



LD March/April 2015 Analysis

The March/April LD topic is “**Resolved: Just governments ought to ensure food security for their citizens.**” Today, we’re going to discuss the basics of building a solid case, so you can make the most of those all-important March/April debates.

We’ll start out with an investigation of some key terms.

First, most experienced LDers (and anyone who debated the previous topic) will be familiar with the term “**just governments.**” It is important to note that the resolution uses the plural form, and that cases should not just focus on one government, such as the USFG, but should rather encompass as many examples as possible. Your value and criterion should be set up to introduce your idea of what just governments would ideally look like, and it is especially important that you choose a definition of justice that supports your framework, as well as the arguments you make throughout the case.



“Ought,” obviously means something like “should,” but in LD debate ought carries a more philosophical/moral weight. Because “ought” is such a common word in LD resolutions, I will not spend time on it here. If you are new to debate and need help with “ought,” rest assured that there are a huge number of analyses on the topic easily available online with a quick search. Please also feel free to email Debate Central directly with any questions.

The word **“ensure”** conveys that affirmatives must defend an enforceable legal provision that just governments would implement. Because of this term, it will probably not be sufficient for an affirmative to simply cite the benefits of food security without delving into the inner workings of food security legislation. Of course, some affirmatives will choose to contest this! If you write your aff case to ignore feasibility/implementation, make sure you have some very good reasons why that is justified.

“Food security” is a key phrase in this resolution. The World Food Summit of 1996 provides clarity on this term, stating:



(World Food Summit: Plan of Action. Rome Declaration on World Food Security; Rome Italy, <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/w3613e/w3613e00.HTM>, 1996)

“Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. In this regard, concerted action at all levels is required. Each nation must adopt a strategy consistent with its resources and capacities to achieve its individual goals and, at the same time, cooperate regionally and internationally in order to organize collective solutions to global issues of food security. In a world of increasingly interlinked institutions, societies and economies, coordinated efforts and shared responsibilities are essential.”

The [2009 World Food Summit](#) further specified its definition of food security within “four pillars”: availability, access, utilization, and stability.



Much like the living wage resolution, this resolution will center on the best/most effective way to reduce or eliminate the effects of extreme poverty, especially malnutrition. As the affirmative, you would be well advised to prepare to defend all four pillars of food security as laid out in the 2009 World Food Summit, linked to above.

“Citizens” could potentially be the most important term in this resolution. Obviously, this limits the actions of just governments within their political borders, to legal citizens only-- e.g. not guest workers, permanent residents, etc. You may want to review the difference between citizenship and other types of residency within a nation, if you are not sure.

However, despite the resolution’s limiting affs to citizens only, malnutrition and poverty exist as global issues. The above definition of food security given by the World Food Summit would seem to echo the sentiment that food security is responsibility that extends beyond a government’s political borders. Some negatives may choose to employ this as a strategy, and point out that just governments ought to think about human rights above and beyond their own citizens. However, keep in mind that a tricky affirmative may use a sort of permutation strategy, pointing out that, if the neg wins that food security should be



guaranteed to all human beings, the category of “everyone” would certainly include a government’s own citizens, as well as everyone else. Thus, the negative’s strategy *includes* the affirmative’s advocacy, and therefore is not a reason to vote neg.

The general idea behind government implemented food security is that no person should go without stable access to nutritious food. There are a few different approaches a government can take when implementing food security legislation. The first is to actually distribute subsidized food, which is the current proposal in India. The second is for the government to implement subsidies (such as food stamps) in order to give people the means to acquire food. Some negatives might argue that the second method doesn’t actually constitute “food security” because it only involves giving people money, as opposed to giving people food. There are also a number of other possible actions for you to explore, but those two will tend to be the most common.

Now that we understand what the resolution is about, let’s move on to **strategic considerations**.



There will be two core areas of clash on this topic. The first is whether or not food security legislation is effective at mitigating social harms, such as poverty and malnutrition.

Similarly, do the negative consequences of these laws outweigh the benefits? If the negative is able to prove that food security legislation does not improve conditions, then it will be hard for the affirmative to win that just governments ought to require them. On this topic, the negative is strongly advised to at least include one contention on efficacy/solvency, for reasons that will be discussed below.

This brings us to the second core area of clash for the topic: whether or not it is just for governments to introduce legislation that would ensure food security. In other words, while it may be moral and just for me to give money to charity to feed others, it may not be moral and just for the government to take my money and use it to feed others, drawing on arguments made by several libertarian philosophers. However, this strategy will not be quite as easy for negatives to win on this topic, compared to the last one. While the literature base for whether or not it is just to intervene in private business (employer/employee) relations is very robust, fewer options exist when arguing that government intervention is more unjust than allowing people to starve. However, when combined with some arguments about feasibility, possibly along with offering an



alternative, nongovernmental solution to food insecurity, this strategy becomes much easier to win.

Theoretically, the negative should be able to win the debate by winning either of these issues: if food security legislation causes more harms than benefits, the judge most likely votes negative. If food security legislation does have benefits, but is in some way inherently unjust (or would not be mandated by a just government), the judge still votes negative.

The affirmative, then, will need to be prepared to win both of these levels of debate.

We will begin with the first area of clash: is food security legislation effective? Do the material benefits of these types of laws outweigh the harms?

One argument surrounding food security legislation concerns access. If a government were to enact a law to ensure food security, how could we be sure it actually enabled people to obtain healthy and nutritious food?



The affirmative will want to argue that food security legislation is effective at mitigating hunger. Here is some **evidence**:

(Dr Luca Alinovi is the Food and Agricultural Organisation representative in Kenya, interviewed by Agatha Ngotho, “Kenya: Regional Integration Key to Kenya's Food Security”, <http://allafrica.com/stories/201503092599.html>)

Currently, statistics show that the number of undernourished people in the world is falling by an average of six million per year, which is well below the yearly target of 22 million necessary to achieve the World Food Summit goal.

However, 63 countries, mostly from the developing world, have reached the hunger target in the first Millennium Development Goal. Sustained political commitment at the highest level, with food security and nutrition as top priorities, is a prerequisite for hunger eradication. Good news in Africa is that eradication of hunger is a top priority of the African Union, evidenced by African Heads of State committing to end hunger on the continent by 2025 in July 2014 at the African Union summit in Malabo, Equatorial Guinea.

In Kenya and East Africa, we must continue working with the governments to ensure the right to food for all. We highly appreciate the political commitment towards ensuring appropriate food security policies, programmes and laws at country level are developed and adopted. In addition, we need to engage better with the private sector, improve access to agricultural inputs, land, services, technologies, markets and promote investment in agriculture towards increasing the agricultural productivity in Kenya. Last but not least, we need to continue promoting rural development and



nutrition programmes for the most vulnerable, especially to address micronutrient deficiencies in mothers and children under five.

This card is generic, but if you are planning to advocate some specific course of action, you should make sure you have evidence saying that specific plan works.

Here's another interesting aff argument-- **evidence** suggesting that empowering women is the key to food security:

*(UN News Center, Women farmers pillar of food security – UN agencies,
<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=50261#.VP-URIF4pVV>)*

Ahead of International Women's Day, United Nations food relief agencies gathered to remind the world that women farmers play a central role in achieving food and nutrition security, urging countries to step up efforts to empower rural women who too often do "backbreaking work" to harvest food.



“Women are the backbone of rural societies as they grow and process food and make sure their families are well-fed and well-nourished,” said International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) President Kanayo Nwanze in his opening remarks at an event in Rome, where the UN food-related agencies are headquartered.

“Rural women need more opportunities to participate, improve their skills, gain access to assets, and be involved in agricultural production and marketing. Let us all work together to empower women to achieve food and nutrition security. For their sake and the sake of their families and communities,” he added.

Joining the IFAD President were leaders from the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the UN World Food Programme (WFP) to share their approaches to empowering rural women, promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment in an effort to reduce rural poverty.

This year’s International Women’s Day – celebrated around the world 8 March – also marks the 20th anniversary of the landmark Beijing Platform for Action. However, despite that historic agreement by 189 governments, no country in the world has yet achieved gender equality.

The food agencies highlighted the “feminization of agriculture,” a new trend sparked by the migration of men in developing countries to urban centres. Approximately half of the agricultural workforce worldwide is now made up of women.



WFP's Purchase for Progress (P4P) initiative has in five years tripled women's participation in P4P-supported farmers' organizations in 20 countries, impacting some 300,000 women.

"By purchasing crops traditionally cultivated by women, such as beans and soya, WFP demonstrated the key role rural women play as we work together to achieve a world with zero hunger," Ertharin Cousin, WFP's Executive Director, said.

"While acknowledging the success of this programme we must scale up the lessons learned to ensure greater opportunities for more women."

Food security overall would improve significantly if women were empowered with the same opportunities that men have, but it is a complex problem that needs a comprehensive approach, stressed FAO's Marcela Villarreal.

"While significant progress has been made in improving the lives of women since the Beijing conference, we're concerned that rural women are lagging behind in every development indicator – both behind rural men and urban women."

Women's rights will be a good option for the affirmative to explore on this topic, because there is ample evidence suggesting women are more affected by food insecurity than men and that women's participation in the marketplace (especially agriculture) is necessary to



advance food security. This also provides the aff with another area beyond malnutrition to develop impacts.

Of course, the neg will want to argue that food security legislation is impossible. There are a number of warrants you could use to support this claim. First, the nations with the most food insecurity are, unsurprisingly, the poorest. Their governments are therefore the least able to implement a costly and complicated law such as guaranteed food security. This is a clear, intuitive argument—but you should still cut some cards on it. It would be great to have some hard data on how much various plans will cost in order to achieve food security. Because there are numerous possible plans, providing those cards is beyond the scope of this guide, but you should have no trouble finding them. Food security is a very thoroughly-studied global problem.

Another similar argument is that, if these nations are able to make progress on food security, they almost always do so at least partly due to support from a nongovernmental organization (NGO), such as a charity or international nonprofit group. The negative can claim that these actors are negative ground (because they are not governments), so the aff can't win by defending any sort of action that involves NGOs. This could be a theory argument or a substantive solvency argument—dealer's choice.



If you want your neg case to focus on feasibility, you might also consider citing Kant’s argument that “ought implies can.” This is an intuitive point—basically, it is impossible to say anyone has a duty to do something (“ought”) if it is truly physically impossible for them to do it. Logically, you cannot be required to do something that you cannot do. Thus, if the neg wins that the aff has implementation problems, then they have effectively destroyed the “ought” part of the resolution.

Another option for the neg is an argument about the connection between meat consumption and food insecurity. The strategic utility here is that the aff may not be able to actually prevent food insecurity without substantially reducing global meat consumption. Since the aff is restrained from being able to do anything globally, this might be a useful generic for the neg to explore. Here is some **evidence**:

*(Xavier Mayes, Phys.org, “Hunger for meat pushing food security to the edge”,
<http://phys.org/news/2015-03-hunger-meat-food-edge.html>)*

Promoting more sustainable plant-based foods and reducing demand for meat and dairy products will be essential to feed billions of people and avoid serious and ongoing global food security impacts, warn experts from UTS’s Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) in a new book launched this week.



Meat-heavy diets are a key driver of phosphorus use, one of the world's key agricultural nutrients. Research by Professor Stuart White and Dr Dana Cordell shows that phosphorus mined from non-renewable phosphate rock will become increasingly scarce this century with very few producing countries controlling the market, leading to volatile food prices.

"We have become highly dependent on rock phosphate for food production," Professor White said. "The 2008 food riots were partly due to an 800 per cent spike in the price of phosphorus. With meat consumption predicted to double in just fifty years, the demands of meat-heavy diets will threaten food security more regularly."

Professor White said the good news was that doing something about our diets is straightforward and has many co-benefits. "The US's top nutritional panel has recognised this, announcing last week that people should eat less meat and that the country's dietary guidelines should align environmental as well as public health goals," he said.

"A shift to more sustainable plant-based foods will require fewer resources such as phosphorus, while benefiting human health and the wellbeing of animals used as livestock."

In *Meat the Future: How Cutting Meat Consumption Can Feed Billions More*, publisher Nicolaas G. Pierson Foundation asked leading scientists and researchers to investigate the environmental issues linked to meat consumption, and to explore new developments in meat alternatives and plant-based diets.



"The environmental impacts of meat have been known in the scientific literature for a long time, but the issue has disappeared from public debate. For example there's a serious blind spot in linking diets and climate change," Professor White said.

ISF research in 2014 by Judith Friedlander showed this issue is mentioned in just one per cent of Australian newspaper coverage of climate change, despite estimates that livestock-related activities make up between 14.5 per cent and 51 per cent of all human-caused emissions.

Finally, a negative could argue that one government cannot promote its own food security without disrupting the food security of other nations, due to globalized international trade.

Here's **evidence**:

(GRACE communications foundation [nonprofit focused on sharing information about environmental and public health issues], Sustainable Table project, "Food security & food access," <http://www.sustainabletable.org/280/food-security-food-access>, 2014)

Various political-agricultural practices contribute to food insecurity worldwide. These include substituting commodity crops for food crops (e.g., growing corn instead of vegetables) and heavy exportation of food crops at the expense of food security of the exporting country. In addition, the recent demand for



biofuels, currently produced primarily from corn and soy, has further decreased the amount of viable arable land being used for food production.

The United States overproduces commodity crops (particularly corn, wheat, and soy) in part due to government subsidization; healthful food and sustainable agriculture has not been historically promoted in US food and farming policy. The FAO's definition of food security includes a provision describing access to "nutritious" food; however, in many low-income areas, it is easier to access cheap, unhealthful food (such as fast food), often produced primarily from commodity crops. In addition, the US exports a high proportion of its commodity crops to the rest of the world. For example, in 2010, over 53 percent of all corn exports in the world were from the US. The exportation of these commodity crops affects farmers in the rest of the world – especially small farmers with limited resources. A large influx of commodity crops from the US can affect local food security, as small farmers cannot compete with less expensive (subsidized) US-produced agricultural products

The above card gives the example of how US agricultural subsidies cause food insecurity elsewhere. As food security grows, eventually there is an excess of the product, and that product gets exported. Often, and especially if the crop is subsidized, the exports are able to be sold for a low price that local farmers cannot match, which drives them out of business. As farmers stop farming, food insecurity gets worse. This will be especially useful against affs that deal with agricultural subsidies, but you could also apply the general principle to



other sorts of affs. Our economy is globalized. Any time a government interferes with markets in a dramatic way such as this, there are bound to be ripples throughout the globe.

That argument offers a nice transition into our next category of arguments....

Beyond the question of feasibility, there is also a debate to be had about actors—should governments truly be responsible for their citizens' food security? Clearly, the aff is restrained to saying "yes." The justification for this will come from your value/criterion, as well as the impacts you claim from poverty, famine, etc. The negative, however, may choose to advance the argument that solving food insecurity is best left to the **private sector** (e.g. charities, individual philanthropy, private trade, etc.)



Here is some **evidence**:

(Nibal Zgheib, The Financial, "The EBRD Private Sector for Food Security Initiative: it's all about quality, <http://finchannel.com/index.php/business/item/41002-the-ebrd-private-sector-for-food-security-initiative-it-s-all-about-quality>)

The FINANCIAL -- The EBRD's Private Sector for Food Security Initiative continues to support the agribusiness sector, championing the role of private companies in boosting food production, improving food quality and setting incentives to create the right policy environment for sector-wide growth. The Initiative fosters private sector involvement in food security with the view that food production is first and foremost a private sector activity.

As outlined in the 2014 Annual Report, last year the EBRD mobilised €5.3 million for technical assistance in the agribusiness sector in 21 countries. The Initiative aims to unlock the region's vast potential in food production focusing not only on producing more food, but also better food. The Initiative complemented the Bank's agribusiness investments, which were kept high at €860 million in over 56 projects.



Launched in 2011, the Private Sector for Food Security Initiative initially focused on enhancing productivity and providing more access to finance for primary agriculture. In recent years, improving food quality and safety standards has emerged as a pressing issue for producers in the region, as well as assisting companies to invest in new technologies, storage and logistics, to increase efficiency and reduce losses, according to EBRD.

The 2014 Annual Report highlights achievements in keeping with the Initiative's main priorities:

Upgrading food quality standards and animal welfare practices

Producing high-quality food means higher proceeds, but also more investment. Building on their success in Croatia, the EBRD and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) are working in Montenegro and Serbia to develop food quality labels for traditional food products in competitive markets.

The EBRD also supports agribusiness companies to move towards improved food safety, quality and animal welfare standards to tap into advanced markets as per the recommendations of the EastAgri meeting "Best Food: How to produce both quality and quantity in Europe and Central Asia", organised in June 2014 with the FAO and supported by the World Bank.

Improving policy transparency through public-private platforms

Together with the FAO, the EBRD facilitates public-private platforms to improve policy transparency and predictability, thus increasing investor confidence in the agribusiness sector. In 2014 they supported a dairy working group in Ukraine that



collaborated with the government on a law amendment to set controls for disease prevention and food safety which came into effect in record time.

Linking exporters and importers to enhance global supply chains

The Initiative focuses on linking exporters from the transition region with importers from the southern and eastern Mediterranean (SEMED) region and new markets. Facilitating this connection increases investments in the agribusiness sector and boosts production and trade predictability in food-exporting countries, while improving import efficiency and minimising losses in food-importing countries.

Responding to price volatility through improved access to finance

Access to credit is a constant and cyclical challenge for agricultural producers around the world, which has a strong impact on the growth of small and medium-sized enterprises. The EBRD is helping countries to implement pre- and post-harvest credit solutions.

Advice for Agribusiness

The EBRD expanded its advisory support for local agribusiness companies to 15 countries in 2014. Experienced industry advisers helped companies improve their efficiency and grow to become catalysts of their economy.

In 2015 the EBRD and the FAO will intensify their efforts through new partnerships with high-level regional actors. Together with the Union for the Mediterranean, the EBRD and the FAO will engage further on enhancing food security in SEMED, specifying priorities at the upcoming “Private sector forum on food security in the southern and eastern Mediterranean region” on 5-6 May in Barcelona.



More **evidence**:

(Jennifer Gerholdt serves as U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation Corporate Citizenship Center Director of Environmental Initiatives. In this role she she works with businesses to maximize their positive impact addressing environmental issues including energy and water use, managing waste, and food security, DevEx Impact, "How the private sector is tackling the global food security challenge, <https://www.devex.com/news/how-the-private-sector-is-tackling-the-global-food-security-challenge-84042>)

Food security is an urgent global issue. The reasons behind food insecurity are numerous, complex and multifaceted. Persistent poverty and undernourishment, combined with political and socio-economic challenges, are the major underpinnings of food insecurity globally. Other major contributing factors include production shortfalls, agricultural impact on the environment, global climate change, water scarcity, natural disasters, rapid population growth, changing consumption trends and price volatility. All these and other challenges only heighten the concern for the future of food access and security over the coming decades.

The good news is many leading companies are on the forefront of helping solve the global food security crisis. In 2008, for example, General Mills launched Partners in



Food Solutions, a consortium of leading global food companies, including Royal DSM and Cargill, and in partnership with TechnoServe and the U.S. Agency for International Development. The consortium aims to help strengthen the capacity of hundreds of food companies in several African nations — including Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania and Zambia — impacting 550,000 small-holder farmers. It encourages other companies with additional capabilities to join to broaden its reach to continue to improve the food value chain in Africa.

Additionally, six coffee industry leaders — Starbucks, Keurig Green Mountain, S&D Coffee, Farmer Brothers, Counter Culture Coffee and Sustainable Harvest Coffee Importers — have launched the Coffee Lands Food Security Coalition, which aims to combat seasonal hunger among coffee-farming families in coffee-producing regions. A three-year program, “Empowering Food Secure Communities,” was established in partnership with the global humanitarian organization Mercy Corps and Nicaraguan organization Asociación “Aldea Global” Jinotega. The program targets 150 women and their families to improve business and farming techniques to support food security and improve livelihoods in coffee-growing communities.

In 2010, Wal-Mart and the Wal-Mart Foundation launched “Fighting Hunger Together,” a \$2 billion cash and in-kind commitment through 2015 to combat hunger in the U.S., in partnership with hunger relief organizations and food banks. Goals include donating more than 1.1 billion pounds of food valued at \$1.75 billion, award \$250 million in grants to hunger relief



organizations, mobilize Wal-Mart customers and employees to contribute their time and expertise to fight hunger, and partner with other companies, foundations, government and food manufacturers. In addition, Wal-Mart is collaborating with USAID through the government's Feed the Future initiative, which aims to support rural small-holder farmers in Central America, connect them to Wal-Mart's international and regional supply chains, and improve nutrition for customers through greater access to more diverse local produce.

Part of the Feed the Future initiative, the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition is a broader collaborative effort that brings together the private sector, donors and the investment community to drive sustainable agriculture in Africa and lift 50 million people out of poverty by 2022.

In 2012, Dupont set food security goals for 2020, including committing \$10 billion to R&D and introducing 4,000 new products focused on producing more food, reducing waste, bolstering food availability and shelf life, and enhancing food and agriculture sustainability; educating 2 million youth; and improve the livelihoods of at least 3 million farmers and their communities. DuPont also launched the Global Food Security Index, developed by the Economist Intelligence Unit, a comprehensive tool to measure the drivers of food security — affordability, availability, quality and safety — in more than 100 countries.

Clearly, there are numerous fantastic examples of initiatives that are helping to move the needle on critical food security issues. The focus now more than ever needs to be on accelerating collaborative approaches among business and with other key stakeholders, including governments and local communities, to scale the most viable solutions to get farther faster. With dwindling natural resources, land degradation, drought and a whole host of other challenges we are facing, there's no time to lose.



One key thing to take away from the first card is that the private sector (specifically the EBRD) fulfills two of the four pillars of food security quite well: utilization and stability. The negative could argue that any public or government based action could not solve for these two pillars nearly as well. Another aspect to note is that this second card highlights an instance of a private sector program that works to empower women – a potentially deadly turn for any affirmative case that argues feminism is the key to food security.

Even more **evidence** on this point:

(Global Harvest Initiative, Enhanced Private Sector Involvement Key To Global Food Security, <http://www.globalharvestinitiative.org/index.php/2012/05/enhanced-private-sector-involvement-key-to-global-food-security/>)

The critical role of the private sector in global efforts to address food security and agricultural development is one of many topics that will be addressed at today's Chicago Council on Global Affairs' Third Annual Symposium on Global Agriculture and Food Security, held in Washington D.C.

The event commences in company with this year's G8 Summit, and brings a renewed focus on food security and agricultural development; the G8 countries as well as global agricultural leaders are expected to focus their efforts on initiatives to attract private sector resources to support



agricultural growth in developing countries worldwide. Investments in agriculture are proven to have significant returns. Feed the Future, the U.S. Government's global hunger and food security initiative, notes that agricultural growth is at least twice as effective in reducing poverty than growth in other sectors, and can spur long-term economic growth.

The agriculture sectors in developing countries have generally experienced severe underinvestment, and in a 2011 report, Global Food and Agriculture Productivity Review: The Investment Challenge, the Global Harvest Initiative (GHI) found that this investment gap approaches \$90 billion annually.

The private sector is uniquely able to help create economic growth to raise global incomes and feed a growing global population estimated to reach 9 billion by 2050.

Given the massive agriculture investment gap, neither the public nor private sector can meet these challenges alone. An unprecedented level of collaboration among public and private sector partnerships will be required to develop new initiatives necessary to transform agricultural production and meet future food demands.

For this reason, GHI is actively engaged in dialogue with Feed the Future and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, among others operating in the food security and agricultural development space, with the goal of identifying opportunities to further leverage the resources and expertise of the private sector. In a recent report, The



Chicago Council on Global Affairs noted the impact that both Feed the Future and Millennium Challenge Corporation have made through global food security initiatives.

By engaging the private sector, committing to sustained agricultural investments, leveraging private-public partnerships and focusing on long-term productivity solutions, agriculture can make important strides in improving food security in developing countries around the world.

It may be strategic to pair these cards with a Kantian framework, specifically the categorical imperative. Affirmative cases, per the resolution, will focus only on providing food security for a government's citizens, while the private sector argument involves a global level of involvement. This pairs nicely with the universality contingent within the categorical imperative and the reality of domestic and global food security initiatives. While affirmative actions will necessarily be segmented and restricted only to certain people, a private sector response would be diffuse, multifaceted, and global. When paired with a Kantian framework, this should be a solid negative strategy. This also helps to resolve the



permutation argument discussed above—the element of competition is established through “government” rather than “citizens.”

Alternatively, you may want to use a libertarian-type value/criterion structure, in which you argue that it is unjust for the government to take from some to give to others. Obviously, any food security policy would need to be funded through some form of taxation. Within this framework, you can argue that private sector action solves food security without compromising individual liberty, which offers another place to generate some impacts.

Whatever negative framework you choose, it is recommended that you include an observation that the aff must defend government implementation (not just the theoretical desirability of people having enough food), and then make at least one or two arguments about why this sort of legislation is not feasible or could not solve the aff’s impacts. This is useful for preempting any aff trickery in the rebuttals, and checks back against “famine outweighs [neg impacts]” arguments.

There is also a debate to be had about the **effects of food insecurity**. Is food security an issue that poses a great threat to nations?



The affirmative can argue that food security initiatives are integral to maintaining a peaceful citizenship and avoiding conflicts. Here is some **evidence** on that point:

*(The Guardian view on food security: if the dreamers lose, we face a nightmare,
<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/mar/01/guardian-view-food-security-dreamers-lose-face-nightmare>)*

By the time nations once again get round a table in Paris in December to discuss climate change, hunger should be on the menu. Researchers have just warned that a new and aggressive strain of yellow rust fungus is now a threat to Britain's wheat harvest. Another team has calculated that average yields of wheat per field, which only two decades ago were rising rapidly, are now down 2.5%, and barley by 3.8%. In each case, the scientists identify climate change as a contributing factor. Global warming has barely begun but climate scientists have been warning about the consequences for food security for 30 years.

The two latest bits of research into wheat yields are not isolated indicators of tomorrow's troubles. The big heat has yet to arrive. It will be catastrophic. Another group has studied the consequences for harvests of extremes of heat and calculated that for each 1C notch in the



thermometer, global wheat yields could fall by 6%. Some latitudes will benefit, but overall, world harvests could fall. This is very bad news: wheat is one of the world's staples, and the world's largest source of vegetable protein. There are other factors at play in the

fields. Within a decade, 2.9 billion people in 48 nations will experience chronic water scarcity, another research team warns.

Agriculture consumes 70% of the world water supplies and action is needed "to pre-empt looming conflicts born of desperation". Separately, US geologists have used historical analyses to work out what modern agriculture does to topsoil.

When European settlers took the plough to the American heartlands, erosion accelerated one hundred-fold. At peak, an inch of soil was lost every 25 years. Before the Europeans, wind and water erosion took 2,500 years to remove the same thin layer.

Because of erosion, overgrazing and drought, the planet's farmland is being degraded at a catastrophic rate. An

estimated 10m hectares are now abandoned each year; something the size of a family farm every minute. And as the food supply is threatened, demand will accelerate. There will be many more hungry people at the table.

In the last year, researchers re-examined UN population projections and decided that the global numbers may not peak at 9 billion. By 2100, the world could be home to 12 billion and still rising. By 2100, according to business-as-usual climate projections, temperatures will have risen by 4C and sea levels by a metre or so. So land that is ever less productive will be expected to deliver vastly more food at ever greater cost in fossil fuel energy to feed increasingly conflict-torn nation states.



Solutions exist but none are easy. All will require a generous adjustment between the haves and the have-nots and sustained global cooperation. That sounds like a dream, but the alternative is a nightmare. The enduring lesson of history is that drought and famine feed conflict, and conflict breeds more privation, and despair.

Come December, each aspect of the climate challenge will have become more pressing, and more complex. Everything should be on the table in Paris except perhaps, symbolically, lunch.

When making this kind of argument—or really any kind of argument--- make sure you complete the argument by developing a clear impact. Why is [peace, economic growth, whatever] so important that we should consider it prior to other concerns? Explain the reasons clearly to your judge, and you will be in great shape.

The good news for the aff is that it's possible to link decreasing hunger to any number of large impacts: economic growth, technological progress, individual rights, democracy, and more. These are easy to locate with a simple search, but (if you have access) you could also sort through some old policy files on the subject.



The bad news for the neg is that it is nearly impossible to successfully argue that food security doesn't matter. However, it may be possible to hedge back against some of the specific impacts affs claim. For example, you may want to argue that food insecurity does not cause conflict. Here is some **evidence** arguing that resource wars are extremely unlikely:

David G. Victor, professor of law at Stanford Law School and the director of the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, "What Resource Wars?" November 12 2007)

RISING ENERGY prices and mounting concerns about environmental depletion have animated fears that the world may be headed for a spate of "resource wars"—hot conflicts triggered by a struggle to grab valuable resources. Such fears come in many stripes, but the threat industry has sounded the alarm bells especially loudly in three areas. First is the rise of China, which is poorly endowed with many of the resources it needs—such as oil, gas, timber and most minerals—and has already “gone out” to the world with the goal of securing what it wants. Violent conflicts may follow as the country shunts others aside. A second potential path down the road to resource wars starts with all the money now flowing into poorly governed but resource-rich countries. Money can fund civil wars and other hostilities, even leaking into the hands of terrorists. And third is global climate change, which could multiply stresses on natural resources and trigger water wars, catalyze the spread of disease or bring about mass migrations. Most of this is bunk, and nearly all of it has focused on the wrong lessons for policy. Classic resource wars are good material for Hollywood screenwriters. They rarely occur in the real world. To be sure, resource money can magnify and prolong some conflicts, but the root causes of those hostilities usually lie elsewhere. Fixing them requires focusing on the underlying institutions



that govern how resources are used and largely determine whether stress explodes into violence. When conflicts do arise, the weak link isn't a dearth in resources but a dearth in governance.

Negs should also plan to generate some impact defense by winning that the aff can't solve. Then, when it is time to weigh impacts, you can say that it doesn't matter if food security is a huge problem, because the aff cannot solve it anyway.

As you can see, while the negative may not be as intuitive for this resolution, there are still a wide variety of arguments to be made. Likewise, on the affirmative, there are many types of food security legislation and initiatives that you can choose to defend. We have not covered various specific proposals here in the interest of space, but a simple search will turn up loads of options.

That concludes our introduction to the March/April LD debate topic. However, this guide is only meant as a starting point, not a comprehensive account of all possible arguments. You should continue your own research and pursue the arguments you find most interesting.



Don't forget that you can always submit completed cases to rachel.stevens@ncpa.org for a confidential, personalized critique. You may also contact me with any questions you may have about this guide, the topic, or debate in general.

Good luck!