# Octas 1NC

## BRICs T

### Shell

1. The actor of the aff must include at least one of the BRIC countries, that is, it must include Brazil, Russia, India, and/or China.
2. His/her plan text is only about Ecuador and Peru
3. Predictable limits
1. The term “developing countries” can refer to 168 countries. It would be impossible to predict which one the aff would choose in any given round, making every round essentially unpredictable. The BRIC countries are the largest developing countries, meaning they are the most predictable limits possible. Predictable limits are key to fairness as they are key to having any clash and any chance of offense. And, if you make a counter interp that makes a limit, there must be a non-arbitrary reason to prefer it, any arbitrary distinctions are inherently unpredictable.

2. The BRIC nations are the topic. The Economist 4/10
The Economist. “The BRICS: The Trillion Dollar Club.” April 15, 2010. http://www.economist.com/node/15912964

The BRICs matter because of their economic weight. They are the four largest

AND

reserves, they could create a fund the size of the IMF.

#### The Economist isolates 3 unique warrants the BRIC nations are the most topical

1. Their economic weight. There are two dimensions
	1. They are the only developing nations with GDPs of a trillion or more dollars, which not only gives them a non-arbitrary reason to prefer them, but also shows that they are the developing nations that will have the most global impact.
	2. Prevented global economy from going into a worse recession in 2008 by growing throughout the financial crisis, which serves as proof that they have an impact.

Economic weight is important because countries that don’t affect anything aren’t going to be talked about in the lit

1. Global carbon emissions. No other developing nation comes close to emitting the amount of carbon and other pollutants into the environment as the BRIC nations. Pollution is key topic lit about environmental protection as it’s the most common thing talked about. This topic should include carbon emissions
2. They have reserves that allow them to currently invest in other nations, meaning you need the BRICs because they are key to other developing nations’ ability to extract resources because they provide the funds and capital to allow production to happen. Even if you have reasons why other nations are good, that doesn’t mean the BRICs are bad, so my interp is always comparatively better. Empirically proven, China gets oil from multiple nations in Africa.

Further prefer my interp since:

1. Climate change and other environmental issues are global issues that affect multiple nations, so it doesn’t make sense to talk about nations that don’t actually have a global impact. No other developing country comes close to the global impact that each BRIC nation has. This also functions as a litmus test for fairness because it decides whether different divisions of ground are legitimate.
2. No other developing nation is grouped in such a way in foreign policy lingo, so the topic lit with BRICs is more expansive, in depth, and equally divided than with other developing nations. To have a debate about the other 164 countries would be worse because

And, topic lit is key to fairness

1. Quality of ground – args with lots of topic lit about them are better and better warranted because qualified people talk about it.
2. Quantity of ground – there is more ground if it’s grounded in the lit since lots of people talk about them.
3. Predictability – args grounded in the topic lit are more common, meaning they are easier to predict.
4. Clash – if both sides talk about stuff in the lit, there is more and better clash since people are discussing better warranted and more in depth things.

Finally, since the aff advocacy isn’t about BRIC, the topic lit available is comparatively worse which is a reason that the aff is unfair because few people talk about it.

1. Fairness
Drop debater on T since there would be no aff advocacy. You can’t vote aff if their advocacy goes away since they don’t defend anything.

## Case—Biodiversity

#### 1. No Brink - The majority of the rainforest is gone, but we haven’t gone extinct. IATP 08

Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy. “Biofuel and Global Biodiversity.” April, 2008. http://www.iatp.org/files/258\_2\_102584\_0.pdf

As in Malaysia and Indonesia, deforestation—and its impact on biodiversity—has

AND

soybean for biofuel likely will accelerate the loss of biodiversity in this region.

Also if you wanna talk about rainforests, talk about Brazil.

#### 2. Species loss is inevitable: s/he can’t solve all causes

New Straits Times 01 (Malaysia), February 4, 2001

Yule rates the loss of biodiversity as the number one environmental crisis. "The

AND

river and air pollution, destruction of rainforests and even over population."

#### 3. Turn, species loss is key to long-term evolutionary change

BOULTER 2002

(Michael, professor of paleobiology at the University of East London, Extinction: Evolution and the End of Man, p. 170)

The same trend of long-drawn-out survival of the final relicts has

AND

that it brings forward the extinctions of a whole selection of vulnerable organisms.

#### This prevents total extinction of life on earth

BOULTER 2002

(Michael, professor of paleobiology at the University of East London, Extinction: Evolution and the End of Man, p. 67)

If biological evolution really is a self-organised Earth-life system there are

AND

to a stop. Extinctions are necessary to retain life on this planet.

#### 4. Humans will survive—we can isolate ourselves from the environment

POWERS 2002

(Lawrence, Professor of Natural Sciences, Oregon Institute of Technology, The Chronicle of Higher Education, August 9)

Mass extinctions appear to result from major climatic changes or catastrophes, such as asteroid

AND

Boulter mourns we will no longer behold vanish before our distant descendants' eyes.

This takes out arguments about environmental collapse in general because we can isolate ourselves from it, meaning the deforestation impacts don’t matter.

#### 5. Turn, biodiversity is bad—complex systems are more prone to total failure—simple ones are stable

HEATH 1999

(Jim, Orchids Australia, December, http://www.orchidsaustralia.com/whysave.htm)

Some people say we can’t afford to lose any species, no matter what species

AND

add diversity, and that added diversity makes the biological world more stable.

## Case—Disease

#### 1. The more virulent a disease it is, the less of a concern it is

The Guardian 03 (“Second Sight”, September 25, http://technology.guardian.co.uk/online/story/0,3605,1048929,00.html, KF)

The parallel with the natural world is illustrative. Take the case of everyone's favourite

AND

short an incubation period, so the pool of infected people doesn't grow.

#### 2. No internal link – not all people will be wiped out:

Sowell 01 (Thomas, Fellow @ Hoover Institution, Jewish World Review, “The Dangers of “Equality””, 3-5, http://www.jewishworldreview.com/cols/sowell030501.asp, KF)

People have different vulnerabilities and resistances

AND

leave some people dying like flies while others remain as healthy as horses

And, his impact is empirically denied

1. There have been big diseases in the past like the black plague that didn’t kill everyone
2. The diseases in the squo aren’t spreading to kill everyone

## Dividends CP

#### A: Ecuador and Peru will implement resource dividend transfers to citizens modeled off the African system. Devarajan 11:

“How Africa can extract big benefits for everyone from natural resources.” Posted by Shanta Devarajan and Marcelo Giugale. Wednesday 29 June 2011 05.00 EDT theguardian.com

While Africa's central banks are today better equipped to deal with currency appreciation, and

AND

is not new – Alaska has been doing it since the early 1980s.

#### B: Mutually exclusive since it uses funds acquired from resource extraction, which the aff stops.

#### C: Dividend programs create a stronger domestic economy. Palley 03:

Combating the Natural Resource Curse with Citizen Revenue Distribution Funds: Oil and the Case of Iraq By Thomas I. Palley | December 2003

Beyond these political economy benefits, there are also more standard economic gains from such

AND

Putting extra money into the hands of individuals can help this process.

#### Ecuador Econ on the brink. The Economist

The Economist. “Ecuador on the brink.” http://www.economist.com/node/273356

FOR a relatively small country, Ecuador has been grabbing more than its fair share

AND

oil price. In short, Ecuador is ill-prepared to dollarise.

#### Economic decline causes extinction

Lt. Col, Tom Bearden, PhD Nuclear Engineering, April 25, 2000, [http://www.cheniere.org/correspondence/042500%20-%20modified.htm](http://www.cheniere.org/correspondence/042500%20-%20modified.htm%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)

Just prior to the terrible collapse of the World economy, with the crumbling well

AND

my personal estimate is that we have about a 99% chance of that