Negative Brief: Pesticide Exports

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

Summary: Plan bans export of pesticides if they have been banned\* for use within the United States. AFF will argue that pesticides we know are bad and can't use in the US are still being manufactured and exported to other countries. Evidence: people are getting sick and dying from pesticides in poor countries and the US is exporting pesticides. But there's a missing link. It's not enough to prove we export and people are getting sick from pesticides. AFF has to prove that the people who are getting sick are specifically using and getting sick from pesticides exported from the US. After all, other countries export pesticides too. And a lot of the pesticides they're worried about haven't been produced in the US for decades. For example, if someone is getting sick from DDT in some poor country today, it's either stuff that's been lingering in the soil for decades or else they imported it from somewhere else other than the US (like China or India). No DDT has been manufactured in the US for over 20 years.

\*"Banned" is a misnomer. The correct term is "unregistered," and they can be unregistered for several reasons. One could be that the EPA found them to be harmful and banned them. They could also be unregistered because the company never submitted them for registration, or for other reasons.
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Negative: Pesticide Exports

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. Not coming from the United States.

**Affirmative's own source (or one that agrees with the AFF position, whether they quoted it or not) complains about US export of pesticides, and then to prove it, they reference harm from chemicals that aren't manufactured in the US. To prove that, first we look at…**

Link: AFF Source for the 27 million pounds/year of exports is "Beyond Pesticides." That source got their numbers from a publication called The Lancet Regional Health

(AFF SOURCE) Beyond Pesticides 2022 ( ) 5 Aug 2022 " [U.S. Exportation of Banned and Highly Restricted Pesticides Continues to Inflict Serious Harm](https://beyondpesticides.org/dailynewsblog/2022/08/u-s-exportation-of-banned-and-highly-restricted-pesticides-continues-to-inflict-serious-harm/)" (accessed 19 Jan 2023) https://beyondpesticides.org/dailynewsblog/2022/08/u-s-exportation-of-banned-and-highly-restricted-pesticides-continues-to-inflict-serious-harm/

This BBC investigative report comes on the heels of a piece in The Lancet, [United States and United Nations pesticide policies: Environmental violence against the Yaqui indigenous nation](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667193X22000722?via%3Dihub#!), that catalogues the abuse of pesticide export policies on indigenous peoples. The piece finds: “The Federal [Insecticide](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/insecticide), Fungicide, and [Rodenticide](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/rodenticide) Act (FIFRA) is a U.S. statute that allows “pesticides that are not approved – or registered – for use in the U.S.” to be manufactured in the U.S. and exported elsewhere. The UN Rotterdam Convention also allows the global exportation of “banned pesticides.” The ongoing exportation of banned pesticides leads to disproportionately high rates of morbidity and mortality, most notably in Indigenous women and children.” The authors cite the extent of the export issue from the U.S.: “Export data from U.S. ports found that over 27 million pounds of pesticides forbidden for use domestically were shipped at an average of 32 thousand pounds per day.

And in fact, that article does refer to 27 million pounds per year, 32,000 pounds/day

The Lancet Regional Health - Americas 2022 (written by Victor A. Lopez-Carme, Timothy B.Erickso, Zara Escobar,, Anpotowin Jensen, Alexandria E. Cronin, LaShyra T. Nole, Marcos Moreno, Amanda M. Stewart) June 2022 "United States and United Nations pesticide policies: Environmental violence against the Yaqui indigenous nation" (accessed 19 Jan 2023) https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667193X22000722?via%3Dihub#bib0001

The United States (U.S.) allows the production and export of pesticides to low- and middle-income countries (LMIC), even when those pesticides have been banned domestically due to their known detrimental health impacts. Export data from U.S. ports found that over 27 million pounds of pesticides forbidden for use domestically were shipped at an average of 32 thousand pounds per day.

But we need to keep reading what that source says. Lancet Regional Health then goes on to talk about the harm caused by exported pesticides to a Native American group in Mexico known as the "Yaqui"

The Lancet Regional Health - Americas 2022 (written by Victor A.Lopez-Carme, Timothy B.Erickso, Zara Escobar,, Anpotowin Jensen, Alexandria E. Cronin, LaShyra T.Nole, Marcos Moreno, Amanda M.Stewart) June 2022 "United States and United Nations pesticide policies: Environmental violence against the Yaqui indigenous nation" (accessed 19 Jan 2023) https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667193X22000722?via%3Dihub#bib0001

The impacts reported in the above testimonies by Yaqui mothers, farmworkers, traditional midwives, and family members are consistent with the known health effects of banned U.S. pesticides and supported by epidemiological studies conducted in Rio Yaqui, Mexico by Guillette et al., in 1998 and 2006, and Meza-Montenegro et al., in 2013.  The studies document high concentrations of pesticides in Yaqui urine, blood, and breastmilk samples, even though those pesticides had been banned by the UN Stockholm convention prior to the sample collection. They also document the reproductive and intergenerational health effects, including links between [prenatal exposure](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/prenatal-exposure) to pesticides and deleterious health effects. In urine samples of Yaqui children in the valley areas, taken in 2013, 100% of samples had higher than average levels of DDT, 39.2% of [Lindane](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/lindane), 9.8% of aldrin, and 3.9% of [endosulfan](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/medicine-and-dentistry/endosulfan%22%20%5Co%20%22Learn%20more%20about%20endosulfan%20from%20ScienceDirect%27s%20AI-generated%20Topic%20Pages).

But here's the problem: These pesticides that are supposedly harming people in Mexico are not produced and not exported from the U.S. and haven't been for years.

First example: DDT. The North American Regional Action Plan banned DDT production in the US 20 years ago

 Commission for Environmental Cooperation of North America 2003. "DDT no longer used in North America" (accessed 19 Jan 2023) http://www.cec.org/files/documents/publications/1968-ddt-no-longer-used-in-north-america-en.pdf

The production and use of DDT (dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane) has been eliminated in Canada, Mexico, and the United States under a North American Regional Action Plan (NARAP) negotiated by the three signatory countries to the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation (NAAEC).

Second example: Lindane. Hasn't been produced in the US since 1976

National Library of Medicine 2022. (article is undated but references material published in 2022) "Lindane" https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/Lindane (accessed 19 Jan 2023)

Hexachlorocyclohexane (HCH) is a manufactured chemical that exists in eight chemical forms called isomers. One of these forms, gamma-HCH (or γ-HCH, commonly called lindane) is produced and used as an insecticide on fruit, vegetables, and forest crops. It is a white solid that may evaporate into the air as a colorless vapor with a slightly musty odor. It is also available as a prescription (lotion, cream, or shampoo) to treat head and body lice, and scabies. Lindane has not been produced in the United States since 1976, but is imported for insecticide use.

Third Example: Aldrin and Dieldrin. Haven't been produced in the US since 1974

Environmental Protection Agency 2003. "Contaminant Candidate List Regulatory Determination Support Document for Aldrin and Dieldrin" (accessed 19 Jan 2023) https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2014-09/documents/support\_cc1\_aldrin-dieldrin\_ccl\_regdet.pdf

In summary, aldrin and dieldrin have not been produced in the United States since 1974, and all uses of the pesticides were canceled by 1987.

Voting Impact: AFF's export numbers are meaningless because they don't relate to the actual harms

Sources the AFF is citing are citing a total number of pounds we export and then citing people being harmed. But the harms aren't necessarily coming from the chemicals exported from the United States. The evidence we cited here shows the Yaqui Indians in Mexico testing positive and potentially being harmed by pesticides, but they're pesticides that haven't been exported from the US for decades. Their harms, if there are any, are coming from pesticides they import from somewhere else, or else from soil contamination that occurred many decades ago and maybe is still persisting in their environment. In any case, their case and plan have nothing to do with the cause or the solution of these harms.

AFF has to not only prove that we export lots of pesticides and that people in poor countries are harmed. They have to prove that the specific pesticides we export are the ones causing those harms, and that the harms aren't being caused by stuff they're importing from other countries, like must be the case in Mexico from the evidence their own plan is citing. For example, those pesticides may have come from Europe, as we see when we look at the Affirmative's evidence in…

2. AFF's "Center for International Environmental Law" evidence applies to Europe

CIEL study of harmful exported pesticides is only about Europe. It documents zero harms from US exports

(AFF Source) Center for International Environmental Law 2022. The Export of Banned Pesticides to Africa and Central America 26 Sept 2022 (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://www.ciel.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Legal-Analysis\_Exports-of-Banned-Pesticides\_FINAL.pdf

This legal analysis examines the legality of exports of banned or unapproved pesticides from Europe (the EU, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) to Parties to the Bamako Convention in Africa and to the Central American Agreement.

3. A/T "Pesticide Action Network" (PAN) evidence

 Response #1: No link to exports.

The P.A.N. article doesn’t mention that any of the many cases of pesticide poisoning were caused by any exports from the United States

Response #2: Suicides. AFF's PAN article cites a PAN paper that goes on to say 2/3 of pesticide harms in poor countries are suicides. (1 million unintentional poisonings and 2 million intentional self-harm)

 **PAN quotes a study by Boedeker, Watts, Clausing and Marquez in 2020 that says:**

(AFF Source) [Wolfgang Boedeker](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Wolfgang-Boedeker),  [Meriel Watts](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Meriel-Watts),  [Peter Clausing](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Peter-Clausing) &  [Emily Marquez](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Emily-Marquez) 2020.(all are with Pesticide Action Network ) "The global distribution of acute unintentional pesticide poisoning: estimations based on a systematic review" 7 Dec 2020 BMC PUBLIC HEALTH (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0

Human poisoning by pesticides has long been seen as a severe public health problem. As early as 1990, a task force of the World Health Organization (WHO) estimated that about one million unintentional pesticides poisonings with severe manifestations occur annually, leading to approximately 20,000 deaths. Additionally, two million cases were expected to result from intentional self-harm.

Response #3: Real problem is safety equipment. PAN says pesticides are bad because poor countries in hot climates don't have or won't use safety equipment

**But of course, that means the AFF Plan won't solve because there are no safe alternatives. All pesticides, imported or not, are going to cause the same problems**

(AFF Source) [Wolfgang Boedeker](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Wolfgang-Boedeker),  [Meriel Watts](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Meriel-Watts),  [Peter Clausing](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Peter-Clausing) &  [Emily Marquez](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Emily-Marquez) 2020.(all are with Pesticide Action Network ) "The global distribution of acute unintentional pesticide poisoning: estimations based on a systematic review" 7 Dec 2020 BMC PUBLIC HEALTH (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0

Realizing that the conditions of use in developing countries are such that toxic pesticides cannot be used safely, the FAO/WHO International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management states that “Pesticides whose handling and application require the use of personal protective equipment that is uncomfortable, expensive or not readily available should be avoided, especially in the case of small-scale users and farm workers in hot climates”.

Response #4: Bad poisoning statistics - No definition. PAN admits inside their own study that there's no accurate definition of pesticide poisoning

(AFF Source) [Wolfgang Boedeker](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Wolfgang-Boedeker),  [Meriel Watts](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Meriel-Watts),  [Peter Clausing](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Peter-Clausing) &  [Emily Marquez](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Emily-Marquez) 2020.(all are with Pesticide Action Network ) "The global distribution of acute unintentional pesticide poisoning: estimations based on a systematic review" 7 Dec 2020 BMC PUBLIC HEALTH (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0

There is no generally agreed understanding of what constitutes acute pesticide poisoning. Studies often refer to a classification tool provided by the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS), which was hosted by the WHO. An acute pesticide poisoning by the IFCS definition is any illness or health effect resulting from suspected or confirmed exposure to a pesticide within 48 h. Clinical presentations and symptoms of poisoning were tabulated by this tool. The chosen latency period from exposure to onset of symptoms is decisive for case identification and comes as a trade-off, especially as unspecific symptoms like headache or nausea are also recognized as exposure effects. A too-short period might exclude symptoms with longer latency, while a too-long period could lead to the recognition of poisoning by symptoms that might have resulted from other causes.

Response #5. Bad poisoning statistics - Inconsistent data. PAN admits in their own study that they used vague, inaccurate, inconsistent and improper data collection on alleged victims

**They even admit at one point that a placebo group (a group not exposed to anything) reported the same symptoms as the pesticide "victims" group**

(AFF Source) [Wolfgang Boedeker](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Wolfgang-Boedeker),  [Meriel Watts](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Meriel-Watts),  [Peter Clausing](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Peter-Clausing) &  [Emily Marquez](https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0#auth-Emily-Marquez) 2020.(all are with Pesticide Action Network ) "The global distribution of acute unintentional pesticide poisoning: estimations based on a systematic review" 7 Dec 2020 BMC PUBLIC HEALTH (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-09939-0

 Prevalence of skin related problems was highest in the 18 months exposure group (50%), in contrast to those exposed for 12 months (13%) or for 6 months of exposure (8%). However, no information was given on how often or to what extent pesticides were used in those periods. Kofod et al. question the validity of self-reported symptoms as a proxy for acute organophosphate poisonings. The authors found a high prevalence of nonspecific symptoms, taken from a standardized list of clinical presentations, in the intervention group (chlorpyrifos application) as well as in the placebo group (neem application). The study also found no difference in biomarker plasma cholinesterase (PchE) activity between the groups and after intervention. A surprisingly high percentage of the farmers reported symptoms for a seven-day period which was thought to be a “washout” period without any pesticide exposure.” In summary, it is difficult to assess the influence of different study characteristics on our estimations because most studies gave no clear case definitions and timeframes.

4. A/T Affirmative's "FMC / Lee Morrisroe evidence" about "illegal pesticides"

FMC/Morrisroe evidence isn't talking about the pesticides in their plan: It's about pesticides that are illegal in the country where they are being used, not the country from which they are being exported

**In fact, the word "export" doesn't even occur anywhere in the article.**

(AFF Source) Lee Morrisroe at FMC agricultural sciences company 2021. "Environmental Impact of Illegal Pesticides" 29 Apr 2021" (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://www.fmc.com/en/environmental-impact-of-illegal-pesticides

Currently, there is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes an illegal pesticide. However, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Best Practice Guidance (BPG) to Identify Illegal Trade of Pesticides has attempted to define an illegal pesticide as "any pesticide product that is not legal in the country where it is placed on the market.”

5. Pesticides on US food are harmless (A/T "circle of poison")

**This is in response to the theory that the US exports dangerous pesticides, they get sprayed on crops, then that food gets imported back to the US and we eat the dangerous pesticides. Happily, that's not the case because the food is tested, and we know what pesticides are in it.**

FDA study finds the most common pesticides found on food are: azoxystrobin, imidacloprid, boscalid and neonicotinoids

Martha Garcia 2022 (journalist) 18 Aug 2022 "FDA Report Finds Pesticide Levels Higher in Imported Food Than in Domestic" (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://www.aboutlawsuits.com/fda-pesticides-in-food-report/

The FDA tested for 750 different pesticides and industrial compounds on 2,078 human food samples. The agency collected samples from human food samples from 35 states and 79 countries. In total, 185 different pesticides were detected in food samples during testing. The most common was the fungicide azoxystrobin, which was found 146 times, as well as imidacloprid, found 143 times, and the fungicide boscalid, found 124 times. Additionally, neonicotinoids, compounds known to kill bees, made up three of the 10 most commonly detected chemicals in food samples.

Affirmative burden: Prove these are harmful

Since AFF claims harm from imported food pesticides, they need to name which pesticides are causing the harm and what those harms are. AFF has the burden to read evidence showing any of these 4 pesticides are harmful to anyone, or have harmed anyone in the United States.

6. No harm from imported food, even if it has pesticides (A/T "circle of poison" theory)

Imported food containing excessive pesticide residues is refused at the border

Renee Johnson 2020 (Specialist in Agricultural Policy with Congressional Research Service) 1 July 2020 U.S. Food and Agricultural Imports: Safeguards and Selected Issues (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R46440/2

Data on FDA import refusals by food group indicate that fish and seafood, vegetables and fruits, and spices accounted for more than half of all import refusals during 2005-2013 (Figure 12). Most produce refusals were due to violative residues (such as pesticides); filth, microbial pathogens, and bacterial contamination (mostly Salmonella); and improper documentation. Import violations involving produce were mostly from Mexico and other Latin America and Caribbean nations.

US Dept of Agriculture (USDA) knows what pesticides are in imported food and enforces safety standards

Renee Johnson 2020 (Specialist in Agricultural Policy with Congressional Research Service) 1 July 2020 U.S. Food and Agricultural Imports: Safeguards and Selected Issues (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R46440/2 (brackets added)

MRLs [maximum residue levels] often vary among countries given different food safety regulations and perceived risks, which can result in differences in import requirements across countries, complicating international trade. USDA maintains a database of MRL standards on imported food products to help ensure that the imports are free from contaminants. USDA’s database specifies maximum acceptable levels of pesticides and veterinary drugs in food and agricultural products in the United States and many of its trading partners. It includes MRLs for fruit, vegetable, and nut commodities and pesticides approved for use on those commodities by EPA.

7. Good reasons for different pesticides in foreign countries

There are good reasons other countries use pesticides differently from the U.S.: their climates and ecosystems are different

Dr Dave Stone and Dr Jason Sandahl 2022 (both are PhDs) 11 Oct 2022 "Demystifying Pesticide Residues" (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://www.food-safety.com/articles/8049-demystifying-pesticide-residues (brackets added)

A key factor contributing to non-harmonized MRLs [maximum residue levels] is that countries have different climates and agroecosystems. Thus, they may have very different pests, pest pressures, crops, rainfall patterns, and agricultural practices, which can result in the establishment of a pesticide application regimen with high variations between countries, and consequently, different MRLs. What is common among MRLs, however, is that they all meet the safe toxicological requirements for the population of the country.

SOLVENCY

1. Weak US regulations

The EPA doesn't ban many pesticides. The rest of the world already has stricter standards than we do

Nathan Donley 2022 (Environmental Health Science Director - Center for Biological Diversity) 29 Sept 2022 "How the EPA’s lax regulation of dangerous pesticides is hurting public health and the US economy" (accessed 19 Jan 2023) https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-the-epas-lax-regulation-of-dangerous-pesticides-is-hurting-public-health-and-the-us-economy/

Throughout the years, the intense political pressure put on the EPA’s pesticide office and the popular trend of many of the agency’s employees going to work for the pesticide industry had tangible consequences. The result is a pesticide regulator that has been increasingly unable to say “no” to any pesticide even when compelling independent research demonstrated the pesticide to have troubling health risks. As a direct result of the EPA’s laissez-faire regulatory approach, in 2019 the U.S. used over 70 agricultural pesticides that were banned in the European Union, amounting to 322 million pounds used each year.  That means over a quarter of all U.S. agricultural pesticide use was from pesticides that all EU member states have prohibited.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Environmental imperialism

Link: Importing countries know the risks and have their own regulations on pesticide imports

Ishmael Kosamu, Chikumbusko Kaonga and Wells Utembe 2020. (Kosamu - Department of Physics and Biochemical Sciences, The Polytechnic, University of Malawi. Kaonga - Department of Physics and Biochemical Sciences, The Polytechnic, University of Malawi. Utembe - Toxicology and Biochemistry Department, National Institute for Occupational Health, Johannesburg, South Africa ) " A Critical Review of the Status of Pesticide Exposure Management in Malawi" Sept 2020 (accessed 19 Jan 2023) https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7557847/

The use of unregistered pesticides as well as very hazardous pesticides (World Health Organization (WHO) class I and II pesticides) has been reported in many countries including Nigeria, Ethiopia, South Africa and Ghana. Smallholder and commercial farmers in these countries utilize these pesticides in large amounts, with little regard to human health and the environment. In order to avoid adverse effects of pesticides on humans and the environment, many countries, including Malawi, have adopted mechanisms for managing and controlling pesticides. These mechanisms include, inter alia, legislative and regulatory mechanisms, risk assessment and registration, testing of pesticide residues in food, as well as reporting and surveillance of pesticide poisoning cases.

Link: Importing countries make rational decisions on pesticides. They don't just blindly accept everything. It's environmental imperialism to assume they can't

Gerald R. Prout 1992. (executive at FMC chemical corporation) Politically Correcting Pesticide Exports, REGULATION, Spring 1992 (accessed 19 Jan 2023) https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/regulation/1992/4/v15n2-2.pdf

In attempting to control those termite scourges, developing countries have traditionally turned to the use of pesticides known as organochlorines. But recently some of those products, such as aldrin and dieldrin, have come under question and have been banned outright for use in some countries. In light of those circumstances, the Zambian government chose to use the unregistered U.S. product carbosulfan, which it regarded as safe to users and the environment, in its reforestation effort. Other developing nations have also considered environmental, climatic, soil, and pest conditions as well as human health and safety needs to determine the appropriateness of using specific pesticides. Those decisions belie the environmental imperialists' concept of the underdeveloped nations' capacity to make informed judgments for themselves. For example, a registration application for the very same carbosulfan was denied in Malaysia owing to specific concerns regarding its impact on their unique environment. Thus, the decision to allow or disallow the use of a pesticide in less developed countries is not, as some in the advanced countries would have us believe, based simply on product efficacy.

Link: Eco-imperialism. Exporting our environmental beliefs to poor countries is eco-imperialism and violates their right to self-determination

Lipton Matthews 2021. (researcher, business analyst, and contributor to *Merion West*, *The Federalist*, *American Thinker*, Intellectual Takeout, mises.org, and *Imaginative Conservative*) 3 Aug 2021 "Eco-imperialism: The West's New Kind of Colonialism" (accessed 19 Jan 2023) https://mises.org/wire/eco-imperialism-wests-new-kind-colonialism?gclid=Cj0KCQiA8aOeBhCWARIsANRFrQFu8uJ9coB8BwZKLPtkFd9wYTWQ6SWeV7-Qt1YvXgMuyZYqG3LE8skaAth\_EALw\_wcB

Yet the West continues a form a colonialism in Africa: eco-imperialism. Because the West’s progressives like this kind of imperialism, we rarely hear anything about it. Reasonable people do believe that developing countries have a right to self-determination, yet the eco-imperialist agenda of the West has failed to invite equal venom. In other words, the West has shown it has every intention of meddling in the internal affairs of developing nations in the name of environmentalism.

Impact: Poor countries can't afford the good intentions of rich countries, and the risk of starvation outweighs

Paul Driessen 2003 ( BA in geology and field ecology from Lawrence University, JD from Univ. of Denver College of Law, senior policy advisor with Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, nonprofit public policy institutes that focus on energy, the environment, economic development and international affairs) ECO-IMPERIALISM: Green Power - Black Death https://jeffersonamericas.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Driessen01.pdf (brackets and ellipses in original)(accessed 20 Jan 2023)

No longer must regulators demonstrate that a new technology is likely to cause harm. Instead, the innovator must now prove the technology will not cause any harm. Worse, “regulatory bodies are free to arbitrarily require any amount and kind of testing they wish…. [T]he biosafety protocol establishes an ill-defined global regulatory process that permits overly risk-averse, incompetent, and corrupt regulators to hide behind the precautionary principle in delaying or deferring approvals,” they charge, as in the case of a years-long moratorium on EU approvals of gene-spliced plants. The principle imposes the ideologies and unfounded phobias of affluent First World activists, to justify severe restrictions on the use of chemicals, pesticides, fossil fuels and biotechnology by Third World people who can least afford them. Opposition to biotechnology is “a northern luxury,” says Kenyan agronomist Dr. Florence Wambugu. “I appreciate ethical concerns, but anything that doesn’t help feed our children is unethical.”

Impact: Increased risk of conflict. Disrespecting national sovereignty increases backlash and conflict

Prof. Stephen M. Walt 2020 (professor of international relations at Harvard Univ.) “Countries Should Mind Their Own Business” July 17, 2020 ​​<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/07/17/sovereignty-exceptionalism-countries-should-mind-their-own-business/> Accessed: September 7, 2022.

 “Second, trying to impose a single model on other countries inevitably raises threat perceptions and increases the risk of serious great-power conflict. The Westphalian idea of sovereignty was created in part to address this problem: Instead of continuing to fight over which version of Christianity would hold sway in different countries (one of the key drivers of the wars that preceded the Westphalian peace), European states agreed to let each ruler determine the religious orientation of their realm. Similarly, a powerful state’s efforts to shape the domestic arrangements of another country will inevitably be seen as threatening by the target: Just look at how Americans now react to the possibility of Russian interference in our political system.”

2. Pesticide resistance

Link: AFF reduces the choices of pesticides available

If not, their plan accomplishes nothing.

Link: Reduced diversity choice of pesticides leads to increased pesticide resistance, which leads to increased amount of pesticides used

Emily Smith 2007. (journalist) 19 Sept 2007 "Second chemicals battle looms over pesticides" POLITICO (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://www.politico.eu/article/second-chemicals-battle-looms-over-pesticides/ (brackets added)

Today, said [European farmers' association Copa-Cogeca spokesperson Simon] Michel-Berger, farmers want to keep the use of pesticides low, in response to consumer demand for environmentally-friendly crop production and low trace levels of chemicals in food. Farmers do not spray large amounts of generic pesticides across crops, he said, but blend targeted amounts of different chemicals to deal with specific problems. Reducing the number of pesticide chemicals available for blending would, according to Copa-Cogeca, dramatically increase the chances of plants developing resistance to treatment and increase the amount of pesticide necessary to wipe out problems.

Impact: Pesticide resistance causes even more of the harms in the AFF case, plus some new ones

**Tom Hunt, Robert Wright and Julie Peterson 2015. (Hunt - Extension Entomologist, Univ. of Nebraska, Haskell Ag Lab. Wright - Extension Entomologist, Lincoln, Nebraska. Peterson - Extension Entomologist, West Central Research & Extension Center)30 Apr 2015 "**Understanding and Slowing the Further Development of Pesticide Resistance" (accessed 20 Jan 2023)https://cropwatch.unl.edu/understanding-and-slowing-further-development-pesticide-resistance

The effects of pesticide resistance are far-reaching, resulting in increased management costs as well as increased risk of environmental contamination and pesticide exposure to humans and other non-target organisms.  In fact, it has such negative worldwide impact that the United Nations Environmental Program has listed pesticide resistance as the third most serious threat to global agriculture behind soil erosion and water pollution.

3. Distracts from bigger threats

Alcohol would be banned if it were a pesticide because it causes the same harms. Focus on banning pesticides distracts us from bigger threats and better solutions

Emily Smith 2007. (journalist) 19 Sept 2007 "Second chemicals battle looms over pesticides" POLITICO (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://www.politico.eu/article/second-chemicals-battle-looms-over-pesticides/ (brackets added)

“Alcohol is a carcinogen, mutagen and a reproductive toxin, but people drink it,” he [Euros Jones, with the European Crop Protection Association] said. “Yet if alcohol was a pesticide we wouldn’t be allowed to use it for fear of traces ending up in food.” Instead of introducing new bans, said Jones, the EU should focus on enforcing the existing risk and exposure-based approach to pesticide control.

Pesticide debate is a distraction from the real environmental impacts of agriculture because it has so little impact

Marc Brazeau 2018 (**Genetic Literacy Project senior contributing writer focusing on agricultural biotechnology. He also is the editor of Food and Farm Discussion Lab** ) 25 May 2018 " Organic vs conventional food fight: Focus on pesticides distracts from real environmental problems" (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://geneticliteracyproject.org/2018/05/25/organic-vs-conventional-food-fight-focus-on-pesticides-distracts-from-real-environmental-problems/

One of the things that has really begun to stand out in the debate between advocates of technologically progressive agriculture and the critics of technological agriculture is the persistence of the idea that the use of pesticides is still a major problem, if not the central environmental impact of agriculture, that needs to be addressed. This is unfortunate. It’s just not accurate. It’s a cul-de-sac in the discussion about how to improve the environmental footprint of agriculture. It’s a distraction from the addressing the major environmental impacts.

4. Reduced fruit & vegetable consumption

Scaring people about pesticides leads to reduced consumption of fresh produce, increasing risk of obesity, heart disease and cancer

Hillary Kaufman 2020 (food industry journalist) 24 July 2020 "Viewpoint: Pesticides on produce aren’t dangerous. Ignore the ‘Dirty Dozen’ and eat more fruits and veggies" (accessed 20 Jan 2023) https://geneticliteracyproject.org/2020/07/24/viewpoint-pesticides-on-produce-arent-dangerous-ignore-the-dirty-dozen-and-eat-more-fruits-and-veggies/

The [USDA’s food desert map](https://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/food-access-research-atlas/go-to-the-atlas.aspx#.UbEgVGRATfE) examines lower-income and lower-access locations where people live far from a supermarket. EWG’s message particularly preys on these shoppers. In a [peer-reviewed study in the journal, Nutrition Today](https://journals.lww.com/nutritiontodayonline/Fulltext/2016/09000/Low_Income_Shoppers_and_Fruit_and_Vegetables__What.6.aspx), researchers found that low-income participants preferred not to buy produce at all – neither organic nor conventional – when informed of specific fruits & veggies with pesticides, putting this group at greater risk of obesity, heart disease, and cancer.