in Europe.

#### Switchgrass reduces CO2

**Prasifka 9.** (J.R., USDA-ARS, Corn Insects and Crop Genetics Research Unit, Genetics Laboratory c/o Insectary, Iowa State University and Richard L. Hellmich, Ph.D. from Ohio State, Assistant Professor of Entomology at Iowa State and Michael J. Weiss. “Role of Biotechnology in sustainable agriculture.” Published by Cambridge University Presse in 2009. https://netfiles.uiuc.edu/prasifka/www/othpub/2008%20Role%20of%20biotechnology%20%28Radcliffe%29.pdf)

The development of alternatives to petroleumbased fuels is one of the best-known biotechnology projects. Currently most farmers are dependent on diesel and gasoline to power agricultural equipment. This makes them reliant on a resource that is (1) non-renewable, (2) environmentally detrimental and (3) subject to price fluctuations arguably manipulated by petroleumexporting countries. The substitution of biologically based fuels (biofuels) such as ethanol or biodiesel may help to insulate farmers from price increases or price instability, and provide an additional source of revenue if maize, soybean or other crops are used to produce biofuels. Biotechnology is being used to more effectively produce ethanol from cellulose by the use of GM yeasts and bacteria. Similarly, genetic engineering is helping create plants that yield greater energy returns than currently available varieties. Applications of biotechnology also may allow fuels to be produced from by-products of agriculture otherwise considered waste. The benefits to the environment may increase as methods and technology related to biofuels advance. Non-food crops, including native perennial grasses, may offer the benefits of biofuels produced from maize or soybean, but with further advantages of reduced fertilizer, pesticide and energy inputs and helping to mitigate carbon dioxide emissions.

#### Warming is anthropogenic and THE ONLY existential risk

Warrants: sci consensus, disease, ice caps, shorter winters, sea temp, NASA measurent, runaway

Deibel 7 (Terry L, Professor of IR @ National War College, “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. 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 serious 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 heat 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 possibly 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.

### Contention 3 is Disease

#### Scenario 1 is Birdflu:

#### Biotech would be used to vaccinate against all strains of the flu

**Macrae 6** FIONA MacRAE, Daily Mail “The Vaccine to prevent every Strain of Flu” <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/health/healthmain.html?in_article_id=425227&in_page_id=1774> 12-29-06

British scientists are on the verge of producing a revolutionary flu vaccine that works against all major types of the disease. Described as the 'holy grail' of flu vaccines, it would protect against all strains of influenza A - the virus behind both bird flu and the nastiest outbreaks of winter flu. Just a couple of injections could give long-lasting immunity - unlike the current vaccine which has to be given every year. The brainchild of scientists at Cambridge biotech firm Acambis, working with Belgian researchers, the vaccine will be tested on humans for the first time in the next few months. A similar universal flu vaccine, being developed by Swiss vaccine firm Cytos Biotechnology, could also be tested on people in 2007 - and the vaccines on the market in around five years. Importantly, the vaccines would also be quicker and easier to make than the traditional jabs, meaning vast quantities could be stockpiled against a global outbreak of bird flu. Martin Bachmann, of Cytos, said: "You could really stockpile it. In the case of a pandemic, that would be a huge advantage. "If you were to start making a traditional vaccine at the start of a pandemic, there is no way there would be enough." The Government believes a bird flu pandemic is inevitable, killing 50,000 people in Britain alone. However, it acknowledges that the bug could be much more lethal - infecting one in two people and claiming more than 700,000 lives.

#### Bird flu causes extinction

Greger, ’06 (Michael, Bird Flu: A Virus of Our Hatching)

Other public health authorities have expressed similar sentiments on a global scale. World Health Organization executive director David Nabarro was recently appointed the bird flu czar of the United Nations. At a press conference at UN headquarters in New York, Nabarro tried to impress upon journalists that “we’re dealing here with world survival issues—or the survival of the world as we know it.”583 “The reality is that if a pandemic hits,” explained the executive director of Trust for America’s Health, a public health policy group, “it’s not just a health emergency. It’s the big one.”584 Similar fears reportedly keep U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services Mike Leavitt awake at night. “It’s a world-changing event when it occurs,” Leavitt said in an interview. “It reaches beyond health. It affects economies, cultures, politics and prosperity—not to mention human life, counted by the millions.”585 Yes, but what are the odds of it actually happening? What are the odds that a killer flu virus will spread across the world like a tidal wave, killing millions? “The burning question is, will there be a human influenza pandemic,” Secretary Leavitt told reporters. “On behalf of the WHO, I can tell you that there will be. The only question is the virulence and rapidity of transmission from human to human.”586 The Director-General of the World Health Organization concurred: “[T]here is no disagreement that this is just a matter of time.”587 “The world just has no idea what it’s going to see if this thing comes,” the head of the CDC’s International Emerging Infections Program in Thailand said, but then stopped. “When, really. It’s when. I don’t think we can afford the luxury of the word ‘if’ anymore. We are past ‘if’s.’”588 The Chief Medical Officer of Great Britain,589 the Director-General of Health of Germany,590 the director of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control,591 the Senior United Nations Coordinator for Avian and Human Influenza,592 and the director of the U.S. National Security Health Policy Center593 all agree that another influenza pandemic is only a matter of time. As the director of Trust for America’s Health put it, “This is not a drill. This is not a planning exercise. This is for real.

#### Scenario Two is AIDS:

#### Biotech key to AIDS vaccine

**NYT 1** Denise Grady, (“AIDS AT 20; Scientists Shifting Strategies In Quest for an AIDS Vaccine,” 6/5/01, http://www.nytimes.com/2001/06/05/science/aids-at-20-scientists-shifting-strategies-in-quest-for-an-aids-vaccine.html)

And so it may seem remarkable that experts now dare to say they may finally be on a path to a vaccine that will offer at least some protection. They are hedging their bets, cautioning that a finished product is probably still 10 years away. But scientific advances have led to renewed enthusiasm. Spending on vaccine research by the National Institutes of Health is projected to be $282 million this year, 12.6 percent of the budget for AIDS and twice the amount spent in 1997. And several large drug companies, which previously saw little promise in the field, are now interested. "These are very good days," said Dr. Norman Letvin, a professor at Harvard Medical School. "I'm the most dour, cynical, pessimistic guy. I've been at this for decades, too long to be anything but shellshocked. And I am very optimistic." Dr. Anthony S. Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, said: "I think we will have a vaccine. I'm not so sure it's going to be a vaccine in the classic mode we make for other preventable diseases where the major objective, the successful endpoint, is to prevent completely the infection in a particular population." Many researchers agree that at least for now, the goal of preventing infection may be out of reach. They have shifted their sights and strategies. Recent studies suggest that it may be possible to develop a vaccine that instead of preventing infection, will control it, prevent the progression of disease and reduce a person's risk of transmitting H.I.V., by holding down the levels of virus in the bloodstream and secretions. More than one type of vaccine, or a combination of vaccines and antiviral drugs, may be needed. And the first vaccines may not work for a high percentage of the population. But researchers say that in places like Botswana and South Africa, where infection rates are high, even a partly effective vaccine can make a big difference.

#### Biotech solves AIDs

**US Dept of Labor 5**, Bureau of Labor Statistics “Career Guide to Industries: Pharmaceutical and medical Manufacturing” http://www.bls.gov/oco/cg/cgs009.htm Dec 20 2005

The pharmaceutical and medicine manufacturing industry has produced a variety of medicinal and other health-related products undreamed of by even the most imaginative apothecaries of the past. These drugs save the lives of millions of people from various diseases and permit many ill people to lead normal lives. Thousands of medications are available today for diagnostic, preventive, and therapeutic uses. In addition to aiding in the treatment of infectious diseases such as pneumonia, tuberculosis, malaria, influenza, and sexually transmitted diseases, these medicines also help prevent and treat cardiovascular disease, asthma, diabetes, hepatitis, cystic fibrosis, and cancer. For example, antinausea drugs help cancer patients endure chemotherapy; clot-buster drugs help stroke patients avoid brain damage; and psychoactive drugs reduce the severity of mental illness for many people. Antibiotics and vaccines have virtually wiped out such diseases as diphtheria, syphilis, and whooping cough. Discoveries in veterinary drugs have controlled various diseases, some of which are transmissible to humans. Advances in biotechnology and information technology are transforming drug discovery and development. Within biotechnology, scientists have learned a great deal about human genes, but the real work—translating that knowledge into viable new drugs—has only recently begun. So far, millions of people have benefited from medicines and vaccines developed through biotechnology, and several hundred new biotechnologically-derived medicines are currently in the pipeline. These new medicines, all of which are in human clinical trials or awaiting FDA approval, include drugs for cancer, infectious diseases, autoimmune diseases, neurologic disorders, and HIV/AIDS and related conditions. Many new drugs are expected to be developed in the coming years. Advances in technology and the knowledge of how cells work will allow pharmaceutical and medicine manufacturing makers to become more efficient in the drug discovery process. New technology allows life scientists to test millions of drug candidates far more rapidly than in the past. Other new technology, such as regenerative therapy using stem cell research, also will allow the natural healing process to work faster, or to enable the regrowth of missing or damaged tissue. There is a direct relationship between gene discovery and identification of new drugs—the more genes identified, the more paths available for drug discovery. Discovery of new genes also can lead to new diagnostics for the early detection of disease. Among other uses, new genetic technology is being explored to develop vaccines to prevent or treat diseases that have eluded traditional vaccines, such as AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and cervical cancer.

#### Extinction

**Muchiri** **2000** [Michaei Kibaara Staff Member at Ministry of Education in Nairobi, “Will Annan finally put out Africa’s fires?” Jakarta Post, March 6, LN]

The executive director of TJNAIDS, Peter Pint, estimated that Africa would annually need between $1 billion to $ 3 billion to combat the disease, but currently receives only $160 million a year in official assistance. World Bank President James Wolfensohn lamented that Africa was losing teachers faster than they could be replaced, and that AIDS was now more effective than war in destabilizing African counties. Statistics show that AIDS is the leading killer in sub-Saharan Africa, surpassing people killed in warfare. In 1998, 200,000 people died from armed conflicts compared to 2.2 million from AIDS. Some 33.6 million people have HIV around the world, 70 percent of them in Africa, thereby robbing countries of their most productive members and decimating entire villages. About 13 million of the 16 million people who have died of AIDS are in Africa, according to the UN. What barometer is used to proclaim a holocaust if this number is not a sure measure? There is no doubt that AIDS is the most serious threat to humankind, more serious than hurricanes, earthquakes, economic crises, capital crashes or floods. It has no cure yet. We are watching a whole continent degenerate into ghostly skeletons that finally succumb to a most excruciating, dehumanizing death. Gore said that his new initiative, if approved by the U.S. Congress, would bring U.S. contributions to fighting AIDS and other infectious diseases to $ 325 million. Does this mean that the UN Security Council and the U.S. in particular have at last decided to remember Africa? Suddenly, AIDS seen as threat to world peace, and Gore would ask the congress to set up millions of dollars on this case. The hope is that Gore does not intend to make political capital out of this by painting the usually disagreeable Republican-controlled Congress as the bad guy and hope the buck stops on the whole of current and future U.S. governments conscience. Maybe there is nothing left to salvage in Africa after all and this talk is about the African-American vote in November’s U.S. presidential vote. Although the UN and the Security Council cannot solve all African problems, the AIDS challenge is a fundamental one in that it threatens to wipe out man. The challenge is not one of a single continent alone because Africa cannot be quarantined. The trouble is that AIDS has no cure -- and thus even the West has stakes in the AIDS challenge. Once sub-Saharan Africa is wiped-out, it shall not be long before another continent is on the brink of extinction. Sure as death, Africa’s time has run out, signaling the beginning of the end of the black race and maybe human race.

### Plan: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its economic engagement toward Cuba by signing a biotechnology science and technology agreement with the Republic of Cuba.

## Contention Solvency

#### **Cuba Says yes- he wants a western party**

Starr 04, Douglas. co-director of the Center for Science and Medical Journalism at Boston University "The Cuban Biotech Revolution - New York Latino Journal." The Cuban Biotech Revolution - New York Latino Journal. New York Latino Journal, 2004. Web. 21 Oct. 2013. <http://nylatinojournal.com/home/business\_economics/med\_biotech/the\_cuban\_biotech\_revolution.html>.

Today the country is the largest medicine exporter in Latin America and has more than 50 nations on its client list. Cuban meds cost far less than their first-world counterparts, and Fidel Castro's government has helped China, Malaysia, India, and Iran set up their own factories: "south-to-south technology transfer." Yet at the same time as they were selling generics, the science-heroes of the Cuban Revolution were inventing. Castro made biotechnology one of the building blocks of the economy, and that has opened the door - just a crack - to intellectual property. To date his researchers have been granted more than 100 patents, 26 of them in the US. Now they"re setting their sights on the markets of the West.

#### **US legislation blocks biotech industry now**

Fienberg 12, Robert E. "The New Cuban Economy What Roles for Foreign Investment?" Latin America Initiative at Brookings. The Brookings Institute, Dec. 2012. Web. <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/12/cuba%20economy%20feinberg/cuba%20economy%20feinberg%209.pdf>.

Law 77 (Chapter IV, Article 10) allows for FDI in all sectors except health, education, and “the armed forces institutions, with the exception of the latter’s commercial system .” In practice, JVs have also been largely excluded from two sectors where foreign investors could make a huge contribution: sugar and biotechnology . 41 In the case of sugar production, the obstacles appear to be rooted in revolutionary history . The expropriations of the large, often foreign-owned estates were a hallmark of the revolution; to return the land to foreign hands might seem an inglorious retreat . There is also the unresolved question of compensation to the former owners, necessary to free the lands from potential legal challenges by claimants and U .S . sanctions . Today, as officials reconsider FDI within the context of economic reforms, there is a sharp debate over whether and to what degree to further open food processing and agro-industry, including sugar-based biomass, to external capital . In an apparent victory for more favorable treatment for FDI, in late 2012 and after lengthy negotiations, the Cuban government approved a joint venture, Biopower, S .A ., with British investors, to generate biomass from sugar derivatives; the roughly $50 million investment is to construct a 30 megawatt power plant . Billed as a pilot project, the British firm, Havana Power, hopes that other biomass energy projects will follow.

#### Pressure to lift now- cancervax checks da links

Wylie 10, Lana. Dr. Lana Wylie, an Associate Professor in Political Science at McMaster University, received her Doctorate in cPolitical Science from University of Massachusetts, Amherst in 2003. She held a Postdoctoral fellowship at the Institution for Social and Policy Studies at Yale University in 2003-2004."Reassessing Canada’s Relationship with Cuba in an Era of Change." Canadian International Council. CIC, Oct. 2010. Web. <http://www.opencanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Reassessing-Canada%E2%80%99s-Relationship-with-Cuba-in-an-Era-of-Change-Lana-Wylie1.pdf>.

The biotechnology sector benefits from an exceptionally well-educated population and a concerted effort by the state to support the industry even in times of great difficulty. Cuba is best known for its innovative vaccine research; it produces vaccines for everything from flu to lung cancer. Furthermore, Cuban scientists are conducting promising research in other areas of biotechnology and medical sciences. A conservative estimate indicates that Cuban scientific institutes have at least 100 products in their drug pipeline. Biotech and pharmaceutical companies from many countries have invested in this sector through joint venture agreements. For example, Beckpharma, a British pharmaceutical company, is collaborating with Cuban research institutes to engineer drugs that Beckpharma will make available worldwide.76American policy-makers have felt pressured to make an exception to the embargo in this area because of the ability of the Cubans to advance medical treatments for many diseases.77 Indeed, given the advances in Cuban research, exceptions have already been made to the embargo in the area of biotechnology. In 2004 the California company CancerVax received approval to develop three Cuban cancer drugs. Although CancerVax was required to pay Cuba in medicine or food, it was a historic deal since this was the first deal approved to develop drugs between a US biotech company and Cuba.78 If Cuban biotechnology continues to produce successful medical treatments and pharmaceutcals, the pressure on American policy-makers to normalize relations will likely become even more intense.

#### Hard for international companies to invest now and no politics link

Wylie 10, Lana. Dr. Lana Wylie, an Associate Professor in Political Science at McMaster University, received her Doctorate in cPolitical Science from University of Massachusetts, Amherst in 2003. She held a Postdoctoral fellowship at the Institution for Social and Policy Studies at Yale University in 2003-2004."Reassessing Canada’s Relationship with Cuba in an Era of Change." Canadian International Council. CIC, Oct. 2010. Web. <http://www.opencanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Reassessing-Canada%E2%80%99s-Relationship-with-Cuba-in-an-Era-of-Change-Lana-Wylie1.pdf>.

Yet companies like YM Biosciences recognize that Cuban ventures carry additional risks, most significantly because of opposition from the United States. David Allen, chief executive of the company, explains, “Developing a product that originates in Cuba is definitely a greater challenge than developing a product that originates elsewhere.”79 Working with Cuban partners makes it difficult to market drugs in the United States and greatly complicates the already tricky process of gaining approval from the American Food and Drug Administration. Although there are serious drawbacks to these projects, companies can overcome the hurdles. For example, the partnership between YM Biosciences and Cuba’s CIM was able to expand in 2004 to include the American corporation CancerVax. YM Biosciences was further encouraged by early signals from the Obama administration. In an April 2009 update for its investors, the company reported that “the enlightened approach demonstrably being adopted toward Cuba matters, consistent with the stated position of senior members of the current US administration (including President Obama), holds out the prospect for positive consequences for our drug which will benefit both our stakeholders and cancer patients in the US.”80

# 2ac

**2ac shunning**

1. **U.S. human rights violations undermines its credibility to push for rights internationally**

**Halperin, 7** (Morton H., Testimony to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs' Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight, “Human Rights and U.S. Foreign Policy,” 7-12-2007, www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/07/halperin\_testimony.html)

The United States should also actively work with the United Nations and especially the Human Rights Council to help to advance human rights and to protect human rights activists. Here, as elsewhere, we need to recognize that by failing to observe internationally recognized human rights ourselves we reduce American credibility to champion human rights for others. I understand that many in the Congress and elsewhere are troubled by the first year of operations of the new Council. I share those concerns. However, it is far too soon to give up on the Council or to cut its funding. I am confident that human rights activists in Cuba, Egypt, and Azerbaijan share this view.

1. **Other obligations override the duty to shun – self preservation and interests of state**

**Beversluis, 89** (Eric H. April 1989. “On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions.” Public Affairs Quarterly, April, vol. 3, no. 2)

What kinds of obligations can override the duty to shun? A clear example is the obligation of self-preservation. If to shun the only grocer in town means to starve, then my duty of self-preservation overrides the duty to shun. On the level of relations between states the essential interests of the state have a similar claim. If there are such essential interests of a state (for example, preservation of borders and internal security), then the duty to protect those interests may well override a duty to shun. An argument that too much United States pressure on the Soviet Union regarding human rights would undermine the relationship between these countries necessary for would peace would be of this kind. Another example might be an argument that a nation ought not to alienate a trading partner who is the only source of a vital import. While these arguments might surely be used in bad faith to avoid an inconvenient duty to shun, that does not render them invalid. Thus there may be, but need not be any hypocrisy or inconsistency in shunning one nation for a certain attack on the moral order but not shunning another for an equally serious attack

1. **Must examine the actual impacts of protecting human rights – whether a social consensus exists is irrelevant**

**Kennedy, 2** (David, Professor of Law at Harvard, Harvard Human Rights Journal, “The International Human Rights Movement: Part of the Problem?” vol. 15, Spring 2002, www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/hrj/iss15/kennedy.shtml)

Traditional debates about whether human rights do or do not express a social consensus, in one society or across the globe, are similarly beside the point. Indeed, we could see them as updated ways of asking whether human rights really exist. Let us say they do express a social consensus—how does this affect their usefulness? Perhaps being able to say they express consensus weakens them, thins them out, skews their usefulness in various ways, perhaps it strengthens them. To decide, as my grandmother used to ask “whether that’s a good thing or a bad thing” we still need to know whether once strengthened or skewed or weakened or whatever they are useful, and if so for what and for whom.

Similarly debate about whether human rights “talk” is or is not coherent. Let’s say the human rights vocabulary, institutional apparatus, even the soul of the human rights advocate, is riddled with contradictions that would not stand up to logical scrutiny for a minute. Knowing only this does not move us any closer to an understanding of whether they are part of the problem or the solution. Perhaps ambivalent porosity is their secret strength—to the extent human rights is useful, we should then be grateful for the contradictions. Perhaps incoherence is a fatal weakness, but if human rights creates more problems than it solves, this would be all to the good.

1. **Too extreme—Cuba’s record isn’t flagrant. Their authors are biased.**

**Lamrani 10** — Salim Lamrani, Lecturer at the Paris Sorbonne-Paris IV and Paris-Est Marne-la-Vallée Universities, specialist in Cuba-US relations, 2010 (“Cuba and the rhetoric of human rights (1 of 2),” *ZNet*, July 7th, Available Online at http://www.zcommunications.org/cuba-and-the-rhetoric-of-human-rights-1-of-2-by-salim-lamrani, Accessed 07-03-2013)

Thus, **the western media has misled the public when it presents Cuba as the main violator of human rights in the Americas. The U**nited **S**tates, for its part, **cannot in any way justify the imposition of economic sanctions based on the human rights situation on the island and should eliminate them**. Indeed, **not only does the US have no moral authority to speak on this subject** in view of its own situation, **but** in addition **most countries on the continent have situations worse than that of Cuba**.

1. **Dirty hands *inevitable*—embargo harms innocents.**

**Hernandez-Truyol 9** — Berta Esperanza Hernandez-Truyol, Professor of Law at the University of Florida, 2009 (“Embargo or Blockade? The Legal and Moral Dimensions of the U.S. Economic Sanctions on Cuba,” *Intercultural Human Rights Law Review* (4 Intercultural Hum. Rts. L. Rev. 53), Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

IV. A Critique - The Effects of the Embargo from a Social Justice Perspective n110

**It is common knowledge that trade sanctions hurt workers and industries, not the officials who authored the policies that are the target of the sanctions. The countries most likely to face sanctions are those run by undemocratic governments least likely to let the pain of their population sway them. These observations hold true in the case of the U.S. embargo on Cuba**.

While in nearly fifty years of the embargo the purported goal of achieving democracy in Cuba has not been met, **the embargo has had deleterious effects on Cuba and the Cuban people**. First, a look at some factual data in light of trade relation confirms the reality and extent of the harms suffered. In 1958, the United States accounted for 67% of Cuba's exports and 70% of its imports, n111 placing it [\*76] seventh on both export and import markets of the United States. n112 In 1999, by contrast, official U.S. exports to Cuba totaled a paltry $ 4.7 million, which was comprised mainly of donations of medical aid, pharmaceuticals, and other forms of charitable aid. n113 In the year 2000, Cuba ranked 184th of 189 importers of U.S. agricultural products. n114 The relaxation of sanctions against food and medicines beginning in 2000 found Cuba rising to 138th in 2001 and to 26th in 2004 for U.S. export markets. n115 By 2006, Cuba's ranking had fallen slightly to become the 33rd largest market for U.S. agricultural exports (exports totaling $ 328 million). n116 The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates an ongoing annual loss to all U.S. exporters of approximately $ 1.2 billion for their inability to trade with Cuba. n117

The Cuban government estimates that the total direct economic impact caused by the embargo is $ 86 billion, which includes loss of export earnings, additional costs for import, and a suppression of the growth of the Cuban economy. n118 However, various economic researchers and the U.S. State Department discount the effect of the embargo and suggest that the Cuban problem is one of lack of hard foreign currency which renders Cuba unable to purchase goods it needs in the open market. n119

 [\*77] That there has been an economic impact of the embargo is evident to anyone who visits Cuba. For example, there is a minuscule number of modern automobiles on the roads of Cuba. Most are American vehicles from the late 1950s--prior to the embargo (and the revolution). To be sure, because the law prohibits ships from entering U.S. ports for six months after making deliveries to Cuba, the policy effectively denies Cuba access to the U.S. automobile market. n120

However, **the impacts of economic sanctions are greater than lack of access to goods**. In the case of Cuba, some argue that **the U.S. embargo has had a deleterious impact on nutrition and health with a lack of availability of medicine and equipment, as well as decreased water quality**. n121 Indeed, **the American Association for World Health** (AAWH), in a 1997 report, **concluded that**

**the** U.S. **embargo** of Cuba **has dramatically harmed the health and nutrition of large numbers of ordinary Cuban citizens**. . . . **[I]t is our expert medical opinion that the** U.S. **embargo has caused a significant rise in suffering—and even deaths—in Cuba**. . . . A humanitarian catastrophe has been averted only because the Cuban government has maintained a high level of budgetary support for a health care system designed to deliver primary and preventive health care to all of its citizens. n122

Thus, **AAWH concludes that the embargo, limiting availability of food, medicine, and medical supplies, has a deleterious effect on** [\*78] **Cuban society**. Significantly, religious leaders, including the late Pope John Paul II, opposed the embargo and called for its end. n123 The gravamen of the objection is the humanitarian and economic hardships that the embargo causes.

1. **No morality d-rule—nations *aren’t* moral actors. Rational self-interest best metric for action.**

**Kennan 86** — George F. Kennan, Professor Emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, served as U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union (1952) and Yugoslavia (1961-1963), 1985 (“Morality and Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 1985/1986, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 216)

Second, let us recognize that **the functions, commitments and moral obligations of governments are not the same as those** [end page 205] **of the individual. Government is an agent, not a principal. Its primary obligation is to the interests of the national society it represents, not to** the **moral impulses** that individual elements of that society may experience. No more than the attorney vis-a-vis the client, nor the doctor vis-a-vis the patient, can government attempt to insert itself into the consciences of those whose interests it represents.

Let me explain. **The interests of the national society for which government has to concern itself are** basically those of its **military security, the integrity of its political life and the well-being of its people. These needs have no moral quality. They arise from the very existence of the national state** in question **and from the status of national sovereignty** it enjoys. **They are the unavoidable necessities of a national existence and therefore not subject to classification as either "good" or "bad." They may be questioned from a detached philosophic point of view. But the government of the sovereign state cannot make such judgments. When it accepts the responsibilities of governing, implicit in that acceptance is the assumption that it is right that the state should be sovereign, that the integrity of its political life should be assured, that its people should enjoy the blessings of military security, material prosperity and a reasonable opportunity for**, as the Declaration of Independence puts it, **the pursuit of happiness. For these assumptions the government needs no moral justification, nor need it accept any moral reproach for acting on the basis of them**.

1. **Shunning is immoral—it uses people as *means to an end*.**

**Gordon 99** — Joy Gordon, Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Fairfield University, holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Yale University and a J.D. from Boston University, 1999 (“A Peaceful, Silent, Deadly Remedy: The Ethics of Economic Sanctions,” *Ethics & International Affairs*, Volume 13, Issue 1, March, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Wiley Online Library, p. 138-139)

To the extent that commentators have pondered the question of why sanctions are still used—and why they are justified—they have generated two main responses: expression and punishment. Galtung and Lundborg, in documenting the failure of sanctions to achieve compliance with the stated political objectives, argue that sanctions should not be seen as "instrumental."41 Sanctions are not really designed to achieve compliance, they assert, but rather are "expressive." A government may consider sanctions useful if they serve to "declare its position to internal and external publics or help win support at home or abroad."42 It is common enough to hear sanctions discussed in these terms—"It's important that we send a message that this type of conduct is unacceptable to the international community."43 If we view sanctions in this light, then they are no longer a failure. For example, after Soviet troops entered Afghanistan, President Carter imposed a grain embargo on the USSR, which President Reagan lifted in 1981. The Soviets did not withdraw from Afghanistan until 1988.44 If we look at sanctions from an instrumental point of view, they were clearly a failure. But sanctions could also "be interpreted as having been motivated in part by a desire to signal resolve and leadership to the domestic public during an election year," Nossal observes, suggesting that as an act of expression, the sanctions were in fact successful.45

However, **"sending a message," while ordinarily a legitimate undertaking for a state, becomes ethically problematic if the means of communication consist of depriving vulnerable sectors of a foreign population of basic necessities. While sanctions against aggression might be justified on utilitarian grounds, sanctions as a means of sending a message cannot claim the same moral legitimacy**. And while deontological ethics might not be able to raise a particular objection to sanctions that prevent aggression—since in either case, some innocent population will suffer—the same cannot be said of sanctions as expression. **Where "sending** [end page 138] **a message" or "signaling resolve" or "expressing outrage" is the purpose of sanctions, the sanctions patently entail the use of human beings as simply a means to an end; human suffering becomes merely a device of communication. Thus the purpose is unacceptable on deontological as well as utilitarian grounds**.

1. **Weigh consequences—moral absolutism *reproduces evil*.**

**Isaac 2 —** Jeffrey C. Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University-Bloomington, 2002 (“Ends, Means, and Politics,” *Dissent*, Volume 49, Issue 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via EBSCOhost, p. 35-36)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, **an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern** may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it **suffers from three fatal flaws:** (1) **It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends**. Abjuring violence or **refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters;** (2) **it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice**. [end page 35] This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion—pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) **it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil**. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: **it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness**.

1. **Case outweighs—scope and urgency.**

**Kennan 86** — George F. Kennan, Professor Emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, served as U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union (1952) and Yugoslavia (1961-1963), 1985 (“Morality and Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 1985/1986, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 216)

Except perhaps in some sectors of American government and opinion, there are few thoughtful people who would not agree that **our world is** at present **faced with two unprecedented and supreme dangers. One is the danger not just of nuclear war but of any major war at all** among great industrial powers—**an exercise which modern technology has now made suicidal** all around. **The other is** the **devastating** effect of modern industrialization and overpopulation on **the world's natural environment**. The **one threatens the destruction of civilization through** the **recklessness and selfishness of its military rivalries, the other through** the **massive abuse of its natural habitat. Both are relatively new problems**, for the solution of which past experience affords little guidance. **Both are urgent. The problems of political misgovernment, to which so much of our thinking about moral values has recently related, is as old as the human species itself. It is a problem that will not be solved in our time, and need not be. But the environmental and nuclear crises will brook no delay**.

# Util Good --- 1NC

**Util’s Inevitable:**

**A --- Rights Conflicts**

Tim **Stelzig,** “DEONTOLOGY, GOVERNMENTAL ACTION, AND THE DISTRIBUTIVE EXEMPTION: HOW THE TROLLEY PROBLEM SHAPES THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RIGHTS AND POLICY,” University of Pennsylvania Law Review, March **1998,** Vol. 146, Issue 3, Ebsco

If the latter is true, no more need be said to show that deontological norms do not exhaust morality. If the former is correct, because rights claims may be overridden only when substantially more good will result--Thomson's Tradeoff Idea(n107)--then almost every situation will involve a true conflict of rights. Determining the resolution of these rights-conflicts would require that morality be supplemented with principles other than rights. If this is correct, rights would perform relatively little theoretic work beyond triggering these principles. Whatever principles would be regularly invoked for resolving rights-conflicts would do the bulk of the work of determining right action. Such a notion does not sit well with the claim that deontology exhausts morality, for the reasons already discussed.(n108)

**B --- Crisis conditions**

**SCARRE** Lecturer – Philosophy – University of Durham **1996** Utilitarianism

Utilitarian thinking about killing seems then, most intuitively acceptable to many people during public emergencies. When society’s very survival is in question, the niceties of normal moral thought are found to be dispensable. Even medical cannibalism might be seen as tolerable if no other mean were available to save certain individuals who were crucial to a nation’s war effort. If Black were designing the weapon which would ensure his country’s victory and White were its most brilliant general, not only their survival might depend upon Green losing his kidneys. Cruel necessities may seem no les cruel but they seem more necessary when the chips are down for the whole community.

**The survival of the body politics a prerequisite for ethical ends**

**STENSLI** Commander Norwegian Naval Forces **2003** Pacem n.1

http://www.pacem.no/2003/1/debatt/stensli/

Political realism is certainly not incompatible with democracy, toleration, and the defence of human rights. But PR is not a theory about these phenomena as such! Rather, PR is a school of thought overwhelmingly preoccupied by how to protect these values. Morgenthau has never claimed to present a Theory of Ethics, simply because politics always is about the tension between ethics (including “ultimate aims”, in the words of Morgenthau) and feasible actions and outcomes (immediate aims). When political realism was constructed in the Western World in the 20th Century, it was implicitly in defence against appeasement as well as against what Kissinger called revolutionary powers. By revolutionary powers, Kissinger meant the powers that seek destruction of others in order to secure themselves. To avoid the destruction of its own polity clearly must be given priority in times of crises. Furthermore, there has never existed a modern democracy without a functioning state. And in modern history, the rule of law and respect for basic human rights has hardly existed outside of democracies. It is for these reasons political scientists have been so occupied with the study of the relations between states, state institutions and democratisation.[(17)](http://www.pacem.no/2003/1/debatt/stensli/#17)

**\Governments must act to preserve the survival of their populations – nothing they do can change this fact – it is the basis of all political institutions**

**KENNAN** Director of the State Department’s Policy Planning Staff, Ambassador to the USSR and Yugoslavia, Professor at the Institute of Advanced Studies **1986**

Foreign Affairs Winter 85-86

Certain distinctions should be made before one wanders farther into this thicket of problems.

First of all, the conduct of diplomacy is the responsibility of governments. For purely practical reasons, this is unavoidable and inalterable. This responsibility is not diminished by the fact that government, in formulating foreign policy, may choose to be influenced by private opinion. What we are talking about, therefore, when we attempt to relate moral considerations to foreign policy, is the behavior of governments, not of individuals or entire peoples.

Second, let us recognize that the functions, commitments and moral obligations of governments are not the same as those of the individual. Government is an agent, not a principal. Its primary obligation is to the interests of the national society it represents, not to the moral impulses that individual elements of that society may experience. No more than the attorney vis-à-vis the client, nor the doctor vis-à-vis the patient, can government attempt to insert itself into the consciences of those whose interests it represents.

Let me explain. The interests of the national society for which government has to concern itself are basically those of its military security, the integrity of its political life and the well-being of its people. These needs have no moral quality. They arise from the very existence of the national state in question and from the status of national sovereignty it enjoys. They are the unavoidable necessities of a national existence and therefore not subject to classification as either "good" or "bad." They may be questioned from a detached philosophic point of view**.** But the government of the sovereign state cannot make such judgments. When it accepts the responsibilities of governing, implicit in that acceptance is the assumption that it is right that the state should be sovereign, that the integrity of its political life should be assured, that its people should enjoy the blessings of military security, material prosperity and a reasonable opportunity for, as the Declaration of Independence put it, the pursuit of happiness. For these assumptions the government needs no moral justification, nor need it accept any moral reproach for acting on the basis of them.

**Allowing the human race to burn in nuclear fire is no different than causing it to happen – you are responsible for what your plan causes**

**NYE** Professor of IR – JFK School of Government – Harvard **1986** Nuclear Ethics

Motives and means are only two dimensions of moral reasoning. Consequences are the third, and many philosophers as well as practical politicians believe that the consequences are the most important criterion by which the morality of nuclear policies should be judged. When the potential consequences are so enormous, “otherwise honorable concerns and with perfection, virtue, rights, and the doctrine of double effect simply give way. The difference between letting humanity or some large part of it be immolated and causing it to be immolated is a moral difference that pales into insignificance.”
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**2ac Brazil DA**

1. **The DA is false China is monopolizing now that is MBD 8 cross apply it.**
2. **Athletics and Corruption cause decline**

**Ristovic, 12** – Master’s Student, Public Diplomacy, Annenberg School of Communication, University of Southern California, Research Intern, Center on Public Diplomacy, University of Southern California (Aleksandra, April/May 2012, “Brazil’s Soft Power and Dilma’s Dilemma,” PDiN Monitor Volume 3, Issue 4, Center on Public Diplomacy, University of Southern California, http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/index.php/pdin\_monitor/article/brazils\_soft\_power\_and\_dilmas\_dilemma/)//Hensel

As the host of both the next football World Cup in 2014 and the Olympic Games in 2016, Brazil has an opportunity to show the world **the vitality of its emerging power** in an area about which it is passionate - sports. The decisions to award the events to Brazil, which were won by the government of former President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, marked a **diplomatic tour de force** for the country. But recent **negative media attention** - highlighting FIFA’s fear that the stadiums won’t be ready in time for the games - shows that convincing the world of your prowess is not enough, one must successfully host the events. This past year’s **corruption scandals** among President Rousseff’s high ranking officials, first Brazil’s Sports Minister and then the head of the Brazilian football confederation this past March, are partly to blame for the delay. Although most of the 12 stadiums are on schedule, many are over budget and being constructed on taxpayer tabs. It remains to be seen if the exposed challenges of execution are symptoms of a larger problem of underdevelopment and whether Brazil’s forthcoming sport diplomacy initiatives will have a positive long-term impact on the population.

1. **Alt causes harm Brazil position - lack of support for UN Security Council seat**

**Bozzo, 2011**

(Albert, “China had the Olympic Games, South Africa had the World Cup” CNBC April 25 <http://www.cnbc.com/id/42683728> accessed tm 7/15 )

¶ Yet, for all of his domestic and foreign policy accomplishments, Lula, who was succeeded by his former chief of staff, Dilma Rousseff, fell short in one key goal: securing a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. Brazilian army soldiers acting as U.N. peacekeepers in front of the presidential palace in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. Brazil has been seeking inclusion for years, but, unlike India, has yet to receive explicit U.S. support. President Obama's visit to Brazil in mid-April once again raised, and then dashed, those hopes. Inclusion, more than anything, say analysts, is the fulcrum of Brazil's global status. Brazil's handling of the recent UN vote on the Libya no-fly zone is an excellent example, say analysts. In keeping with its general opposition to military intervention, Brazil abstained."Leadership comes with obligations," says Farnsworth. "I think it [voting yes] would have been a positive signal." Brazil's move was reminiscent of its abstention in the case of sanctions against Iran several years ago. Washington and Brazilia also differed on the Honduran coup of 2009

1. **US intrusion allows Brazil to reassert its influence in the region**

**Sotero, 10 –** director of the Brazil Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, MA in Journalism and Public Affairs from the American University, adjunct lecturer at  Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University (Paulo, “Brazil's Rising Ambition in a Shifting Global Balance of Power,” Perspectives on the Changing Global Distribution of Power Volume 30, Issue Supplement s1, pages 71–81, December 2010)//HAL

Although Brazil has begun to assert itself on the global stage in the twenty-first century, historically the nation's world perspective has been heavily conditioned by geography. From the early years of the republic, in the late nineteenth century, the key foreign policy objectives were the consolidation of the national territory through the peaceful resolution of all border disputes and the pursuit of closer ties with a then emerging United States. One hundred years later, President Cardoso set Brazil in a new direction in regional affairs, in order to assert the country's autonomy while pushing for integration with its immediate neighbours. With the nation's position strengthened by the legitimacy of its democratic regime and successful economic stabilisation policies, Cardoso sought to define Brazil's sphere of influence by engaging its South American neighbours in a strategy of economic integration independent of the US. In September 2000, he convened in Brasília the first-ever summit of South American presidents (OEI, 2000). Six months later, speaking at the Third Summit of the Americas in Quebec City, Cardoso made clear Brazil's scepticism of the continent-wide integration project the United States was promoting by way of the proposed Free Trade Area of the Americas (Cardoso, 2001, p. 3): ‘the FTAA will be welcome if its creation is a step towards access to the most dynamic markets; if it is an effective way to shared rules on anti-dumping; if it reduces non-tariff barriers; if it avoids the protectionist distortions of the good sanitary rules; if, while protecting intellectual property, it fosters our peoples technological capacity; and, furthermore, if it goes beyond the Uruguay Round and correct the asymmetries it enshrined in agricultural trade. If it does not do so, [FTAA] would be irrelevant or, in the worse hypothesis, undesirable’. Lula stayed the course on regional affairs. In the first year of his government, Brazil blocked further negotiations of the FTAA. The new president, however, substantially changed Brazil's style of diplomacy, in favour of a more vocal foreign policy, reflective of his talent as a charismatic leader who loves the limelight and does well on the stump. In his first trip abroad as president, he said in Quito, Ecuador, that his country's diplomacy would ‘blossom’. Lula described Brazil as the region's ‘natural leader’ and proclaimed that the country was ‘ready to assume its greatness’ (Veja, 2003, p. 68). Brazil sought to expand existing regional mechanisms, such as Mercosur, by proposing the accession of Venezuela, and promoted the creation of new ones, such as the Union of South American Nations, the South American Defence Council and the Community of Latin America and Caribbean States in order to promote faster integration. In mid-2004, Brazil assumed the military command of the UN stabilisation mission in Haiti, a bold move calculated to enhance Brazil's credentials as a candidate to a permanent seat on the UNSC, according to Clovis Brigagão (Osava, 2006). The regional activism of the Lula administration led his government to act to defuse the internal crisis in Bolivia, after forgiving the country's president, Evo Morales, for unceremoniously nationalising Petrobras assets in Bolivia. Brazil expanded staffs of its embassies in the region and established a total of 35 new ones, mostly in the developing world. The powerful Brazilian National Bank for Development (BNDES) became an instrument of the regional policy. By 2009, the bank had more than $15.7 billion in lines of credit extended to countries interested in contracting Brazilian companies' services (BIC, 2009). Surprisingly, Brazil's activism in regional affairs did not extend to efforts to settle disputes between neighbours – a point not lost on critics of Lula's Iran initiative. ‘The Iranian adventure is incomprehensible, especially since there are various conflicts closer to us which we haven't tried, or haven't managed, to mediate’, noted Sérgio Amaral (The Economist, 17 June 2010). In contrast with the Cardoso government, which had, with the US, Chile and Argentina, successfully mediated the 1995 border dispute between Peru and Ecuador, the Lula administration did not get involved in a dispute between Argentina and Uruguay, both Brazil's partners in Mercosur, over the operation of a cellulose plant on the Uruguayan side of the Uruguay River. Brasília also showed no interest in helping to lower tensions and avoid a possible military confrontation between Venezuela and Colombia, which border Brazil. Lula's attempt to bring Caracas and Bogota closer together in August 2010, after Chávez severed diplomatic relations with Colombia, reacting to accusations of harbouring FARC rebel groups in Venezuela, had little impact and did not alter the mismatch between Brazil's assertions of leadership at the global level and its modest interest in assumeing the risks of leadership closer to home, where it should have a better chance of success. There are various possible reasons for the Lula government's lack of appetite to mediate in regional conflicts. Such disputes generate little interest and no political dividends in Brazil. An amalgamation of African descendants indigenous peoples and European and Asian immigrants who speak Portuguese, Brazilians do not see themselves as Latin Americans. Historically, they have been quite distant from their immediate neighbours (Bethell, 2009). Moreover, the region is seen more as a source of potential problems than as presenting opportunities for Brazil. A survey of senior diplomats, business executives, scholars and opinion-makers conducted in 2001 and 2008 indicated decreased support for pursuing relations with the region (De Souza, 2008). This finding suggests that South America and Latin America are generally perceived by Brazilian elites as a poor platform for Brazil to project itself as a global power. Nonetheless, there are a few indications that suggest that the Lula government has come to see the region as valuable to the exercise of leadership in so far as it helps to project Brazil's opposition to US dominance. From the early days of the republic, there has been an anti-American strand among Brazilian elites. This strand is likely to be manifest in the foreign policy of any government of an ascendant Brazil, the only country emerging in the United States's so-called ‘back yard’. The US recession and a general disappointment with US President Barack Obama's timid policies for the hemisphere – on Cuba, trade and regional security – strengthened the hand of key figures in Lula's foreign policy known for their lack of sympathy to the US, and reinforced a tendency to distance Brazil from Washington. In the reverberations of the Wall Street collapse, in December 2008 Brazil convened a summit to launch the Latin America and Caribbean Community of Nations – an event planned to highlight Brazilian leadership in regional affairs and underline the US's loss of influence. ‘There is no question that this is about exclusion, about excluding the United States’ (Peter Hakim, quoted in the Barrionuevo, 2008). There was also the ill-disguised confrontation between Brasília and Washington over how to respond to the June 2009 constitutional crisis in Honduras, precipitated by a coup against President Manuel Zelaya. The Lula government's unexpected and ultimately unsuccessful intervention in the Honduras crisis showed again that while Brazil has not generally sought to assert its regional leadership, it has been more than willing to stand up to the United States.

1. **we control uniqueness – Rousseff’s leadership style destroys Brazil’s credibility as willing to stand up to the US – the plan creates an opportunity for Brazil to counter the US and regain credibility within the UN**

**Ristovic, 12** – Master’s Student, Public Diplomacy, Annenberg School of Communication, University of Southern California, Research Intern, Center on Public Diplomacy, University of Southern California (Aleksandra, April/May 2012, “Brazil’s Soft Power and Dilma’s Dilemma,” PDiN Monitor Volume 3, Issue 4, Center on Public Diplomacy, University of Southern California, http://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/index.php/pdin\_monitor/article/brazils\_soft\_power\_and\_dilmas\_dilemma/)//Hensel

While Brazil has made great strides in its public diplomacy efforts, the transfer of leadership from Lula to Rousseff has **changed the tone** of the country’s soft power. Under Lula, Brazil’s independent voice was obvious: his charismatic leadership successfully cultivated formal diplomatic ties with every member of the UN General Assembly even while pursuing an independent foreign policy characterized by its non-alignment with Western powers such as the United States. On taking office, it seemed at first that Ms. Rousseff would maintain Lula’s activist foreign policy that sought to play the middleman between Asia, Africa, and the developed world. But after one year, it appears that President Rousseff is more inclined to agree with the U.S. than was her predecessor. This inclination has **weakened Brazil’s image** as a country unafraid to oppose U.S. and European policies when necessary.

1. **US and Brazil competition is not zero-sum**

**Sweig, 10** – Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow and Director for Latin America Studies and the Global Brazil Initiative at the Council on Foreign Relations (Julia E., “A New Global Player: Brazil's Far-Flung Agenda,” Foreign Affairs, Nov/Dec 2010, <http://www.panzertruppen.org/2012/politica/001.pdf>)//HAL

 Proximity and interests have likewise compelled the new Brazil to learn to live with this changed political environment. **It is unlikely that either Brazil or the United States will succeed in dominating diplomacy in Latin America.** Old multilateral institutions such as the Organization of American States are struggling to recover from the distortions of U.S. hegemony and the ambivalence and outright defiance of some member countries. Without appearing to desire leadership over institutions in the region, which could possibly induce an anti-Brazil backlash from lesser powers, Brazil is proceeding gingerly to maximize its interests and minimize conflict. On some issues, real conflict will continue to exist between the United States and Brazil. But on balance, **Brazil is neither fundamentally anti-American nor pro-American.** While Brazil was challenging the United States from Honduras to Colombia to Iran, for example, it was simultaneously negotiating the first defense cooperation agreement with the United States since 1977, working with the Obama administration to resolve a dispute over the cotton market, and maintaining an open channel of communication on climate change and international economic institutions. The bilateral relationship is likely to hover in this undefined space of neither friend nor adversary. **The Obama and Lula governments have coined the term "global partnership dialogue,"** a fuzzy way of acknowledging some interest in building up layers of scaffolding around a house in the very early stages of construction. The missed opportunity and mixed signals of the Iran episode reflect strategic differences between the two countries. But **global issues still provide fertile ground for them to cooperate**, especially on climate change, in the G-20, through modest joint efforts in alleviating poverty, and in treating infectious diseases in Haiti and Africa. The biggest and most immediate test for president-elect Rousseff will be to balance an ambitious domestic agenda with the need to secure Brazil's international position. Indeed, Brazil is in the catbird seat of global powers: it can afford to modernize its defense and security establishment without being forced to make wrenching guns-versusbutter choices. To substantially deepen the investments in its people -- on which its new social contract is based -- Brazil may well have to lower its near-term sights regarding global leadership. Ultimately, the outcome could be the same: a strong, self-confident Brazil that makes a sizable contribution to peace and prosperity, not just in the region but globally. **Perhaps the single most important way the United States can influence Brazilian foreign policy is to make clear, in word and deed, that Washington regards Brazil's rise not as a zero-sum game that threatens U.S. interests but rather as the emergence of a not-quite-natural, albeit sometimes necessary, global partner.**

1. **Relations are inevitable with Brazil**

**Sotero, 12** – Director of the Brazil Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, in Washington (Paul, “Why United States and Brazil Will Pursue a More Productive Bilateral Relationship”, Huffington Post, 11/09/12, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/paulo-sotero/why-united-states-and-bra\_b\_2102004.html)//EX](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/paulo-sotero/why-united-states-and-bra_b_2102004.html%29//EX)

Whereas previous conversations between Brazilian and American policymakers might have been limited to a few areas of core interest, it is now all-encompassing. **There are mechanisms for regular ministerial cooperation and consultation ranging from challenging topics such as trade, finance and defense, to 21st century concerns such as cyber security, open government, and innovation in science and technology, to issues that directly affect the average citizen such as education and social policies. People to people exchanges are on the rise, strengthening and expanding networks particularly in education and scientific research. Viewed by skeptics as window dressing and no substitute for concrete agreements on hard issues such as trade and taxation, the rapid increase in the breadth and depth of the bilateral dialogue and the Brazilian and American governments' efforts to maintain the doors open for a more productive and consequential relationship suggest, at a minimum, that they understand they need each other, benefit from working together and risk paying a political price for not doing so.¶** **Brazil's emergence as an substantive international actor and its rise as the world's sixth largest economy, have introduced new factors in Brazilian-American relationship that authorities and bureaucrats in Washington and Brasilia cannot afford to ignore.** Once the host of numerous multinational companies from the United States and Europe, Brazil is now also home to dozens of Brazilian controlled multinational enterprises that have dramatically expanded their operations worldwide and, in particularly, in the United States. Some occupy substantial positions as investors in key markets, such as the meat, beer, regional aviation and special steel industries. **The growing presence of Brazilian companies in the United States offers new perspective to matters such as the negotiation of a tax treaty that the two countries have talked about for four decades.¶ What was once an issue of interest only for U.S. companies in Brazil is now also a topic on the agenda of Brazilian firms operating in the U.S. market.** Participants in the annual meeting of the Brazil-U.S. Business Council, held last month in Brasília, say the political pressure generated by the new reality of Brazilian global companies in the United States has created momentum for the approval by the Brazilian Congress of a bilateral agreement on exchange of tax information that is seen as the first step for a treaty addressing double taxation.¶ Brazil and the U.S. have also taken on global challenges together, benefiting from Brazil's ability to wield soft power and newfound status in multilateral fora. The Open Government Initiative (OGI) that Brazil and the United States launched last year has attracted over forty countries committed to promoting transparency, fighting corruption and harnessing new technologies to make government more open, effective, and accountable.¶ As suggested by developments on taxation and **the progress made in OGI, gradualism is the crucial ingredient in efforts to advance U**