Ethics Paper 3 Guidelines: Water: Human Right or Private Commodity?

Paper Topic: Water: Human Right or Private Commodity? The focus of the paper is an ethical analysis and evaluation of the plight of the indigenous people of Bolivia (Andes Mountains and lowlands) as a consequence of water depletion due to glacial melting. The case involves the effort of the Bolivian government, the International Monetary Fund and the US owned Bechtel Corporation to privatize water services in the Cochabamba region of Bolivia.

PAPER ORGANIZATION AND REQUIRED COMPONENTS:

1. Introduction. Describe the situation or problem. Clearly identify the following for the reader: What is the problem, Where, Who are the principal parties, Which proposals or solutions---What is the view of Water that the different parties/solutions hold (human right or economic commodity) Include pertinent background information about Bolivia and its inhabitants. Keep this short, do make it the major part of the paper. (You will need to refer to and incorporate the background information into your discussion below)

2. Identify the principal moral issue(s): you may identify both a major issue and attendant or related issues

BEGIN ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF PRO (Human Right / public resource) and CON (economic commodity/private management) positions on water access. Although this is a global issue, focus on this particular case.

3. Identify the ethical/moral systems that best fit with each position/party. Provide a reasoned argument to support your assessment (would Individual Ethical Egoism readily apply to someone who views water as a human right?) Discuss/explain how these systems reflect social, economic, and other factors.

4. Identify and explain the view of “human rights” and “justice” that both pro and con positions hold with respect to water. Distinguish among the views held by (a) indigenous people (b) international organizations such as the UN and (c) international economic organizations/businesses. Explain or clarify the underlying philosophical, cultural, economic systems or values that shape specific views

5. Explain how ideas of “moral responsibility” adopted by the various parties, including indigenous communities, are shaped by underlying views of (a) free will versus determinism and (b) relativism versus absolutism and (c)human versus nature. You must define the terms that you employ and support their application by drawing directly from the case material.

6. Conclusion: Your reflection on the case. If you had the authority to act, how would you respond to Bolivia’s water problem and the global problem in general? What factors would you most consider, physical, cultural, et., and why? On what moral system and meta-ethical considerations do you base your judgment.
REQUIRED READING and VIEWING


## Ethics Case Study Paper Grading Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Content / Issues and parties involved</td>
<td>Clearly understands fundamental facts; integrates background information, and identifies major elements of the case</td>
<td>Reasonable understanding of fundamental facts and elements of the case; some background information</td>
<td>Some grasp of fundamental facts; background information; reports empirical facts without reflection</td>
<td>Displays an inaccurate and superficial understanding of the material;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Assessment of Issues: Identification and application of theories and concepts</td>
<td>Clear identification of moral issues; insightful application of theories and concepts; clear definition and explanation of terms</td>
<td>Reasonable identification of moral issues, careful; less insightful application of theories and concepts</td>
<td>Minimal identification of moral issues, does not define terms, limited application of theories and concepts; tends to report rather than analyze</td>
<td>Minimal identification of moral issues; displays little understanding of concepts, theories and material; little to no objectivity; forum for personal opinions and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of cultural, economic and environmental factors; social implications ethical concerns</td>
<td>Good understanding of cultura, economic and environmental factors as applied to this case and how it relates to other communities and societies</td>
<td>Reasonable understanding of factors as applied to this case; some awareness of broader implications</td>
<td>Some understanding of these factors as they applied to the case; some awareness of wider implications; reports more than reflects and integrates into assessment</td>
<td>Little or no understanding of the factors; repeats ideas and information culled from the readings; personal opinions and values minimize importance of contextual factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of global crisis and global economic factors that make water an issue of moral concern</td>
<td>Good understanding of the global problem and factors; good grasp of underlying philosophical and moral differences thoughtful perspective about long-term factors.</td>
<td>Awareness of global problem; grasp of underlying philosophical and moral differences; some perspective on long term factors</td>
<td>Aware of problem in some regions; minimal grasp of underlying philosophical and moral differences; minimal consideration of long term factors</td>
<td>Aware of problem in some regions; no understanding of underlying philosophical and moral differences; no consideration of long term factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>Effective and persuasive supporting lines of thought and arguments</td>
<td>Reasonable presentation lines of thought and arguments</td>
<td>Minimal presentation and ineffective supporting arguments</td>
<td>Viewpoint and supporting lines of thought are not presented or evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence, Composition, use of sources</td>
<td>Very thoughtful, well organized essay; meets or exceeds scholarly writing standard; excellent resource use</td>
<td>Reasonably thought out and organized essay; scholarly writing needs work; some resource use</td>
<td>Some organization; provides information without reflection; writing is informal; minimal resource use</td>
<td>Essay does not meet college level writing disorganized and/or off-topic; does not indicate focused perusal of any material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Case Examined

The glaciers in the Andes mountains that supplied fresh water to the ecosystems and inhabitants of Bolivia for millennia, have melted and disappeared to the point of bare trickles. Both the indigenous highland people of Bolivia and other inhabitants faced water shortages for decades. In an ever-expanding, world economy, the distribution of any resource does not come without some degree of compromise or public debate. Water supply and accessibility was addressed in 1999 when the World Bank and a large United States privately owned water company, Bechtel Corporation made a proposal to the Bolivian government for privatized water control and distribution. The World Bank threatened to withhold 600 million dollars in debt relief if Bolivia didn’t privatize Cochabamba’s public water system (Shiva, 2002). In October 1999 the Bolivian Congress passed the Drinking Water and Sanitation Law, allowing privatization and ending government subsidies to municipal utilities (VanOverbeke, 2004).

Following the passage of Bolivia’s new water laws, Bechtel soon privatized the Cochabamba water systems that drew water from the increasingly arid Andes highlands for distribution the lowland cities of La Paz and its surrounding poor rural areas. The prices of the privatized water however were not affordable for most of the poor indigenous people of Bolivia. Bechtel charged as much as twenty dollars per month, in a region where average income was about one-hundred dollars per month (VanOverbeke, 2003). Instead of resolving the problem of dwindling water supply among the various urban, rural, and highland communities, the western economic model of privatization of a public resource deepened the crisis. As a result, after two years of protest, where hundreds were injured and several killed, against the government and the multi-national corporation, Bechtel was forced out of Bolivia, but without a reformed water system.
According to the CIA World Factbook, Bolivia has the largest proportion of indigenous people in South America. More than 60% of Bolivia's population is indigenous. According to the World Bank, 64% of Bolivia’s indigenous population lives below the poverty line. Nearly 50% of its non-indigenous population also live in poverty. Glaciers compose the entirety of Bolivia’s fresh water supply, and it has nearly reached the point of full depletion In Bolivia, 24% of the rural population has access to water services and 39% of the rural population has access to sewage disposal and sanitation services. (Visionvictory, 2011).

These statistics, however, do not provide a complete picture of Bolivia especially with respect to the lives and customs of the people most affected by the water crisis. Since the arrival of European Spaniards to what is now Bolivia, the indigenous people of both the Andes mountains and the lowlands have been oppressed and marginalized by their conquerors. The Indians were recognized as citizens by governing elites as long as they did not threaten the authority and economic interests of the non-indigenous government elites. (Frankel, 2011). Many indigenous people survived by retreating to areas that were not settled by the Spanish people. They were able to live because they held on to their own traditional values. For example, the Aymara Indians, the society from which new president of Bolivia, Evo Morales, comes have lived in solidarity and reciprocity with community and environment for a thousand years. They had an economy that focused on the ideas of “living well” within the community and the larger natural environment. (Frankel, 2011).

For North Americans “living well” means having all the things of a consumer society, and people who do not have those things must live in poverty. Communities living in the Andean highlands had adapted their agriculture and living conditions to an environment that sustained them. They did not need swimming pools or dishwashers to live well, they just needed water. The melting of the glaciers in the Andes Mountains, means that millions of indigenous people will experience water deprivation, dislocation and cultural death. The idea that these problems could best be resolved through Bechtel’s “free market” approach to water shows just how complex the global water shortage water has become.

**Ethical Problems and Systems**
In July 2010, the UN General Assembly declared access to clean water and sewage facilities to be a human right. This means that all people, regardless of the ability to pay for water, have an unconditional right to access. The moral position of the UN and many other agencies is based on a biological reality: Life equals Water. On this planet the survival of humanity and other living things is absolutely dependent on water. A human being has approximately three days to live without water, so individual water demand is not a negotiable need. The right to water is inseparable from the right to life.

The ethical dilemma presented by the Bolivian water crisis is the fair distribution of a life sustaining resource. The problem of fairness in the face of scarcity, brings up other moral issues such as the nature of human rights, individual responsibility, and the survival of cultural communities. The questions that need to be addressed are: Who determines which people get access to water and how? Should water be treated like any other market commodity? What is "responsible" use of water? How much is it ethical to use and for what purposes?

On an individual basis, most people believe they should be able to access the essential commodities required for life. The debate in both ethics and societies at large centers on the manner in which people can, or cannot obtain, these resources. In western societies, especially the United States, the political and economic system work to promote an ethic of “individual responsibility.” This is sometimes promoted as a non-consequentialist system of morality based on Kantian principles or Christian morality. But the moral system actually practiced by those who promote “individual responsibility” is more like that of Individual Ethical Egoism, where the needs of individual must never yield to the interests of others unless there is direct benefit. (Mackinnon, 2012) According to The Culture of Capitalism, the radical individualism of corporations like Bechtel requires that everyone and everything serve its best interest or profit. (Appleby, 2010). If profit can be made by privatizing and selling anything, including the air we breathe, then the method and action are morally good.

In contrast to the Individual Ethical Egoism system of morality, Utilitarianism does not focus on the primacy of the individual but on the group or society as a whole. It is a western system of ethics that represents a departure from previous theories and is often associated by Americans with
socialism. Utilitarian ethics holds that an action is good if it tends to benefit the majority of people and bad if it increases harm among the majority of members of society. (Mackinnon, 2012). Since the actions of the Bechtel corporation resulted in harm to thousands of people who could not afford to pay the high prices, then it was immoral. The fact that the owners and investors benefitted and that the more affluent residents of La Paz could afford it does not justify the harm to the majority.

With the stress on social responsibility and communal benefits, Utilitarian ethics comes closer to the holistic communal systems of morality practiced by the indigenous societies of Columbia than either Kantian or Virtue ethics. But there is still a critical difference between systems of morality and anthropocentric religions that place the welfare of humans at the center of moral concern and non-western philosophical systems that revere the totality of the environment. For the indigenous societies of Bolivia water is more than an instrumental human necessity, it belongs to the earth, all its places, and is sacred to all life. (Shahriari, 2012) For the Aymara Indians, it is an intrinsic good like the mountains themselves, it is not something to be conquered, manipulated and made to serve the sole interest of man.

*End-Result versus Process Distributive Justice; Positive versus Negative Justice*

Underlying the different ethical views of water as a public good or private resource, are ideological differences in the ideas of justice, free-will and determinism, positive versus negative rights, absolutism versus relativism, and cultural versus universal values.

The elaborate fountains and swimming pools in the westernized, rich neighborhoods of La Paz show that cultural values always influence water use decisions. The dominant value system in water privatization and management is based on capitalist economic logic. The economic logic of the Bechtel corporation views water as an economic good and the private market as "an important way of achieving efficient and equitable use, and of encouraging conservation and protection of water resources." (Water Culture Institute, 2012) Corporations such as Bechtel embrace and promote Capitalism as cultural system of belief. Like most other systems of belief, it attempts to justify its behavior and the consequences of that behavior.
Bechtel claimed that its purchase of the Cochabamba water plant was justified because it was legally available in the free-market and it presented an opportunity for profit. Its argument rests on a particular idea of justice, that of process distributive justice. (Mackinnon, 2012) Process distributive justice is only concerned with the fairness of rules or laws of the game; if all interested parties have an equal right to participate and compete in an activity, in this case a commercial activity, then the individual who puts in the most effort or money is entitled to win and has a moral right to the prize. Since the government of Bolivia permitted Bechtel to purchase stakes in the country’s water supply system, Bechtel committed no wrong. Bechtel did not steal water from the Bolivian people, it bought rights to water from the legal representative of the people. However, the conditions the Bolivians were under, according to both the United Nations and the indigenous population, are one of many fallacies in Bechtel’s perspective (VanOverbeke, 2003).

Both the United Nations and Bolivians abide by process distributive justice and also end result justice. End-result justice focuses on just that: the end-result of policies and actions, how these affected all parties involved, especially the most vulnerable citizens. The actions of the The World Bank, the Bolivian government and Bechtel had a very negative effect on the majority of Bolivians. End result justice requires that life-sustaining resources reach all people in need, not just those who can pay for them. This idea of justice is shared by Utilitarian ethics and the communitarian ethics of indigenous people of Bolivia.

The idea of justice requires that people get what they rightfully deserve, but what quantifies as a ‘right’ and who defines it? Most capitalistic enterprises [Bechtel included] operate under the Libertarian idea of negative rights. (MacKinnon, 2012). In other words, negative rights are basically the right to be left alone by government and other entities; the is view holds that a product, such as water, that is acquired through individual labor or payment, belongs exclusively to the owner. Although other people may need it, the owner must not be forged by government or any other agent to provide it. This “‘hands-off’ view natural liberties is reducible to this, people have a right to life, but they do not have a right to the resources that sustain life. According to this view, water holds an economic instrumental value, it is inherent human right.
Unlike negative rights, positive rights take into consideration the fact that humans are not isolated beings, they are social beings born into natural social groups. In all social groups, the right to life comes with obligations to others. If there were no obligation to other members, the group would cease to exist. In this social animal sense, each member of the group has both a natural right to water and an obligation to share water. According to the UN and many humanitarian agencies, the obligation of the group, even at the global level, extends to provision of food, shelter, and the basic necessities of life. In addition to liberty, access to material necessities and especially water, are human rights that do not disappear because of economic systems. (MacKinnon, 2012).

Free-Will versus Determinism; Absolutism versus Relativism; Ethical Perspectivism

The notion that society should provide for its poor or those who ‘lack’ basic resources fits with the principles utilitarianism. Utilitarianism holds that society should prioritize the maximization of pleasure and reduction of pain at a universal level. (MacKinnon, 2012). Utilitarianism allows for the fact that many factors can prevent people from being in control or having the ability to act on their own behalf. Physical determinism led to the melting of the Andean glaciers not the irresponsible choices and action of indigenous people. They are therefore not morally responsible for the situation. The government of Bolivia on the other hand has an obligation to assist them and to protect them from exploitation.

Bechtel and the culture of capitalism promote the opposite view, the libertarian “free-will” position. It holds that the individual is entirely responsible for his own actions and free to make choices. (MacKinnon, 2012) The free-market libertarians also support a Social Darwinism approach to economics. They argue, as Bechtel did, that it is the individual’s responsibility to adjust to changes in the markets. If an indigenous Bolivian cannot produce the means or money to survive in the marketplace, then he must do without or leave the system. In keeping with the ethics of Individual Egoism, the culture of capitalism shifts the blame for the water crisis on the indigenous people of Bolivia. It ultimately requires them to abandon their culture if they wish to survive in the culture of a
global capitalist economy. There is no consideration of global responsibility for the melting of the glaciers, or of the fact that capitalist producer and consumer societies might be at fault. The position of corporations such as Bechtel is both absolutist and relativist. It is relativist in excusing its own actions in Bolivia, and absolutist in maintaining that the culture of capitalism must apply globally to all individuals and and cultures. Under this profit driven absolutist lens, corporations that privatize water will win whereas the of Bolivia will ultimately lose (Visionvictory, 2011).

**Concluding Statement**

Once the glaciers in the Bolivian Andes are depleted, they are gone forever. The resulting human, social, and economic distress could be catastrophic for the region for generations to come. Under the presidency of Evo Morales, the government has assumed responsibility for the distribution of water to the people. It has also put the survival of indigenous societies and ways of life above the transnational corporations. Morales has blended the social ethic of Utilitarianism with the indigenous ethic of communitarianism and reciprocity. (Frankel, 2011) The attitude toward water as a shared public good and human necessity also fits the United Nation’s idea of water as a universal human right.

It may seem that these humanitarian and communitarian principles can not co-exist with those of the free-market, and that Bolivia’s water crisis will only get worse. But in spite of fundamental differences among ethical systems and cultures, the need for a common solution to a common problem allows for a compromise. Even an ethical egoist can not survive without water and no amount of utilitarian social concern will bring back the Andean glaciers. It is not necessary to adopt the holistic morality of an indigenous culture to understand that present practices and uses of the earth’s resources are not sustainable. If only for absolutely selfish reasons, an informed ethical egoist would encourage others to live within the earth’s means in much the same way that the natives of Bolivia did for thousands of years.

Instead of pushing Bolivia into a global market economy, it makes more sense to push for preservation of non-consumerist societies. It also makes sense for public and private groups to work together. In countries such as Bolivia where water is very scarce, a solution could be to publicly assist
and protect traditional communities that do not over-consume resources while establishing private-public partnerships that serve the urban areas. Like other countries, Bolivia will have to resort to sea water purification. This is not an easy or free process. The production and delivery of fresh water for millions of people takes resources and labor. The government of Bolivia knows this, just as it knows that global warming has irreparably changed the Andes. The right thing for the Morales government to do would be to re-negotiate with private individuals (engineers) and companies for development of desalination plants. Although the experience with privatization in Bolivia resulted in more harm than good, it does not prove that all privatization is bad or excessively exploitative. At the same time, the public ownership of a decreasing resource will not bring back the Andean glaciers.

Citations


Additional Sources

Ethics Case Study Paper “C” level Sample (underlining, strike-outs, and italics the instructor’s)

Water: Human Right or Private Commodity?

Water is essential life. Humans cannot live without water. Up to 60 percent of the human body is made up of water, water is essential to life. Unfortunately not all people are able to get access to water. Large corporations such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund want to privatize water in countries where the glaciers and other sources of water are disappearing. One such country is Bolivia where the snow in the Andes mountains that provided fresh water to the people has disappeared. This has affected almost all of the people of Bolivia and especially the indigenous people that still live in the mountain regions above La Paz. By 1998 the government of Bolivia recognized the drought problem, but did not have enough money to upgrade the Cochabamba water plant that clean drinking water to millions of its people; it needed to borrow the money from the World Bank (Shiva,2002) The World Bank, a lending agency that represents the interests of big private banks and businesses, threatened to withhold 600 million dollars in debt relief if Bolivia didn’t privatize Cochabamba’s public water system (Shiva,2002). In October 1999 the Bolivian Congress passed the Drinking Water and Sanitation Law, allowing privatization and ending government subsidies to municipal utilities (Shiva,2002). Since the World Bank pressured the Bolivian government to sell the Cochabamba plant to Bechtel, a U.S. corporation, the government did so. The result of privatization was an immediate increase in the price of water. Millions of poor Bolivians who had been able to survive with less than clean or plentiful water, could not afford the prices that Bechtel charged. Within a year, the people of Bolivia rose up in protest against the privatization of water. The protests turned violent and, violating the contract with Bechtel, the government repossessed the Cochabamba water plant. (VanOverbeke, 2004)

(Main ethical issue(s)) The privatization of water violates peoples’ right to life. A human cannot go long without water. The person will eventually die. And also water that is not sanitary makes it
harder for people to continue life. Unsanitary water can cause humans to get sick with deathly diseases. If people are dying because they are not able to receive water or receive sanitary water, then maybe eventually their whole family dies and then it spreads to throughout towns and through cultures. Another problem with the privatization is that most the countries it is happening in are in poverty. Most of the people cannot afford to pay for the water.

(You need to follow up with idea or concept of justice---distributive vs retributive that the above positions on human rights entail---you jump to meta-ethical arguments that underlie the ideas of justice) There are different views when it comes to “human rights” and “justice” in regards to water. Indigenous people seem to have a negative view on human rights. Indigenous people have a negative view when it comes to water because it is part of nature. “Indigenous peoples share an ethos for living in harmony with nature.” (Lutz, 2010) Since they believe in being harmonious with nature, then their view on economic justice probably does not exist because if nature rules, then they do not believe in society and economic justice would be part of society. (they do have a view; distributive---nature provides for all!) The United Nations has a positive view on human rights and water. (Here you jump back to human rights, away from determinism…) In July 2010, the United Nations said that water was a basic human right (positive right, define and apply it to case; follow with idea of justice the position entails)). (Deen, 2012) The World Bank has a negative view on the right to water. “The World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) are pushing for the privatization of water services by the European and U.S. based companies. (VanOverbeke, 2004) Since the World Bank supports privatization of water, then it believes in economic justice of water because privatization of water generates money.

Indigenous people hold a determinist view on moral responsibility on a lack of water. Determinists believe that all acts, events, etc. are beyond their control. One of the challenges that the indigenous people face is that the waterbodies that are critical are being polluted by outside forces beyond the indigenous people’s control. (Water- Culture Institute, 2012) The particular case of indigenous people also should be considered by a cultural relativist view. A cultural relativist view is a “view that all beliefs, customs, and ethics are relative to the individual within his own social context.”
Others like the government of countries with indigenous peoples should consider the definition of cultural relativism when dealing with issues that affect indigenous people because they have their own beliefs and clearly have been trying to live the way their beliefs say. Indigenous people are a special case. The government in Bolivia holds the view of free will. They hold this view because they allow privatization of water to take place, prices to increase, and water to be unsanitary. A group of people in Bolivia formed called La Coordinadora de Defensa del Agua y de la Vida or The Coalition in Defense of Water and Life. (VanOverbeke, 2004) This group protested the government and the high prices of water. (VanOverbeke, 2004) The group did numerous of activities to show the government their opposition to the prices of water. (VanOverbeke, 2004) Finally, the government responded. The government told the people that they would “reverse the price hike,” but they never did. (VanOverbeke, 2004) The government’s broken promise and position of Bechtel corporation shows their free will, individual responsibility views. By not lowering the prices to make water affordable, they are showing that they think that the people should be able to pay for it if they want it. Also, keeping the prices high shows the government of Bolivia’s view of absolutism. The government is absolutist because they are concerned with making money off water when there are people who need water. The businesses that are the ones that own the water are free will because they expect the people to be able to pay for it. The businesses are also absolutist because they think of water as profit.

Nature. Natural law can be applied to the pro position to the argument of whether water should be a human right or private commodity. Nature law is the belief that we ought to do what is best for us to function as members of our species. (Mackinnon, 2012) If people are without water, then they are risking the survival of our species. Kantian duty ethics would support both the pro position and the con position to the argument as well because Kantians judge the morality of acts by whether or not good intention was put into the acts. (Mackinnon, 2012) Kantians would support the position by saying that it’s in everybody’s best intention to be able to access water. They also would support the con position maybe by saying that the government is trying to stimulate the economy to bring more money in. Not a thoughtful application of Kantian morality! Absolutists would support the con position of the argument
because they believe in competition in the market. Utilitarians would support the pro position because 
water being a human right would maximize the good of the people. (Mackinnon, 2012)

Water is a human right. I think it should be cheap, but not necessarily free. I think it should cost something so that there is money to pay for proper sanitation. I think I might be leaning towards a utilitarian view because I think making water available for a cheaper price would be for the maximum good of the people.
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Comments and Grade

Main criticism: Lack of organization and cohesion. You jump around in your discussion or rights, meta-ethics, justice, etc., This confounds rather than clarifies how a particular position on human rights entails different ideas of justice, economics, moral responsibility, and so forth.

Failure to provide and apply the background information (facts about Bolivia, economics, culture, environment) to support your assessment and analysis. You introduce and discuss the relevant concepts and theories in too neutral textbook fashion; you needed to do so within the context of the case.

Composition/Writing/Grammar: need considerable work to meet scholarly standards.
The Water Crisis in Bolivia

All around the world nearly at the same time nations are falling victim to water shortages creating a whole new health (ethical) concern through the privatization of water. That in most countries out-weighs the worry of even finding water to stay clean, since the cost of water has risen to over half the monthly wages in most countries. You need to write sentences that make sense to the reader; you do not observe syntax rules (how to put words together correctly) This leaves families to decide whether feeding or giving their family water is more important. Which has made this a very moral and ethical dilemma that every government has come to a decision on even if they refuse to admit so. The choice comes down to whether or not letting water become privately owned over it being a human right is worth enforcing through restrictions, and if so by who should these rules be control by to prevent future water crises.

The principle of water as a human right has become an ethical issue after understanding how important it is for survival, and how many people are being denied of this every day. Since water can never be substituted for anything else like food, it meets a whole new standard of access and distribution. There are two positions on water as a human right; now identify and discuss them set of regulations. Which need to be established universally all across the world to eliminate the possibility of other countries creating privatized corporations inside their boarders. Like countries with indigenous people that are very limited to their supply of water, and without government’s protection can do little to stop such powerful corporations. That in the year of 2002 according to future money trends, “the United Nations decided through the CESCR” (“The coming global,” 2011) to provide these countries citizens with fresh water as a human right, to help make an equal middle ground among the communities. Other countries that allowed their government to give into the corporate privatization of water found a much different effect upon their societies. In Bolivia its predicted “according to after the World Back recommendation Bolivian Congress passed the Drinking Water and Sanitation Law, which
soon raised the price of the monthly water bill to twenty dollars in the city where the minimum wage is less than $100 a month” (“Bechtel in cochabamba,” 2011). While most families would jump to the conclusion that the water supply must be decreasing at an overwhelming pace to make increases this high. The truth is the answers lay with the corporations in control of the resource itself. That in 1990s the French company Suez Lyonnaise des Eaux insisted on receiving 35 percent increase in their profit margin after allowing these restrictions on the privatization of water. Proving that these private corporations weren’t looking for the best interest of their customers, but instead just a high revenue chart. *This is a report on the general problem; it deviates from the task, analysis of the specific case—the to positions on rights—pro and con*

Since the CESCR came to an agreement with the United Nations under their power they must provide us with fresh water, since they came to an understanding that humans cannot survive without this resource. When food is different since humans can live and adapt to different types of substances, when denying water from someone without money wouldn’t be justice (now you need to examine the concepts of justice associated with the pro and con positions) since not everyone is born in an equal level in society. We should all have the opportunity to have what we need, and decide whether or not we want to work for what will keep us living. When in some areas it would be a miracle to have little water, other locations are using rich locations to profit substantially through price fixing. For example in “Subic Bay in the Philippines as well as many places in England water rates have raised by 400 percent, while CEO salaries increase by nearly 708 percent according to Third world travelers” (Shiva, 2011). Which puts a different spin on is this real justice be shown through these private corporations where profits are more important to companies than helping the one billion people around the world living without drinking water.

Right here in the United States of America located directly in the middle of our country running from Colorado all the way to Texas. Lays the largest body of fresh water resource our country has had till this day called the Ogallala Aquifer. That averaged at a depth from 50-200 feet according to future money trends (“The coming global,” 2011). Our country used this resource to water planes and keep the words a prosperous place. That until recently with the demand for fresh water to
grow our crop fills our pools and hydrates our lawns, have scientist seen a decrease in the depth in most place down to 0-50 feet. Which has put the farming industry on a huge stand still in most areas, when government regulations deny farms from growing in places that allow more natural water flow. This has forced farmers to sell their land for government grants just so that they can afford to live temporarily at another location. The real questions are in whether these actions taken by our governments control are morally correct decision. When denying these farms their request to grow elsewhere is preventing further benefits by using less water. Instead of the way we are benefiting foreign countries by allowing them to purchase local water plants privately through the regulations that our Government has set. That when we look at the reports done by “Mckinsey & Company a Global management-consulting firm which predicted the demand for water to increase by 40 percent in the next ten years” (“The coming global,” 2011). Should out weigh the positive aspects our country could be receiving through privately owned foreign companies owning our water resources, and profiting through them. When it’s proven that our country uses about 71 percent of our water to grow our food, prices will only continue to rise unless we start considering water to be a more important resource over tangible good.  

This is a report on the global shortages and problems, you basically restate what the sources said about the global problem

With water becoming one of the worlds most important resources its important for cultures to understand how much water goes into making things they desire. For instance with America using over 70 percent of our water to grow our food, we should be spending more time researching ways to making the amount of water we use work more efficiently. Instead of giving our money and resources to scientist and corporations who can’t fully insure our out come will be more beneficial for us down the road. When at the same time the cost of water and food is rising due to the amount of food we are using to test in our new research. The positive sides of these tests just don’t out weigh the negative sides to the crisis of 2.6 billion people around the world lacking adequate sanitation. On top of the amount of fresh water we have left without any signs producing more before it’s to late.  

More report

It is a very competitive direction the world has been heading in over the past few decades, but the fact that water isn’t kept out of this list should show what type of people are dealing with these
regulations. Ones who do not have the view of *Kantian duty ethics which doesn't stand for someone choosing to benefit themselves over someone going thirsty*, which is morally unacceptable to most cultures. A personal egoist  

You need to apply these to the pro con positions specific to the Bolivia case would much rather want to further himself in any way possible, no considering who might get in the path. Since these people are very true to exist it should be the governments position to step in and regulate the decisions made by company’s to make sure they’re kept to fallowing the guidelines within our human rights. Bechtel for example which is an “American owned company was caught in 2002 by a local alternative weekly newspaper, exposed that at least $5 million dollars of nearly $8 million payed out to Bechtel for its first year of service was a complete waste of money” ("Bechtel in cochabamba.,“ 2011). It shouldn’t be the public’s job to have to control which company’s they should trust. It should be the ones who control the regulations of these types of activities that need to start keeping a closer eye at the efficiency and honesty of this work.

I believe the positive side effects of Kant's idea of fallowing the moral law, and not treating other people as a means of just receiving a higher salary. Is that it allows there to be much more of a middle ground for people to move up in society, instead of off the back denying people of their only way to survive. When personal egoist would wants to do whatever they can to benefit themselves. As we find In another case dealing with Bechtel we see them take a “city’s database of projects, resorted the information, changed the data into a different format, and sold it back to the city for almost $500,000” ("Bechtel in cochabamba.,“ 2011). This proves the power and amount of trust you can have in your own country when it comes to government powers taking advantage of their position. If this was the only one to be found it’s interesting to think of how long this has being going on for.

It should be in no ones control to be able to decide who gets water over another country. It should be every Governments job to come to one agreement instead of fighting over three. The problems we have run into are the regulations conflicting into countries that aren’t informed of these global problems, and are not aware of the future implications they could be inducing by selling these bodies of water. Kant’s idea of making a decision regardless of thinking about how its benefits towards yourself is exactly how we need to address these topics in the coming years. Since anyone naturally
will want to insure his or her population is going to be safe, it is only justice for everyone to be leveled
off into a middle ground. That way we all have the same type of opportunities to reach, instead of
giving another society advantages through resources that didn’t originally belong to them.
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Comments and Grade:

You did not do the assignment! You wrote a general report paraphrasing the material from the sources
and expressed your own opinions and views.

The paper does not meet college level writing/composition standards.