# **Beast Boy counterplan**

*[note 1: The way you use this CP is you ask in CX – will you defend dietary choices, such as vegetarianism, as medical choices? If they say no, read T (I’ll also upload that shell), if they say yes, this CP is now mutually exclusive. Chris and I might get to read this CP more often cause we have reps for being shady theory debaters so people will be more likely to comply in CX]*

*[note 2: what the solvency/net benefits are will depend on what the aff is]*

I negate. Intuitions determine our beliefs. **Huemer:**[[1]](#footnote-1)

Other things being equal, **it** i**s reasonable to assume** that **things are the way they appear**. I call this principle 'Phenomenal Conservatism' ('phenomenal' meaning 'pertaining to appearances'). I have discussed the principle elsewhere, so here I will be relatively brief.(1) There is a type of mental state, which I call an 'appearance', that we avow when we say such things as 'It seems to me that p', 'It appears that p', or 'p is obvious', where p is some proposition. Appearances have propositional contents--things they represent to be the case--but they are not beliefs, as can be seen from the intelligibility of, 'The arch seems to be taller than it is wide, but I don't think it is'. Nevertheless, appearances normally lead us to form beliefs. 'Appearance' is a broad category that includes mental states involved in perception, memory, introspection, and intellection. Thus, we can say, 'This line seems longer than that one', 'I seem to recall reading something about that', 'It seems to me that I have a headache', and 'It seems that any two points can be joined by a single straight line'.(2) All of those statements make sense, using the same sense of 'seems'. Appearances can be deceiving, and appearances can conflict with one another, as in the Müller-Lyer illusion: It initially seems that the top line is longer than the bottom line. But if you get out a ruler and measure them, you will find them to be of the same length. The top line will seem, when holding a ruler next to it, to be 2 inches long, and the bottom line will similarly appear to be 2 inches long. So, all things considered, it seems that the two lines are of the same length. As this example illustrates, an initial appearance can be overruled by other appearances (this does not mean the initial appearance goes away, but only that we don't believe it), and only by other appearances. **Some appearances are** stronger than others--as we say, some things are **'more obvious' than others--and this determines** what we hold on to and **what we reject in case of conflict**. Presumably, it more clearly seems to you that the result of measuring the lines is accurate than that the result of eyeballing them is, so you believe the measurement result (this may have to do with background beliefs you have about the reliability of different procedures--which would themselves be based upon the way other things seem to you). Things can become complicated when many different beliefs and/or appearances are involved, but the basic principle is that we are more inclined to accept what more strongly seems to us to be true. Appearances can be intellectual, as opposed to sensory, mnemonic, or introspective. It seems to us that the shortest path between any two points must be a straight line; that time is one-dimensional and totally ordered (for any two moments in time, one is earlier than the other); and that no object can be completely red and completely blue at the same time. I accept those things on intellectual grounds. I am not looking at all the possible pairs of points and all the possible paths connecting each pair and seeing, with my eyes, that the straight path is the shortest in each case. Instead, I am 'seeing' intellectually that it must be true--that is, when I think about it, it becomes obvious. **Logic**al judgments **rest[s] on** intellectual **appearances. We think the following inference logically valid** (the premises entail the conclusion, regardless of whether the premises are true): **Socrates is a man. All men are inconsiderate. Th[us]**erefore, **Socrates is inconsiderate**. but the next one invalid: Socrates is inconsiderate. All men are inconsiderate. Therefore, Socrates is a platypus. We 'see' this, not with our eyes, but with our intellect or reason. All judgments are based upon how things seem to the judging subject: a rational person believes only what seems to him to be true, though he need not believe everything that seems true.(3) The function of arguments is to change the way things seem to one's audience, by presenting other propositions (premises) that seem true and seem to support something (the conclusion) that may not initially have seemed true to the audience. An argument has force only to the extent that its premises seem true and seem to support its conclusion. Intellectual inquiry presupposes Phenomenal Conservatism, in the sense that such **inquiry** proceeds by **assum[es]**ing **things are the way they appear, until evidence (itself drawn from appearances)** arises to **cast[s] doubt** on this. **Even the [skeptic’s] arguments** of a philosophical skeptic who says we aren't justified in believing anything rest upon the skeptic's own beliefs, which are **[are] based upon what seems [true] to the skeptic** to be true.

Thus, you cannot abandon intuitions. The basis of logic isn’t further logic; logic is just intuitive. This means that even if I lose the framework debate we still compare the strength of the NC impacts to those of the AC since the framework is just a way to clarify what appearances are morally relevant, but if it’s clear that something is bad without a complicated metaethic, we should still prevent it. It’s clear we should reject cases that say mass suffering is OK. And, all moral traditions share intuitions that justify util. Haines1:[[2]](#footnote-2)

Arguably consequentialism **[Util] is implicit in** the very **familiar** conception of **moralit[ies]**y**, shared by many cultures[:]** and traditions, which holds that moral perfection means loving all people, **loving others as we love ourselves.** For **what is meant by “love” here? [Not]** Forming many romantic attachments hardly seems like the path toward perfection; nor perhaps does the widespread spiritual exercise of focusing on **wishing people well without actually helping** them. If there is truth in the saying that we should “love all people,” perhaps it is simply that **we should actively do** what is **good for people** and not bad for them, **as much as possible**. If we try to **[and] produce the greatest total benefit**, then we are loving “all people” in the sense that we are being impartial, caring for people in general, promoting each person’s well-being insofar as that is at stake in our actions and insofar as our helping one does not hurt others more. A similar line of thought starts from the idea that **morality is** at bottomtwo things. First, abstractly, to be moral is to do one’s rational best to do what is objectively right. Second, more concretely, to be moral is **to care about people.** Now, rationality and objectivity are impartial; they do not favor one person over another. **Hence to be moral is to care [and help]** about **people** equally or **impartially**, so far as one can, which means trying to benefit people as much as one can. **So [util]** consequentialism **is correct.**

Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well-being. Prefer the standard since

1. All judgments are epistemically limited by pain and pleasure, the experiences that motivate all. **Nagel**[[3]](#footnote-3),

“Almost **everyone takes the avoidance of** his own **pain and** the **promotion of** his own **pleasure as subjective reason**s **for action** in a fairly simple way; they are not back up by any further reasons. On the other hand if someone pursues pain or avoids pleasure, either it as a means to some end or it is backed up by dark reasons like guilt or sexual masochism. What sort of general value, if any, ought to be assigned to pleasure and pain when we consider these facts from an objective standpoint? What kind of judgment can we reasonably make about these things when we view them in abstraction from who we are? We can begin by asking why **there is no plausibility** in the zero position, **that pleasure and pain have no value of any kind that can be objectively recognized.** That would mean that I have no reason to take aspirin for a severe headache, however I may in fact be motivated; and that looking at it from outside, you couldn't even say that someone had a reason not to put his hand on a hot stove, just because of the pain. Try looking at it from the outside and see whether you can manage to withhold that judgment. If the idea of objective practical reason makes any sense at all, so that there is some judgment to withhold, it does not seem possible. If the general arguments against the reality of objective reasons are no good, then it is at least possible that **I have a reason**, and not just an inclination, **to refrain from putting my hand on a hot stove.**,”

2. Evaluating consequences is what people actually do when they judge action, empirics verify, Gino

[Francesca Gino Kenan-Flagler Business School, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Don Moore Tepper Business School, Carnegie Mellon University, Max H. Bozman Harvard Business School, Harvard University “No harm, no foul: The outcome bias in ethical judgments” http://www.hbs.edu/research/pdf/08-080.pdf] AT

**The** present **studies provide strong evidence** of **the existence of outcome effects** in ethically-relevant contexts, **when people are asked to judge the ethicality of others’ behavior**. It is worth noting that what we show is not the same as the curse of knowledge or the hindsight bias. The curse of knowledge describes people’s inability to recover an uninformed state of mind (Camerer, Loewenstein, & Weber, 1989). Likewise, the hindsight bias leads people to misremember what they believed before they knew an event’s outcome (e.g., Fischhoff, 1975; Fischhoff & Beyth, 1975). By contrast, we show that that **outcomes of decisions lead people to see the decisions** themselves **in a different light,** and that this effect does not depend on misremembering their prior state of mind. In other words, **people will see it as entirely appropriate to allow a decision’s outcome to determine** their assessment of **the decision’s quality.**

Impacts: **A.** Turns arguments about freedom, polls, or contracts because the best way to respect the autonomy of the people is to use utilitarianism **B.** outweighs – means that util is a prerequisite to the government having the support of the people and even existing in the first place and **C.** Gino answers calculation indicts since obviously util isn’t impossible to implement if it’s what we already do.

3. There’s no act-omission distinction since ever omission necessitates you take some action as a replacement, eg if you fail to help a drowning child you take the action of walking away. Even if there is a distinction for individuals the resolution concerns government action, for which there is none. Susntein and Vermuele:

 Sunstein Cass Sunstein and Adrian Vermuele, “Is Capital Punishment Morally Required? The Relevance of Life-Life Tradeoffs,” Chicago Public Law and Legal Theory Working Paper No. 85 (March 2005), p. 17.
In our view, any effort to distinguish between acts and omissions goes wrong by overlooking the distinctive features of government as a moral agent. If correct, this point has broad implications for criminal and civil law. Whatever the general status of the act/omission distinction as a matter of moral philosophy, the distinction is least impressive when applied to government, because the most plausible underlying considerations do not apply to official actors. The most fundamental point is that **unlike individuals, governments always** and necessarily **face a choice** between or **among possible policies for regulating third parties.** The distinction between acts and omissions may not be intelligible in this context, and even if it is, the distinction does not make a morally relevant difference. Most generally, **government is in the business of creating permissions and prohibitions. When it explicitly or implicitly authorizes private action, it is not omitting** to do anything **or refusing to act.** Moreover, the distinction between authorized and unauthorized private action – for example, private killing – becomes obscure when government formally forbids private action but chooses a set of policy instruments that do not adequately or fully discourage it.

If there is no act-omission distinction, then government is fully complicit with any harm it allows, so decisions are moral if they minimize harm. ALSO means based and side constraint theories collapse because competing violations would otherwise paralyze action, we need a comparative standard like util.

4. Governments are epistemically limited to generalities and public officials use and can only use util. **Goodin**[[4]](#footnote-4)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty , and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to chose general rules or conduct.

## Util framework

I negate. First off is the util framework. Intuitions determine our beliefs. **Huemer:**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Other things being equal, **it** i**s reasonable to assume** that **things are the way they appear**. I call this principle 'Phenomenal Conservatism' ('phenomenal' meaning 'pertaining to appearances'). I have discussed the principle elsewhere, so here I will be relatively brief.(1) There is a type of mental state, which I call an 'appearance', that we avow when we say such things as 'It seems to me that p', 'It appears that p', or 'p is obvious', where p is some proposition. Appearances have propositional contents--things they represent to be the case--but they are not beliefs, as can be seen from the intelligibility of, 'The arch seems to be taller than it is wide, but I don't think it is'. Nevertheless, appearances normally lead us to form beliefs. 'Appearance' is a broad category that includes mental states involved in perception, memory, introspection, and intellection. Thus, we can say, 'This line seems longer than that one', 'I seem to recall reading something about that', 'It seems to me that I have a headache', and 'It seems that any two points can be joined by a single straight line'.(2) All of those statements make sense, using the same sense of 'seems'. Appearances can be deceiving, and appearances can conflict with one another, as in the Müller-Lyer illusion: It initially seems that the top line is longer than the bottom line. But if you get out a ruler and measure them, you will find them to be of the same length. The top line will seem, when holding a ruler next to it, to be 2 inches long, and the bottom line will similarly appear to be 2 inches long. So, all things considered, it seems that the two lines are of the same length. As this example illustrates, an initial appearance can be overruled by other appearances (this does not mean the initial appearance goes away, but only that we don't believe it), and only by other appearances. **Some appearances are** stronger than others--as we say, some things are **'more obvious' than others--and this determines** what we hold on to and **what we reject in case of conflict**. Presumably, it more clearly seems to you that the result of measuring the lines is accurate than that the result of eyeballing them is, so you believe the measurement result (this may have to do with background beliefs you have about the reliability of different procedures--which would themselves be based upon the way other things seem to you). Things can become complicated when many different beliefs and/or appearances are involved, but the basic principle is that we are more inclined to accept what more strongly seems to us to be true. Appearances can be intellectual, as opposed to sensory, mnemonic, or introspective. It seems to us that the shortest path between any two points must be a straight line; that time is one-dimensional and totally ordered (for any two moments in time, one is earlier than the other); and that no object can be completely red and completely blue at the same time. I accept those things on intellectual grounds. I am not looking at all the possible pairs of points and all the possible paths connecting each pair and seeing, with my eyes, that the straight path is the shortest in each case. Instead, I am 'seeing' intellectually that it must be true--that is, when I think about it, it becomes obvious. **Logic**al judgments **rest[s] on** intellectual **appearances. We think the following inference logically valid** (the premises entail the conclusion, regardless of whether the premises are true): **Socrates is a man. All men are inconsiderate. Th[us]**erefore, **Socrates is inconsiderate**. but the next one invalid: Socrates is inconsiderate. All men are inconsiderate. Therefore, Socrates is a platypus. We 'see' this, not with our eyes, but with our intellect or reason. All judgments are based upon how things seem to the judging subject: a rational person believes only what seems to him to be true, though he need not believe everything that seems true.(3) The function of arguments is to change the way things seem to one's audience, by presenting other propositions (premises) that seem true and seem to support something (the conclusion) that may not initially have seemed true to the audience. An argument has force only to the extent that its premises seem true and seem to support its conclusion. Intellectual inquiry presupposes Phenomenal Conservatism, in the sense that such **inquiry** proceeds by **assum[es]**ing **things are the way they appear, until evidence (itself drawn from appearances)** arises to **cast[s] doubt** on this. **Even the [skeptic’s] arguments** of a philosophical skeptic who says we aren't justified in believing anything rest upon the skeptic's own beliefs, which are **[are] based upon what seems [true] to the skeptic** to be true.

Even if I lose the framework debate we still compare the strength of the NC impacts to those of the AC since framework is just a way to clarify what appearances are morally relevant, but if it’s clear that something is bad without a complicated metaethic, we should still prevent it. And, all moral traditions share intuitions that justify util. **Haines1**:[[6]](#footnote-6)

Arguably consequentialism **[Util] is implicit in** the very **familiar** conception of **moralit[ies]**y**, shared by many cultures[:]** and traditions, which holds that moral perfection means loving all people, **loving others as we love ourselves.** For **what is meant by “love” here? [Not]** Forming many romantic attachments hardly seems like the path toward perfection; nor perhaps does the widespread spiritual exercise of focusing on **wishing people well without actually helping** them. If there is truth in the saying that we should “love all people,” perhaps it is simply that **we should actively do** what is **good for people** and not bad for them, **as much as possible**. If we try to **[and] produce the greatest total benefit**, then we are loving “all people” in the sense that we are being impartial, caring for people in general, promoting each person’s well-being insofar as that is at stake in our actions and insofar as our helping one does not hurt others more. A similar line of thought starts from the idea that **morality is** at bottomtwo things. First, abstractly, to be moral is to do one’s rational best to do what is objectively right. Second, more concretely, to be moral is **to care about people.** Now, rationality and objectivity are impartial; they do not favor one person over another. **Hence to be moral is to care [and help]** about **people** equally or **impartially**, so far as one can, which means trying to benefit people as much as one can. **So [util]** consequentialism **is correct.**

Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well-being. Prefer the standard

1. Evaluating consequences is what people actually do when they judge action, empirics verify, Gino

[Francesca Gino Kenan-Flagler Business School, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Don Moore Tepper Business School, Carnegie Mellon University, Max H. Bozman Harvard Business School, Harvard University “No harm, no foul: The outcome bias in ethical judgments” http://www.hbs.edu/research/pdf/08-080.pdf] AT

**The** present **studies provide strong evidence** of **the existence of outcome effects** in ethically-relevant contexts, **when people are asked to judge the ethicality of others’ behavior**. It is worth noting that what we show is not the same as the curse of knowledge or the hindsight bias. The curse of knowledge describes people’s inability to recover an uninformed state of mind (Camerer, Loewenstein, & Weber, 1989). Likewise, the hindsight bias leads people to misremember what they believed before they knew an event’s outcome (e.g., Fischhoff, 1975; Fischhoff & Beyth, 1975). By contrast, we show that that **outcomes of decisions lead people to see the decisions** themselves **in a different light,** and that this effect does not depend on misremembering their prior state of mind. In other words, **people will see it as entirely appropriate to allow a decision’s outcome to determine** their assessment of **the decision’s quality.**

Turns your arguments about freedom because the best way to respect the autonomy of the people is to use util. And I outweigh since util is a prerequisite to the government having the support of the people and even existing in the first place.

2. Governments are epistemically limited to generalities and public officials use and can only use util. **Goodin**[[7]](#footnote-7)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty , and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to chose general rules or conduct.

Second off is the CP

## A. is the text –

Resolved: [the aff actor] ought to institute modified vegetarianism for adolescents via only serving vegetarian meals in school cafeterias, **Little:**

http://www.tahoedailytribune.com/southshore/17892031-113/letter-schools-should-feed-children-healthy-meals

Sixty-four percent of U.S. school districts now [offer](http://www.echopress.com/letters/3829715-school-lunches-should-limit-meats-offer-more-plant-based-foods#19909428) vegetarian options. More than 120 schools, including the entire school districts of Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Detroit, Houston, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Oakland, Philadelphia, and San Diego, have implemented Meatless Monday. **Some schools have dropped meat** from their menu **altogether.** As **parents**, we **need to work with** school **cafeteria managers** and our own children **to encourage** the availability and consumption of healthy, **plant-based school foods.** [Entering](http://www.echopress.com/letters/3829715-school-lunches-should-limit-meats-offer-more-plant-based-foods#14672284) “vegetarian options in schools” provides lots of good resources.

CP’s key to health, **Paster:**

“Good Health – Compulsory Vegetarianism” H. E. Paster, M.D. 10/20/17 http://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=PRP19171020.2.54.1

**Compulsory Vegetarianism. We are** fast **coming to it**, in & modified form, not through choice but **from necessity.** And as necessity is said to be .the mother of invention, necessity in this matter may be said to be the mother of a revised and better dietetic practice. Owing to the war and to certain economic conditions, our sources of meat sup. ply are growing more and more meager. The time is coming when the presence of meat on the daily bill of, fare in any household will be a mark of wealth and social distinction, if not of ggod judgment.\* We are not of those who make it almost a dogma of their religion to exclude meat from their dietary and confine themselves to cereals, vegetables, nuts, etc We are firmly convinced, nevertheless, that the **appetite for meat-eating** in America **has been** ever pampered, **to the detriment of the general health.** We believe the present **compulsory drift toward a modified vegetarianism is in the hygienic interest** of those on whom the compulsion falls. **It will lessen the prevalence and severity of such diseases as rheumatism, cancer, and** a host of minor ailments **more** or less traceable to excessive flesh consumption.

## B. is the competition –

1. It’s mutually exclusive – he concedes in CX that medical choices include dietary choices, which means he defends autonomous dietary choices for adolescents, whereas I take away their freedom to eat meat in school.

2. Disads to the aff that the CP avoids are reasons the CP alone is better than the perm.

## C. is the solvency –

Adolescence establishes health habits across people’s entire lives, **Garber:**

“Physical Development and Daily Health Habits” 10/2013 Child Trends

**Adolescence: A time to nurture healthy habits** Adolescence is a period of tremendous development and physical growth. By traditional markers, such as rates of mortality and chronic disease, adolescents are generally very healthy. In fact, more than four in five parents (81 percent) rate the health of their adolescent as excellent or very good. As adolescents become more independent, **they assume greater responsibility for taking care of themselves** on a daily basis. **Adolescence offers a chance to establish habits that affect health** not just during the teenage years, but **across the lifespan.**

Schools have key influence on adolescent health habits and can meaningfully impact them, the CP starts a generational shift towards vegetarianism. **CDC:**

“Why Schools?” http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/about/why\_schools.htm#35307339

**Research has shown that** school health programs can reduce the prevalence of health risk behaviors among young people and have a positive effect on academic performance. **Schools** also **play a critical role in** promoting the health and safety of young people and **helping [young people]** them **establish lifelong healthy behaviors.** It is easier and more effective to [develop healthy](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/about/why_schools.htm#26562397) behaviors during childhood than trying to change unhealthy behaviorsduring adulthood. In addition, preventable health risk behaviors are often established during childhood or adolescence and continue into adulthood, contributing to the leading causes of death, disability, and social problems: Unhealthy eating. Inadequate physical [activity](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/about/why_schools.htm#3462935). Alcohol and other drug use. Tobacco use. Sexual behaviors that can result in HIV infection, other sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), and unintended [pregnancy](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/about/why_schools.htm#94155774). Behaviors that contribute to unintentional injury and violence. During the transition from childhood to adulthood, adolescents establish patterns of behavior and make lifestyle choices that affect both their current and future health. Serious health and safety issues such as motor [vehicle](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/about/why_schools.htm#671558) crashes, violence, substance use, and risky sexual behaviors can adversely affect adolescent and young adults. Some **adolescents** also **struggle to** adopt behaviors that could decrease their risk of developing chronic diseases in adulthood, such as **eat**ing **nutritiously**, engaging in physical [activity](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/about/why_schools.htm#34292207), and choosing not to use tobacco. Environmental factors such as family, peer group, school, and community characteristics also contribute to adolescents' health and risk behaviors. Societal Influences on Adolescents and Young Adults **Young people's behaviors are influenced at the** individual, **peer**, family, **school,** community, **and societal levels.** Because many sectors of society contribute to adolescent health, safety, and well-being, a collaborative effort that engages multiple partners is necessary. Such joint efforts can also help to promote a more comprehensive approach to [addressing](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/about/why_schools.htm#35307339) adolescent health—one that views each adolescent as a whole person, recognizing and drawing upon his or her assets and not just focusing on risks. To have the most positive impact on adolescent health, **government agencies**, community organizations, **[and] schools**, and other community members **must work together** in a comprehensive approach. Providing safe and nurturing environments **for our nation’s youth** can help ensure that adolescents will [be healthy](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/about/why_schools.htm#75553068) and productive members of society.

Vegetarianism’s key to health, **Freston:**

“Does Meat kill More Americans Than Cigarettes Do?” Kathy Freston 3/13/12 http://www.alternet.org/story/154532/does\_meat\_kill\_more\_americans\_than\_cigarettes\_do

**The West's three biggest killers --** [**heart disease**](http://www.alternet.org/story/154532/does_meat_kill_more_americans_than_cigarettes_do#74216634)**, cancer, and stroke -- are**[**linked to excessive animal product**](http://thechinastudy.com/)**consumption**, and **vegetarians have much lower risks of all three.** Vegetarians also have**[and] a** [**fraction of the obesity and diabetes rates**](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/07/090701103002.htm)of the general population -- of course, both diseases are at epidemic levels and are only getting worse.But much more important than the vegetarian community's general statistics are what can be done with the right vegetarian diet: For some years now, **doctors**  have been not just **prevent**ing**,** but **even revers[e]**ing**,** [**heart disease**](http://www.alternet.org/story/154532/does_meat_kill_more_americans_than_cigarettes_do#65298948) **using** a low-fat **vegetarian diet.** That's right -- **the disease that kills almost as many Americans as everything else combined** can be not just prevented, but reversed, with a low fat plant-based diet, as documented by Dr. Caldwell Esselstyn in [Prevent and Reverse Heart Disease.](http://www.amazon.com/Prevent-Reverse-Heart-Disease-Nutrition-Based/dp/1583333002/ref%3Dsr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1328728905&sr=1-1) There's a link from animal product consumption to our country's No. 2 killer, too: [According](http://www.alternet.org/story/154532/does_meat_kill_more_americans_than_cigarettes_do#43159510) to the[American Institute for Cancer Research](http://www.aicr.org/), about as much cancer could be prevented by diet and exercise as is caused by smoking -- and you know what's causing all that cancer? It's not whole grains, legumes, fruits, or vegetables. Dr. T. Colin Campbell has [documented the link](http://thechinastudy.com/) between cancer and animal products. There's a lot of money in the meat industry, just like there's a lot of money in big tobacco. For many years, the tobacco establishment pointed to elderly smokers like George Burns and millions of others as proof that their very-natural product could not be harmful. Even long-distance runners and members of the military could be found smoking a cigarette at the end of a long run or intense drill. Similarly, today the meat industry points to the fact that there are an awful lot of old meat-eaters, conveniently ignor[es]ing our sky-high [heart disease](http://www.alternet.org/story/154532/does_meat_kill_more_americans_than_cigarettes_do#7788616) and cancer rates, as well as our ballooning rates of obesity and diabetes, all of which are linked to their products.

I outweigh – my disease’s impacts are huge, systemic, and high probability – literally the biggest impacts possible in the squo since they kill the most people annually.

## D. is the net benefits –

### 1. Biodiversity

Demand for livestock is the leading cause of global biodiversity loss, **Geiling:**

Natasha Geiling 8/17/15 “Meat-Eaters Are the Number one Cause of Worldwide Species Extinction, New Study Warns http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/08/17/3692194/meat-eaters-species-extinction-study/

A meat-inclusive diet often comes with a [side of environmental caveats](http://www.fao.org/agriculture/lead/themes0/climate/en/), including livestock’s contribution to global warming, its contribution to deforestation, and the stress it places on a bevy of increasingly precious resources, from water to land. Now, a group of researchers want to add another concern to the meat-eater’s plate: [and] worldwide species extinction. According to a [recent study](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969715303697) published in *Science of the Total Environment* by researchers at Florida International [University](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/08/17/3692194/meat-eaters-species-extinction-study/#14559848) in Miami, **livestock production**’s impact on land use **is** “likely **the leading cause of** modern **species extinctions” —** a **[the] problem** the researchers think **will only get worse as population** growth **increases** the global demand for meat.The study is particularly interesting to scientists because research linking livestock’s relationship to biodiversity loss has been lacking, Gidon Eshel, a geophysicist at Bard College who was not involved in the study, [told Science](http://news.sciencemag.org/environment/2015/08/meat-eaters-may-speed-worldwide-species-extinction-study-warns). “Now we can say, only slightly fancifully: **You eat a steak, you kill a lemur in Madagascar.** You eat a chicken, you kill an Amazonian parrot,” Eshel said. To understand livestock production’s impact on biodiversity, researchers at Florida International University mapped areas that have exceptionally high percentages of native plants and animal species — known as biodiversity hotspots. The researchers then mapped areas where livestock production is expected to increase in the future, and determined how much land would be lost as a result of expanding meat operations, using data from the Food and Agriculture Organization and other studies about historic livestock production and land use conversion in those areas. Then, they compared the biodiversity hotspots with the expected expansion of meat production. They found that **of the areas expected to have the greatest conversion of land** use for agriculture — **from forest** to land dedicated **to livestock production — 15 were in “megadiverse” countries that have the greatest diversity of species.** The study concludes that in the 15 “megadiverse countries,” **land used for livestock** production **will** likely **increase** by **30 to 50 percent** — some **3,000,000 square kilometers** (about 741 million acres). “These changes will have major, negative impacts on biodiversity,” Brian Machovina, the study’s lead author, told Science. “Many, many species will be lost.” Several studies have suggested that the Earth is currently in the midst of the [sixth mass extinction](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/06/22/3672390/humans-are-the-earths-plague/), caused largely by human activities. Animals are hunted and sold for trade, climate change is disrupting migration and mating patterns, extreme weather is threatening animal populations, and deforestation is fragmenting crucial habitat. But all of those causes, Machovina and his colleagues claim, pale in comparison to the threat of habitat loss driven by demand for meat, which the study claims “will cause more extinctions than any other factor.” And though meat consumption in the United States has [fallen steadily](http://www.earth-policy.org/data_highlights/2012/highlights25) since peaking in the 1970s, meat consumption worldwide continues to rise, driven by technological advancements, liberalized trade, and growing economies. Livestock production is also an incredibly important source of economic security for millions of the world’s poor, providing stable income for 987 million around the world. Machovina and his colleagues do suggest some mitigation efforts that could curb the loss of biodiversity from meat production — namely, eat less meat. The study says that in order to limit the worst biodiversity losses, the average diet should get no more than 10 percent of its calories from meat, and that [pork, chicken, and fish](http://grist.org/food/can-meat-actually-be-eco-friendly/) are less resource-intensive options for meat eaters.

And biodiversity loss causes eco-collapse and human extinction, **Diner:**Major David Diner, JAG Corps, United States Army, Winter 1994, Military Law Review, 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161, p. 170-173
1. Why Do We Care? -- No species has ever dominated its fellow species as man has. In most cases, people have assumed the God-like power of life and death -- extinction or survival -- over the plants and animals of the world. For most of history, mankind pursued this domination with a single-minded determination to master the world, tame the wilderness, and exploit nature for the maximum benefit of the human race. **In past mass extinction episodes**, as many as **ninety percent of the existing species perished**, and yet the world moved forward, and new species replaced the old. So why should the world be concerned now? The prime reason is the worldâ€™s survival. Like all animal life, **humans live off of other species.** At some point, the number of species could decline **to the point at which the ecosystem fails**, and then **humans also** would **become extinct.** No one knows how many species the world needs to support human life, and to find out -- by allowing certain species to become extinct -- would not be sound policy. In addition to food, species offer many direct and indirect benefits to mankind. 2. Ecological Value. -- Ecological value is the value that species have in maintaining the environment. Pest, erosion, and flood control are prime benefits certain species provide to man. Plants and animals also provide additional ecological services -- pollution control, oxygen production, sewage treatment, and biodegradation. 3. Scientific and Utilitarian Value. -- Scientific value is the use of species for research into the physical processes of the world. Without plants and animals, a large portion of basic scientific research would be impossible. Utilitarian value is the direct utility humans draw from plants and animals. Only a fraction of the earthâ€™s species have been examined, and mankind may someday desperately need the species that it is exterminating today. To accept that the snail darter, harelip sucker, or Dismal Swamp southeastern shrew could save mankind may be difficult for some. Many, if not most, species are useless to man in a direct utilitarian sense. Nonetheless, they may be critical in an indirect role, because their extirpations could affect a directly useful species negatively. In a closely interconnected ecosystem, the loss of a species affects other species dependent on it. Moreover, as the number of species decline, the effect of each new extinction on the remaining species increases dramatically.4. Biological Diversity. -- The main premise of species preservation is that diversity is better than simplicity. As the current mass extinction has progressed, the worldâ€™s biological diversity generally has decreased. This trend occurs within ecosystems by reducing the number of species, and within species by reducing the number of individuals. Both trends carry serious future implications. Biologically **diverse ecosystems** are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. â€œThe more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can **resist** a **stress**. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole.â€ By causing widespread **extinctions**, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the **risk** of **ecosystem failure.** The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, **each new animal or plant extinction**, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, **could cause total** ecosystem **collapse and human extinction.** Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraftâs wings, mankind [humankind] may be edging closer to the abyss.

CP solves, a gradual, societal decrease in meat consumption checks back for excessive livestock production and allows habitat restoration, **Machovina et al** explains the conclusion of empirics:

Brian Machovina, Kenneth J. Feeley, William J. Ripple “Biodiversity conservation: the key is reducing meat consumption” Science of the total Environment 536 (2015) 419-431 7/5/2015

**Based on**  a balance of the need to increase nutritional health(Campbell and Campbell, 2007), availability of calories with **the need to decrease the land demands and ecological footprint of agriculture** (Foley et al., 2011), and the desire for people to eat meat, we argue that **people should strive toward** a goal of significantly reduc[e]ing the contribution of animal products in the human diet, ideally to a global average of **10% or less** of **calories [from meat]** (Machovina and Feeley, 2014b; Machovina and Feeley, 2014c). This is roughly equivalent to **limiting average daily consumption of animal products to approximately 100 g** (a portion **of meat** approximately the size of a deck of playing cards or smaller). Others have proposed 90 g per day as a working global target (McMichael et al., 2007), sharedmore evenly among nationswhich currently range 10-fold in meat consumption,with notmore than 50 g **per day** coming from ruminants (McMichael et al., 2007). These scenarios,combined with further crop improvements, **could enable** the future global population to be fed on extant agricultural lands, potentially enable **restoration of habitats** (Machovina and Feeley, 2014a; Machovina and Feeley, 2014c), while still enabling people to eat some meat. Reaching these goals and reducing the overall global animal product consumption to ~10% will require significant decreases in per capita meat consumption by developed countries and little or no increase in most developing countries (Bonhommeau et al., 2013).

(\_) Biodiversity turns econ, **Mittermeier:**

Mittermeier ‘11(et al, Dr. Russell Alan Mittermeier is a primatologist, herpetologist and biological anthropologist. He holds Ph.D. from Harvard in Biological Anthropology and serves as an Adjunct Professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. He has conducted fieldwork for over 30 years on three continents and in more than 20 countries in mainly tropical locations. He is the President of Conservation International and he is considered an expert on biological diversity. Mittermeier has formally discovered several monkey species. From Chapter One of the book Biodiversity Hotspots – F.E. Zachos and J.C. Habel (eds.), DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-20992-5\_1, # Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2011. This evidence also internally references Norman Myers, a very famous British environmentalist specialising in biodiversity. available at: http://www.academia.edu/1536096/Global\_biodiversity\_conservation\_the\_critical\_role\_of\_hotspots)

**“Other consequences of biodiversity loss,** more subtle but equally damaging, **include the deterioration of Earth’s natural capital. Loss of biodiversity on land in the past decade alone is estimated to be costing the global economy $500 billion annually** (TEEB2009)**. Reduced diversity** may also **reduce[s] resilience of ecosystems and the human communities that depend on them.** For example, more diverse coral reef communities have been found to suffer less from the diseases that plague degraded reefs elsewhere (Raymundo et al.2009).”

### 2. Warming

Livestock are as bad as transportation and make up almost a sixth of greenhouse gas emissions, **Machovina et al:**

Given the potential widespread and profound effects of climate change, addressing the contribution of livestock-produced greenhouse gases is a valuable component of biodiversity conservation. **Livestock** are an important **contribut[e]**or **to global warming through** the production of **greenhouse gases** (carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide). Worldwide, the livestock sector is responsible for **approximately 14.5% of** all anthropogenic greenhouse gas **emissions**, approximately **equivalent to all** the direct **emissions from transportation** (Gerber et al., 2013; Ripple et al., 2014b).Land-use change (deforestation & feedcrop expansion) dominates CO2 production from livestock with an estimated 2,400,000,000 tons of CO2 released annually (Steinfeld et al., 2006a). Releases of methane from enteric fermentation are equivalent to 2,200,000,000 tons of CO2. The use of nitrogen fertilizers in feed and manure production contributes 75–80% of annual agricultural emissions of N2O, equivalent to 2,200,000,000 tons of CO2. Some data suggest that N2O is the largest livestock-driven climate change threat, primarily resulting from the production of manure and the intensive over-use of fertilizers for the production of animal feed (Idel, 2013). Indeed the amount of nitrogen released by livestock viamanure is estimated to exceed the global use of nitrogen fertilizers (Bouwman et al., 2009).

The impact is extinction. Tickell:

Tickell 8 Oliver, Environmental Researcher, The Guardian, August 11,

“We need to get prepared for [**four degrees of global warming**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/06/climatechange.scienceofclimatechange), Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a [4C rise](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/07/carbonemissions.climatechange) is absurd and dangerous. [Global warming](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/climatechange) on this scale **would be a catastrophe that would mean**, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our **extinction.** The **collapse of** the **polar ice caps** would become inevitable, **bring[s]**ing long-term[**sea level rises**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/gallery/2007/dec/05/climatechange.flooding?picture=331454811) **of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost**, complete **with ports, cities**, transport and industrial infrastructure, **and** much of **the world's most productive farmland.** The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, [floods](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/08/climatechange.flooding) and hurricanes. **The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would** undoubtedly **die.”**

CP solves – substituting livestock with crops lets us feed more people and with far less of an environmental impact, **Machovina et al:**

**Reducing demand for livestock products,** or other demand-side mitigation measures, such as reduced waste, **offer** a much **great**er **potential for meeting the challenges of both food security and greenhouse gas mitigation** than supply side measures that allow the production of more agricultural product per unit of input, although both supply and demand-side measures should be implemented (Smith et al., 2013). **Eliminating the loss of energy** available in plants **via livestock production and instead growing crops** only for direct human consumption **is estimated to increase the number of food calories available** for human consumption by **as much as 70%.**

And, the environment precludes rights. Ataner:
“My second line of argument in rejecting the claim that unowned lands are freely destructible, i.e., the view that our freedoms over and against the natural environment are unlimited, is as follows. Given, as we have seen above, Kant’s claims pertaining to humanity’s possession of the earth ab initio being an “original possession in common” or an “original community of land in general”, I deny that the natural environment can ever be thought of as truly res nullius, or, more appropriately, that land can be terra nullius in some absolute sense. This claim, while I cannot fully develop it here, rests simply on Kant’s general conception of land, which has unusual, often overlooked, implications within his overall framework. Briefly put, as we have seen, Kant claims that **our possession** in common **of the finite** surface of the **earth is a [material] precondition of** (the possibility of) **our collective coexistence** under Right, or, relatedly, that the unity of all places on the earth’s finite surface is a condition of the possibility of a united will among a plurality of unavoidably interacting persons. (For, as we have already noted, if the surface of the earth were infinite and unbounded, we would not necessarily come into contact with each other; hence, the united will, the sole condition pursuant to which rightful relations among all can be established, would carry no normative necessity. As Edwards puts it succinctly, if somewhat obscurely, Kant’s “idea of original community of land is a conceptual representation that picks out the objective correlate of the idea of universal will.”) The upshot of Kant’s line of reasoning, essentially, is that, as a collective, **we inhabit the** surface of the earth (and, by extension, the **[natural environment]** in a manner parallel to the way in which we inhabit our bodies as individuals: in order to exist as free persons, we have to subsist as individuals in finite bodies; in order to co-exist as free persons under conditions of Right dictated by a united will (the only possible way in which we can co-exist as mutually free persons, mediated by the dictates of practical reason in its external aspect and the idea of the social contract, etc.), **we have to subsist collectively within a finite** (confined) **space, namely** upon the spherical surface **the earth** that unites all lands upon it. In either case, **freedom** as such **can only have reality under certain material,** empirical **[pre]conditions.** But,if the integrity of our finite bodies is necessary to our individual freedom, then we have to also admit that **the integrity of the** finite surface of the earth (and by extension, the [**natural environment] is essential** to our collective co-existence as free persons. For, imagine **if each of us were free to destroy some bit of the finite** surface of the **earth;** in that case, **it would**, in principle, **[by universality] be permissible to destroy all surfaces of the earth. However, if we**, through collective cumulative action, **were to destroy the earth’s (finite) surface, we would have nothing,** no space**, to subsist upon**, either collectively or individually. As such, it is hardly coherent to say that the destruction of portions of the surface of the earth must [may] be permissible under laws of freedom; and, the incoherence of the destruction of land (as a matter of Right) in this regard is exactly parallel to the incoherence of suicide (as a matter of Virtue).

# **More cards**

B. is the link – Defending adolescent autonomy to make medical choices affirms their right to make dietary choices as my opponent concedes in CX, and youth are increasing in their meat eating habits.

## U.S. poll

**In the poll, 3% of U.S youth indicated they never eat meat, poultry, and fish/seafood. They were classified as vegetarian. About 1/3 of the vegetarians (1% of the U.S. youth population) also never eat dairy, eggs, and honey, and were classified as vegan. One-third of the vegetarians (1% of the U.S. youth population) were vegan, except for honey.**

I defend that [the aff actor] ought to institute compulsory modified vegetarianism, limiting each individual’s meat consumption to 10% or less of their total calories. **Machovina et al** is the solvency advocate:

Brian Machovina, Kenneth J. Feeley, William J. Ripple “Biodiversity conservation: the key is reducing meat consumption” Science of the total Environment 536 (2015) 419-431 7/5/2015

Based on a balance between the need to increase nutritional health (Campbell and Campbell, 2007), availability of calories with the need to decrease the land demands and ecological footprint of agriculture (Foley et al., 2011), and the desire for people to eat meat, we argue that **people should** strive toward a goal of significantly **reduc[e]**ing the contribution of **animal products in** the human **diet, ideally to** a global average of **10% or less** of **calories** (Machovina and Feeley, 2014b; Machovina and Feeley, 2014c). This is roughly equivalent to limiting average daily consumption of animal products to approximately 100 g (a portion of meat approximately the size of a deck of playing cards or smaller). Others have proposed 90 g per day as a working global target (McMichael et al., 2007), sharedmore evenly among nationswhich currently range 10-fold in meat consumption,with notmore than 50 g per day coming from ruminants (McMichael et al., 2007). These scenarios, combined with further crop improvements, could enable the future global population to be fed on extant agricultural lands, potentially enable restoration of habitats (Machovina and Feeley, 2014a; Machovina and Feeley, 2014c), while still enabling people to eat some meat. Reaching **these goals** and reducing the overall global animal product consumption to ~10% **will require significant decreases in** per capita meat **consumption by developed countries and little or no increase in most developing countries** (Bonhommeau et al., 2013).
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