

# Free book review on the missing campus climate debate

[Business](#), [Company](#)



## **PART 1**

### Group work on corn

Genetically modified plants are plants created through genetic engineering techniques (biotechnology). The genetic engineering experiments involve the DNA merging from different species thus creating an unstable plant combination. The result is termed to be risky for human consumption because they may be vulnerable to viral developments. In relation to the genetically engineered corn, the food might be poisonous depending on stability against diseases. In addition, genetically modified corn is ranked as one of the highly risky biotechnology foods in America.

Genetically modified corn that is not yet approved by the Food and Drug Administration is now being sold in supermarkets in Taco Bell taco Shells. It is suspected that the corn could have negative effects once consumed by human beings. Such effects include nausea, shock and even allergic reactions. However, medical reports do not show anyone who has become ill from the consumption of the tacos corn. In addition to that, a member of an environmental group called Environmental Protection Agency comments that the group is not aware of any effects linked with the tacos corn.

A member of the environmental group confirmed that the tacos corn sold in the supermarkets were tested before they found their way to the market. Moreover, the Bohlen added that the group is looking forward to testing all taco shells in Taco Bell restaurants. The group aims at achieving a healthy community with no health complications through sharing the safest food supply. Bohlen adds that they are progressing to ensuring that foods sold in the market are safe for human consumption. On the other hand, a more

complicating statement was made that the lab has not been producing accurate results in the past. The statement adds more weight to the FDA's argument that the tacos are not fit, and they could have some negative health complications for human beings.

In my opinion, genetically modified food should be manufactured in safe conditions. It is true that genetically modified products are overtaking the agriculture industry. In addition, the biotechnology foods should pass via the lab for testing. FDA should not permit any food that is untested to get into the market. The environmental group makes a mistake in making a statement that the lab has not produced reliable results. The group has a responsibility to investigate everything made for human consumption. The laboratory instruments should be kept updated in case of any emergency. The health of human being species should be given priority when it comes to health related issues.

Moreover, any suspected food product should be harmful to human consumption should be tested with immediate effect. The defects found in the foods must also be dealt with immediately. This is because of the long term negative effects that the genetically possessed foods should have.

## **PART 2**

Global warming is the normal debate of the modern world. It has negative effects in like endangering the life of human species living on planet earth. As people around the globe strive to make money, it is important also to look at the ethical side of their actions. There are activities that bring more profits to individuals or institutions but have negative effects on the environment. In

fact, it is the responsibility of teachers, administrators and students to make a unified decision on directions concerning the issue of global warming.

In addition to that, other arguments say that universities do not mean what they say. The argument is based on the argument that many universities conduct researches in social isolation. Moreover, the universities conduct researches in order to keep their relationships right with governments, donors (in order to receive material or commercial donations), and benefitting politically. In other words, the researchers in the modern world have no descriptive value to the world. Moral considerations have to be employed universities. The investment policies have been distorted as a result of moral considerations. For instance, a tobacco company passed through divestment and other Sudanese companies due to morality.

Divestment is can be defined as the process of selling an asset. In other words, divestiture, it focuses on either social or financial goals. Moreover, it is the reverse of investment. For instance, the Columbia's president says that the divestment is necessary because there are many things that people do not like in this world. University leaders have strongly argued against the harmful effects of fossil fuels. The fossil fuels are currently accountable for the state of the economy worldwide. The big question comes at that point: how do we balance between benefitting from the global economy and endangering the world's climate through global warming? It is more significant to value human life even though the world's economy support humanity. Investments in fossils have great impacts because profits are for social good. For instance, the fossil-fuel energy companies can finance programs and projects meant for benefitting colleges. That is a good motive

of it. Public universities stand to defend the argument on the social basis. It is very vital to avoid global warming by any possible measure.

Divestment is costly according to a report on 2012. Oil, natural gas and American petroleum institute hold nearly 2.1 percent of holdings of endowments. Other researchers conclude that endowments could be in good health if fossil-fuel companies could be disqualified. Others like the president of Western Washington University have made a decision to stay glued to investments on fossil fuels. In an argument, the president acknowledges that their divestment by the university's foundation has no effect on global climatic change currently and in the future. On the other hand, in South Africa, divestment campaigns were carried out to encourage a positive force on the issue of fossil-fuel energy. The campaigners argued that universities could exert more leverage if they remained invested in fossil fuels. In addition, South African president and Nelson Mandela cited that divestment is influential. Moreover, the national party in South Africa could end apartheid. In other words, apartheid is a racial segregation system that was witnessed in South Africa by the National Party governments as from the year 1948 to 1994. It was argued that the fossil fuel usage cannot be possibly stopped immediately. This is because an extensive part of the world's population relied on the fossil-fuel energy companies for products and serviced in daily basis. It is impossible to boycott the company's products in the name of divestment. Lastly, fossil-fuel companies do not only extract and sell energy but also they invest on political issues and compile reports on global climatic changes.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, it is an extensive debate that could take more time before a conclusion is made. The whole world has been arguing about global warming possibly caused by human activities especially the fossil-fuel products manufacturers. The activities of producing energy bring about to changes of climatic conditions in most parts of the world. Though harmful to world's climate, the fossil-fuel companies support the economy worldwide. It is so hard to stop the production and consumption of fuel companies resources due to the economic effect worldwide. Most people in the world use products of the fuel companies on daily basis. In general, divestment on the fossil fuels is nearly impossible. Though many university researchers indicate the negative effects of fossil fuels to global warming, the companies cannot divest.