



PF April 2014 Con Analysis

The current NSDL (formerly known as NFL) Public Forum resolution is **Resolved: Prioritizing economic development over environmental protection is in the best interest of the people of India.** Earlier, we analyzed the [pro side](#) of the topic. Today, we're going to look at the resolution from the con point of view.

We'll begin by looking at some of the key terms in the resolution. If you already read the pro guide, you can safely skip to page 3.

First, consider the word "**prioritizing.**" There are two possible ways to understand "prioritizing" in the context of this topic. The first conveys an element of sequencing: we should do economic development prior to worrying about environmental protection. The second interpretation is that they can be done at the same time, but economic development should be considered the more important imperative. The second is probably more strategic for the pro side, because it allows for more flexibility. Regardless, both interpretations are very similar, and will probably not play a major role in very many of your debates. It is important to realize, however, that *neither interpretation requires either side to argue that specific policy attempts to achieve either imperative are always good OR always bad.* Rather, we are speaking in general about which outcome we ought to be most concerned about.

"**Economic development**" and "**environmental protection**" are pretty straight-forward. You will easily be able to find numerous definitions of these terms, all of which will be quite similar. Neither are terms of art, so your existing understanding of their meanings is probably adequate.



The term “**best interest**,” however, demands some engagement. Well-crafted cases on this topic will require some framing work about how we ought to determine “best interest.” These arguments should include not only an interpretation for *how* we ought to measure best interest, but also argumentation about *why* this is the most appropriate measurement. You might want to draw inspiration from LD’s value/criterion structure as you prepare this portion of your case.

Keep in mind that “best interest” refers to “**the people of India.**” This is distinct from the Indian government, American (or other foreign government) interests, or the priorities of the human race as a whole. It may require you to engage in argumentation about the demographics of the Indian people: how old are they? How affluent are they? Where do they live? What kinds of jobs do they have? What pressing social problems do they face? What do they self-identify as their priorities? Etc. All of these questions can guide your research and help you arrive at a strong interpretation of “the best interest of the people of India.”

In fact, your success on this topic will in many ways be tied to your working knowledge of India as a nation. You *MUST* conduct thorough background research in order to be able to intelligently discuss prioritizing competing imperatives from the perspective of a particular country. Cutting a couple of cards is not enough. If you doubt that background research is important, I encourage you to read [this article](#).

Here are a few places to begin familiarizing yourself with India’s demographics, economy, and political system:

[Wikipedia](#)

[CIA World Factbook](#)

[Heritage Foundation’s Economic Freedom Index](#)



Once you feel like you are thoroughly informed about India, you'll want to determine your framing of "best interest," and build your case impacts around that structure.

One common approach will be **utilitarianism** (the greatest good for the greatest number). If you claim "best interest" should be determined through a utilitarian lens, you will need to win that the impacts of failing to protect the environment outweigh the impacts of a lack of economic development. To do this, you will need to engage in substantial direct impact comparison.

You might want to borrow the CX technique of comparing *probability* (how likely the impacts are to occur; is it 100% certain, or is it a predictive scenario that might never come to pass?), *magnitude* (how big of an impact it is/how many people could suffer or die), and *timeframe* (how fast the impacts will occur). For example, you might argue that, even if the pro wins that development solves hunger in the short-term, pollution will disrupt agriculture long-term, ensuring the problem of famine is replicated and expanded. We will discuss techniques for this sort of argumentation throughout this guide.

The key thing to remember is that your case arguments must clearly paint a path to victory using the interpretation of "best interest" you provide. As always in debate, *it is critical that your framework supports the rest of your arguments.*

One obvious avenue for carving out con offense is **climate change**. This is a strong argument because it has a large magnitude, implicates lots of other impacts, and can be used to turn pro arguments about economic growth.



Cards about this are extremely easy to find; search Google News for “climate change India” and you will be overwhelmed with results. Nevertheless, here’s some strong **evidence** with a laundry list of impact claims:

(Vishwa Mohan, The Times of India, “Climate change may lead India to war: UN report,” <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/environment/global-warming/Climate-change-may-lead-India-to-war-UN-report/articleshow/33034504.cms>, April 1 2014)

Asia is facing the brunt of climate change and will see severe stress on water resources and food-grain production in the future, increasing the risk of armed conflict among India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and China, the latest report of a UN panel has warned.

UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, in its report assessing impacts of climate change on human health, settlements and natural resources released on Monday, carried a dire warning. "The worst is yet to come," it said, if no measures are taken to curb the ill-effects of global warming.

India, like other developing economies, may lose up to 1.7% of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP) if the annual mean temperature rises by 1 degree Celsius compared to pre-industrialization level, hitting the poor the most.

The report also predicts an increase in extreme weather events such as last year's flash floods in Uttarakhand and cyclone Phailin in Odisha if steps are not taken to control the rise in temperature.

"Nobody on this planet is going to be untouched by the impacts of climate change," R K Pachauri, IPCC chairman said while making the report public in Yokohama, Japan.

The report says rise in temperatures would also affect 'beach tourism' in many countries. India surprisingly stands out as the most vulnerable among 51 countries where beach tourism is an important sector.

Climate change is not just about the future. The report said people around the world were already getting hit as it directly affects livelihoods, reduces food-grain production, destroys homes and raises food prices. These trends will accelerate if climate change is left unchecked.



Among other things, the report warns that climate change increases the risk of armed conflict around the world because it worsens poverty and economic shocks.

"Climate change is already becoming a determining factor in the national security policies of states", said a statement issued by the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) which has been working to arrive at a global climate deal by 2015 to fight the menace effectively through combined efforts of nations.

Though the report doesn't have country-specific predictions, its region-wise findings brought out many eye-opening conclusions for India.

Aromar Revi, lead author of one of the chapters of this report, said the impacts of climate change would be felt severely in Indo-Gangetic plains, affecting poor people in the entire region. "The areas which are facing frequent floods these days may face drought like situation in the distant or near future. We cannot ignore the changes which are taking place either in the Indus river basin or in Brahmaputra river system over the longer period," said Revi, explaining the implications of the report in Delhi.

Another lead author, Surender Kumar, explained how climate change would affect the poorer nations. He said if mean temperatures increased beyond 1 degree C, it would knock 3% off the GDP of developing economies.

More **evidence**, including the claim that environmental protections are needed urgently and should happen now:

(Yogesh Pawar, DNA India, "Threat from global warming heightened in latest UN report," <http://www.dnaindia.com/mumbai/report-threat-from-global-warming-heightened-in-latest-un-report-1974065>, April 1 2014)

The new Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report – released in Yokohama, Japan on Monday – has set off warning bells across the world particularly for countries in South Asia which have huge coastlines. Greenpeace India has urged Indian leaders to take cognizance of the warning in the report, and accelerate clean and safe energy transition.



The IPCC report has said climate change impacts are already widespread across all continents and oceans and rapidly worsening. The report states that in Asia, this climate chaos can bring about floods, heat-related mortality, and drought and water related food shortage. For an agro-based economy like India that depends largely on monsoons, this can be disastrous.

The report also states that climate change will have a negative impact on wheat yields in South Asia. Global food production is reducing slowly, and IPCC chairperson, RK Pachauri has even said that in some parts of the world, the much-touted green revolution has reached a plateau. Also an increase in riverine, coastal, and urban flooding can lead to widespread damage to infrastructure, livelihoods, and settlements, in Asia. This might mean likely impact on cities such as, Mumbai and Kolkata in India and Dhaka in Bangladesh. But how bad it will get hinges on near-term choices.

The dangers of climate change are real, have been clearly spelt out by the IPCC Working Group II report titled 'Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability'. "It clearly shows that continuing on the path of coal and high carbon emissions will hurt India's development and economy eventually and all that had been gained in improving the standard of living in the country will be negated. In a matter of few days India will vote again and the new government cannot be unmindful of India's vulnerability to climate change impacts," says Arpana Udupa, campaigner, Greenpeace India.

The recent hailstorms in parts of Karnataka Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh which destroyed crops such as wheat, gram, cotton, jowar, onion and vineyards in over 12 lakh hectares of land, and led to consequent farmer suicides, points towards IPCC's prediction of erratic precipitation patterns. The IPCC had earlier predicted a possible decrease in overall rainfall but an increase in extreme weather events.

"With the latest report predicting severe impact on wheat, the new Indian government will have to take positive steps to mitigate the problem," says Udupa. According to her, the IPCC report also provides some hope when it states that limiting warming below 2 degree Celsius would reduce many key risks to medium or low level. "The new government should speedily act to bring about a clean energy transition and strengthen adaptation, looking at the mitigation and adaptation benefits in every scheme, starting from energy," she says.

The IPCC report found that climate change is a growing threat to human security, as it exacerbates food and water vulnerabilities and indirectly increases the risks of migration and violent conflicts. "Oil rigs and coal power plants are weapons of mass destruction, loading the atmosphere with destructive carbon emissions that don't respect national borders. To protect our peace and security, we must disarm them and accelerate the transition to clean and safe renewable energy that's already started," said Jen Maman, peace adviser at Greenpeace International.



It is important to note that many pro teams will answer climate change arguments by stating that India alone cannot resolve the problem, because other nations will continue polluting, and emissions do not respect national boundaries. There are a few ways to answer this; you should plan to make multiple, diverse arguments in order to avoid having your impacts taken out.

First, you can argue that, even if India alone cannot solve climate change, it is nevertheless a substantial contributor, so it must reduce its environmental impact. You can claim that the topic confines you to discussing India, but arguing that India should protect the environment does not mean that other nations shouldn't also protect the environment. You can also make a "try-or-die" argument: climate change will be so disastrous for India that they must attempt to stop it at all costs, even if their chances are success are slim.

All of those are ok arguments, but the strongest response is that other nations will **model** India's commitment to environmental protections. The warrant to this is that the international community is currently at a stalemate, where developing countries won't cut emissions because they want to keep up rapid economic expansion, and developed countries also refuse to act until they have broader international support. No one wants to be the first to make changes. If India made significant moves towards environmental protection, this would get the ball rolling.

Here is **evidence**:

(Vishwa Mohan, The Times of India, 'South Asia needs to unite on climate change', <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Home/Environment/Global-Warming/South-Asia-needs-to-unite-on-climate-change/articleshow/33097177.cms>, April 2 2014)

A day after a UN panel predicted gloomy future for South Asia where climate change may even push nations to war due to pressure on natural resources, its chairman R K Pachauri on Tuesday admitted that the situation is indeed bad and it would be worse if the countries do not act together to face this common challenge.

"The world has all kinds of drivers of stress and drivers of conflict. With the climate change, these are likely to get accentuated further," said Pachauri in an interview to TOI.



Pachauri - chairman of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) which released its report in Yokohama, Japan on Monday - was responding to the kind of messages one can get from this much-awaited document.

Asked how this problem could be tackled unless countries in South Asia join hands, he said, "Under SAARC, for instance, we have a programme to deal with environmental protection and climate change. But I am afraid that is not being implemented effectively."

Pachauri gave an example of massive floods in Pakistan in 2009 which he could see himself while flying over the country. He had later conveyed his concerns to then Pakistan's President Asif Ali Zardari, when he met him.

"I later went to meet the then President Zardari and told him that there is no political conflict on these issues and that the two countries should work together because all we are vulnerable. So, it would make a lot of sense that countries of South Asia should coordinate their policies and action to fight the common threat," he said.

Asked about Zardari's response, Pachauri - who is also a member of the Prime Minister's advisory council on climate change in India - said, "The response was positive. But, it's a question of who's going to bell the cat."

His remark assumes significance in view of the predictions made by the IPCC not only for the Asia but the also for whole world where the threat of climate change must be handled through joint action.

(Note: If you aren't familiar with it, the idiom "bell the cat" refers to a fable in which mice argue about which of them should have to complete the dangerous task of putting a warning bell alarm a sleeping cat's neck. It refers to a situation in which everyone agrees on the solution to a shared problem, but no one wants to be the one who has to take the costly first step.)

If you would prefer to avoid debates about climate change, there are also a number of other environmental impacts available to you. One significant option is **air pollution**. India is ranked as having the poorest air quality in the world, and numerous studies link this to massive illness, death, and other



problems. The cause of this high level of pollution is a combination of growing numbers of vehicles, reliance on coal and other dirty technologies, and an absence of enforceable environmental regulations.

Here is **evidence**:

(Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, "India's Air the World's Unhealthiest, Study Says," <http://envirocenter.yale.edu/news/237/56/India-s-Air-the-World-s-Unhealthiest-Study-Says/d,newsDetail>, February 1 2012)

India's has the worst air pollution in the entire world, beating China, Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh, according to a study released during this year's World Economic Forum in Davos.

Of 132 countries whose environments were surveyed, India ranks dead last in the 'Air (effects on human health)' ranking. The annual study, the Environmental Performance Index, is conducted and written by environmental research centers at Yale and Columbia universities with assistance from dozens of outside scientists. The study uses satellite data to measure air pollution concentrations.

India's high levels of fine particulate matter (a subject we've been looking at on India Ink, albeit just in Delhi) are one of the major factors contributing to the country's abysmal air quality. Levels of so-called PM 2.5, for the 2.5 micron size of the particulates, are nearly five times the threshold where they become unsafe for human beings.

Particulate matter is one of the leading causes of acute lower respiratory infections and cancer. The World Health Organization found that Acute Respiratory Infections were one of the most common causes of deaths in children under 5 in India, and contributed to 13% of in-patient deaths in paediatric wards in India.

When it comes to overall environment, India ranked among the world's "Worst Performers," at No. 125 out of the 132 nations, beating only Kuwait, Yemen, South Africa, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Iraq. Neighboring Pakistan, in contrast, ranked 120th and Bangladesh was listed as No. 115 on overall environment.



It is not just India's big cities which are grappling with air pollution, said Anumita Roychowdhury, executive director of India's Centre for Science and Environment, a non-profit organization which was not involved in the study. Air pollution also is worsening in smaller cities, she said.

The main culprit, Ms. Roychowdhury said, is the growing number of vehicles in India. While the country still has far fewer vehicles per capita than developed nations, India's cars are more polluting, Ms. Roychowdhury said. Other air pollution experts also cite India's reliance coal and polluting industries like brick-making that are located close to densely-populated areas.

Emission standards are nearly "10 years behind European standards," Ms. Roychowdhury said, and these standards are not legally enforceable, unlike in countries like the United States which has the Clean Air Act. India has an Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 which is supposed to be enforced by the Central Pollution Control Board. This act lacks teeth, Ms. Roychowdhury said. "We need to take big steps or the problem will overwhelm us," she said.

Other possible areas of concern are pollution of the **water supply** and **deforestation**. In the interest of time and space, I'm not including anything about those in this paper. However, cards about them are easily available online.

In addition to their health-related effects, pollution, poor air quality, and resource damage also have strong **negative effects on India's economy**. This is a useful argument, because it turns the pro's impacts.



Here's **evidence**:

(The World Bank, "An analysis of physical and monetary losses of environmental health and natural resources in India," <http://go.worldbank.org/RAI6KHO150>, 1/10/12)

This study provides estimates of social and financial costs of environmental damage in India from three pollution damage categories: (i) urban air pollution; (ii) inadequate water supply, poor sanitation, and hygiene; and (iii) indoor air pollution. It also provides estimates based on three natural resource damage categories: (i) agricultural damage from soil salinity, water logging, and soil erosion; (ii) rangeland degradation; and (iii) deforestation. The estimates are based on a combination of Indian data from secondary sources and on the transfer of unit costs of pollution from a range of national and international studies. The study estimates the total cost of environmental degradation in India at about 3.75 trillion rupees (US\$80 billion) annually, equivalent to 5.7 percent of gross domestic product in 2009, which is the reference year for most of the damage estimates. Of this total, outdoor air pollution accounts for 1.1 trillion rupees, followed by the cost of indoor air pollution at 0.9 trillion rupees, croplands degradation cost at 0.7 trillion rupees, inadequate water supply and sanitation cost at around 0.5 trillion rupees, pasture degradation cost at 0.4 trillion rupees, and forest degradation cost at 0.1 trillion rupees.

Another option for cultivating con offense would be arguing that economic development is bad *in general*. There are a number of schools of thought that support this argument. One that has particular relevance to this topic is the concept of "[deep ecology](#)," which maintains that we must move away from seeing nature as something that exists for humans to use, and must instead view it as inherently valuable and worthy of protection, regardless of its use-value to humanity. Thus, it argues, societies must actually de-develop in order to consume fewer resources. If you are interested in pursuing this route, Google can be your guide.

Finally, you could say that the only way to determine what is in the "best interest of the people of India" is to obey the will of the majority of Indians, as measured by **opinion polls**. A variety of polls have shown



that Indians say they favor stronger environmental protections, even if they come at the expense of economic growth.

Here's **evidence**:

(Pew, Global Attitudes Project, "Global Warming Seen as a Major Problem Around the World Less Concern in the U.S., China and Russia," <http://www.pewglobal.org/2009/12/02/global-warming-seen-as-a-major-problem-around-the-world-less-concern-in-the-us-china-and-russia/>, December 2 2009)

In three nations that have enjoyed strong economic growth in recent years — India, China and Brazil — agreement on this issue is nearly universal. Roughly eight-in-ten in India (84%), China (82%) and Brazil (79%) agree with prioritizing the environment over rapid economic expansion.

There are LOTS more surveys that have the same results (albeit by varying margins). I selected the above card because it conveyed the argument strongly and concisely. However, it is a little old (December 2009), so you'll also want to have newer cards available.

Here's some newer **evidence**:

(Lowy Institute for International Policy, "India Poll 2013," <http://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/india-poll-2013>, May 20 2013)

Most Indians (74%) are optimistic about prospects for their economy. But Indians are divided about whether the fruits of rapid growth are being justly distributed: while a small majority (56%) of Indians see themselves as economically better off than five years ago, about 18% feel worse off and 27% do not think their economic situation has changed.



Most Indians see major problems looming. Shortages of energy, water and food, along with climate change, register as the most important challenges, with 80-85% of Indians rating these issues as 'big threats' to their country's security. Other issues rated as big threats by large majorities of Indians include possible war with Pakistan (77%), home-grown terrorism (74%), foreign jihadist attacks (74%), possible war with China (73%) and a continuing Maoist insurgency (71%).

This framing of the topic would be strengthened by some argumentation about the impossibility of objectively determining what is in someone's "best interest." None of us are equipped to perfectly predict the future. However, we can allow people to be in charge of their own destinies. Because human beings tend to prefer self-determination, it is reasonable to conclude that upholding the will of the majority would be in the best interest of any given people.

In addition to advancing your own impacts, strong con cases will also provide **defense against common pro arguments**. Remember, this topic is asking you to weigh two imperatives and determine which one to prioritize. This means you want to have two layers: the first being defense of your framework and arguments which help you win the debate under that framework, and the second being reasons why you still win under the pro's framework. We have already discussed a number of ways that you can leverage your impacts against the economy-based impacts of the pro side. Now, let's look at some indictments to common pro arguments.

Many pro teams will make arguments based, either partially or entirely, on the [Environmental Kuznets Curve](#) theory, or EKC. EKC maintains that the relationship between economic growth and environmental degradation follows a U-shaped curve, in which degradation increases with growth, until a certain "turning point" is reached, at which point increased economic activity corresponds to decreased degradation. Practically, this argument is usually expressed as something like "because nations must achieve a certain base level standard of living and wealth in order to gain the ability to care about environmental protection (you cannot worry about global warming tomorrow when your children are starving today), as well as in order for political institutions to develop the capacity to pass and enforce environmental regulations."



However, EKC is extremely controversial. Plenty of economists have said that it is not supported by the data, or is only accurate in a few, narrow situations.

Here is **evidence** that says the EKC does not exist, and that the theory is based on flawed econometrics:

(David I. Stern, Prof. of economics at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, "The environmental Kuznets curve," International Society for Ecological Economics: Internet Encyclopaedia of Ecological Economics, <http://isecoeco.org/pdf/stern.pdf>, June 2003)

The environmental Kuznets curve is a hypothesized relationship between various indicators of environmental degradation and income per capita. In the early stages of economic growth degradation and pollution increase, but beyond some level of income per capita (which will vary for different indicators) the trend reverses, so that at high-income levels economic growth leads to environmental improvement. This implies that the environmental impact indicator is an inverted U-shaped function of income per capita. Typically the logarithm of the indicator is modeled as a quadratic function of the logarithm of income. An example of an estimated EKC is shown in Figure 1. The EKC is named for Kuznets (1955) who hypothesized income inequality first rises and then falls as economic development proceeds. The EKC is an essentially empirical phenomenon, but most of the EKC literature is econometrically weak. It is very easy to do bad econometrics and the history of the EKC exemplifies what can go wrong. The EKC idea rose to prominence because few paid sufficient attention to econometric diagnostic statistics. Little or no attention has been paid to the statistical properties of the data used such as serial dependence or stochastic trends in time series and few tests of model adequacy have been carried out or presented. However, one of the main purposes of doing econometrics is to test which apparent relationships, or "stylized facts", are valid and which are spurious correlations. When we do take such statistics into account and use appropriate techniques we find that the EKC does not exist (Perman and Stern 2003). Instead we get a more realistic view of the effect of economic growth and technological changes on environmental quality. It seems that most indicators of environmental degradation are monotonically rising in income though the "income elasticity" is less than one and is not a simple function of income alone. Time related effects reduce environmental impacts in countries at all levels of income. However, in rapidly growing middle income countries the scale effect, which increases pollution and other degradation,



overwhelms the time effect. In wealthy countries, growth is slower, and pollution reduction efforts can overcome the scale effect. This is the origin of the apparent EKC effect.

Here is **evidence** that says the EKC hypothesis is inappropriate for India:

(Ethan Goffman, Discovery Guides editor & Natural Resources post-grad, "Growth and the environmental Kuznets curve," ProQuest, <http://www.csa.com/discoveryguides/envecon/review4.php>, April 2007)

David I. Stern, writing for the International Society for Ecological Economics, attacks the very idea of the EKC. His analysis shows that countries rich and poor tend to reduce pollution relative to economic output over time, but that since developing countries grow at a rapid rate their overall pollution grows rapidly: "in rapidly growing middle income countries the scale effect, which increases pollution and other degradation, overwhelms the time effect. In wealthy countries, growth is slower, and pollution reduction efforts can overcome the scale effect" (3). In other words a fast-growing economy will produce more pollution despite technological advances. A more recent study, using other methods, finds evidence that the Environmental Kuznets curve does in fact exist, while stipulating that it "still remains a very fragile concept" (Galeotti et al. 16). Another current study, of Latin American countries, shows "significant evidence of an EKC relationship for deforestation" (Culus 429), a result consistent with the theory that highly visible local conditions are most susceptible to the EKC. Still, the study cautions that "environmental policies and institutional arrangements" also need to be accounted for (436).

Scale, specific situation, and type of environmental degradation are some of the variables that must be carefully examined when evaluating the EKC. Still it's clear that, particularly in countries such as China and India, where growth is far outpacing improved environmental efficiency, simply allowing development to take its course is insufficient.



Finally, here is **evidence** arguing that even if EKC is sometimes accurate, it is still not an optimal course for development and has significant, unnecessary costs:

(James Van Alstine and Eric Neumayer, Dept. of Geography and Environment and Center for Environmental Policy and Governance at the London School of Economics and Political Science, "The environmental Kuznets curve," Handbook on Trade and the Environment (Chapter 3), <http://www.lse.ac.uk/geographyAndEnvironment/whosWho/profiles/neumayer/pdf/EKC.pdf>, December 28 2008)

Questions were raised with serious ramifications for LDCs. Should today's developing countries follow the "grow now, clean up later" logic that has characterized the development paths of today's rich countries? Given predictions that some LDCs will not reach EKC turning points for decades to come, it is even more imperative that economic growth and liberalization should not be thought of as a solution for environmental problems. Therefore it might not be optimal, particularly for LDCs, to follow an EKC pathway for a variety of reasons, including: the likelihood of high environmental damage costs; the high cost of raising environmental quality after the damage has occurred; the potential of reaching environmental thresholds and causing irreversible environmental damage; and the potential damage to human health and economic productivity. A precautionary approach suggests that in order to decouple economic value from environmental degradation policy responses are needed from the earliest stages of economic development. Thus, alternative socio-economic factors that would induce increased demand for environmental regulations should be given incentives along with measures to spur economic growth

These cards will also speak to the core warrants of most "growth solves environment" claims, even if they do not directly mention EKC. Of course, however, you should always read and consider your opponents' particular evidence in order to ensure your answers are responsive.



I'll leave you with a piece of **evidence** from an Indian science and environment leader, who engages in direct comparison and concludes that India must prioritize environmental protections, and that this is key to continued economic health:

(Sunita Narain, Director of the Centre for Science and Environment and the Society for Environmental Communications, "India's dilemma - Economics vs. environment", Open Knowledge, January 29, 2010, <http://knowledge.allianz.com/environment/pollution/?88/indias-dilemma-economics-vs-environment>)

Allianz Knowledge: Many governments seem torn between economic development and environmental protection. What is more important?

Sunita Narain: I don't think we need to make that choice. I think we can have economic growth with environmental protection, but if we do not have environmental protection, we will not have long-term economic growth.

The more the environment degrades, the more people suffer, because people live off their environments, and when they do not have the basic needs like water and firewood, they get poorer.

But I think the bigger connection is wealth and environmental degradation, because so far, we have found only one way of becoming wealthy, and that is by degrading the environment. Once we start understanding that we can have growth and protection, then we can make sure that we don't blow up our planet.

Despite the crisis, India kept on growing. Can this happen a climate-friendly way?

I think that it is possible for us to find a different way, and for the first time, because of the economic crisis, my own government is realizing that other countries don't have the answers, and that maybe we can think differently.

India is not so badly affected by the economic crisis, because in some senses, we have tried out a different way of growth. We have depended more on agriculture, we have built resilience in local communities, and we are not too export-oriented.

The Indian government and our policymakers have the chance to invent a new model of economic growth that builds the well-being of large numbers of people, not the wealth of some.



A model where we will not first destroy the environment and then invest in cleaning it up. If we can do this, then we will actually leapfrog to new, cleaner technologies.

The possibilities are enormous. The question is will India do things differently. And that is the big question for the entire world, because everyone is talking about it. And still the actions don't match what needs to be done. We have to do something, but we don't seem to get our act together.

What is the most important environmental challenge in India?

To my mind, it is the issue of water. We will have a massive water crisis all over the world, but particularly in a country like India. And climate change makes it even worse, because we get a change in the monsoon patterns. The monsoon is India's true finance minister; so much of our wealth and economy depends on the rain it delivers.

It is going to be very hard if we don't make sure that every community has a tank and a pond to capture the rainfall, and that every city does not waste water and pollute its rivers.

Do you already see impacts of climate change in India?

Definitely in our part of the world, we can see the effects of climate change. The monsoon patterns are changing and we are seeing more extreme weather events.

That is making people's ability to cope very difficult, because if you cannot predict your rainfall, how do you plant your crops? How do you know when to harvest? How do you know what your options are? That is a very tough thing for people who are so dependent on nature.

So yes, in our parts of the world, we can see it. In other parts of the world, you might not be able to see it today. The question is should we really wait for the catastrophe before we do something?

You should now be ready to begin work on your con case for the April topic.

As always, remember: this guide is only an introduction to the resolution. There are numerous strategic options that aren't covered here. You are encouraged to pursue your own research and get creative!



So, go write an awesome case, and win all of your con debates! Don't forget that you can always email completed cases to Rachel.Stevens@NCPA.org for a free case critique. Don't forget to also join the discussion in the comments below, and keep checking back for more Debate Central postings about this month's PF topic. Good luck!