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## Overview

This file is designed to answer the Carbon Tax affirmative file that is also included in the novice packet. For a full description of what a carbon tax is, and the different ways of implementing a carbon tax, you should check out the overview to the “Carbon Tax Aff” file.

One important thing to keep in mind—as indicated in the affirmative file, there are a variety of ways to approach a carbon tax and a variety of different things to do with the revenue. Most of the evidence in this file applies no matter what the affirmative does, but some of these cards may be specific to certain approaches. But perhaps more important than keeping track of whether or not your own evidence applies, is to watch out for what the affirmative does, and not let them get away with benefits they can’t claim. So, for example, if the affirmative claims that they use the revenue from a carbon tax to reduce the federal debt, then they can’t answer your business confidence disadvantage with evidence that businesses favor a revenue neutral carbon tax. There is also a Topicality argument you can use against an affirmative that does more than a carbon tax in their plan.

### Abbreviations

I have largely tried not to overuse abbreviations in this file, but here are some important ones:

AT means “Answers to,” so “AT: No Consensus” would be your answers to the “no consensus” argument that the negative might make. In other files you might see this abbreviated as “A2”

CT means carbon tax, though I tried to spell it out every time I used it in the file, I probably missed a couple.

1NC means the first set of arguments you would read, usually in the 1NC speech, but not always. Also known as Firstline or Frontline arguments.

Ext. is short for extensions, which is evidence to back up the arguments in the 1NC.

### Cross-Applications

There are several parts of this file that could be useful in answering more than one argument. While I tried to put evidence where it would be most directly responsive, there are still overlaps. For example, near the top of the file there are some cards labeled “Economy DA Links.” You could use these to help strengthen the link to an economic or business confidence disadvantage, or if the affirmative claims a debt advantage, you could use these as solvency turns.

There are a lot more of these than I can point out in this overview, so you can look for other interactions yourself.

### DA & CP Links

I have included some evidence for specific links to the disadvantages and counterplan in the other files in the novice packet. Keep in mind that these are not sorted, and will hopefully just supplement the evidence and arguments in those files.

### Other Notes

I did a version of this file back in 2016. This is all new except a few cards in the Ocean Acidification section—I couldn’t find anything better than the 2016 cards for some arguments, so they are back.

Thanks to Maria Pinto & Gia Kardos of JMU for help with some of the DA & CP links!

Good luck! Have fun! If you have any questions, you can email me at [buttns@jmu.edu](mailto:buttns@jmu.edu).

Neil Butt, James Madison University

## Topicality

### 1NC-Revenue Recycling is Extra-Topical

#### A. Decarbonization is the process of reducing carbon gases

CED, 24

[Cambridge English Dictionary; “decarbonization,” Updated August 7, 2024. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/decarbonization] [NSB] [NWG]

the process of stopping or reducing carbon gases, especially carbon dioxide, being released into the atmosphere as the result of a process, for example the burning of fossil fuels:

#### B. Violation. The part of the plan that specifies revenue will be used to offset consumer costs or other taxes is not FOR DECARBONZATION. It is a separate policy FOR reducing economic impacts.

#### C. Our interpretation is Best. It preserves Fair Ground. The topic is designed to build-in certain negative arguments, so that debates are balanced. Allowing extra-topical plan spikes means the affirmative can “wish away” core negative arguments, like economic disadvantages, destroying the balance.

#### D. Impact

#### 1. At a minimum, reject the parts of the plan that are not topical, and any disadvantage answers or solvency arguments based on those parts.

#### 2. Voting Issue—the damage has already been done. The negative strategy is based on the 1AC. Making the negative change strategy mid-round based on changes in the affirmative plan is unfair.

### AT: It is part of the energy policy

#### 1. That evidence just says legislation is better if it considers more than the initial goal, NOT that the additional actions are “clean energy policy.”

#### 2. This just proves our point about fairness. In the real world, you could do whatever is necessary to make the best policy. In DEBATE, there is supposed to be BALANCE, which is why the affirmative is limited to topical actions.

#### 3. Revenue adjustments are fiscal policy, not clean energy policy

CRS, 22

[Congressional Research Service, Introduction to U.S. Economy: Fiscal Policy, December 29, 2022. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11253> ] [NSB] [NWG]

What Is Fiscal Policy? Fiscal policy is the means by which the government adjusts its budget balance through spending and revenue changes to influence broader economic conditions. According to mainstream economics, the government can affect the level of economic activity—generally measured by gross domestic product (GDP)—in the short term by changing its levels of spending and tax revenue.

#### 4. Even Aff solvency authors describe them as separate polices

Barron et al, 2019

[Alexander Barron, Smith College, Marc Hafstead, Resources For The Future, Adele Morris, The Brookings Institution, Policy Insights From Comparing Carbon Pricing Modeling Scenarios, May 7, 2019. <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/ES_20190507_Morris_CarbonPricing.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Economically speaking, a carbon tax is actually two policies that operate in tandem – a price on carbon and the use of the revenue. This study examines twelve core policy variants that vary by price path and revenue use. Four price trajectories begin in 2020 at either $25 or $50 per ton of CO2 and rise at either one percent or five percent over inflation per year, leveling off in 2050. All dollar values are expressed in constant 2010 dollars. The policies apply the revenue either for direct rebates to households or to cuts in capital or labor taxes. All policy scenarios hold the U.S. federal budget deficit constant relative to the reference scenario. Modelers did not analyze new spending or deficit reduction scenarios, which are also options available to policymakers.

#### 5. What happens to the revenue is a separate question

Peace & Ye, 20

[Janet Peace & Jason Ye, Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, Market Mechanisms: Options for Climate Policy, April 2020. <https://www.c2es.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/market-mechanisms-options-climate-policy.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

A carbon tax has the potential to raise significant revenues for the government. Ultimately, how the revenue is used will be a political decision. Recent U.S. congressional carbon pricing proposals would use the revenue to fund clean technology, reduce payroll taxes (i.e., tax and invest), or use at least some portion of the revenue as a dividend (e.g., tax and dividend).

#### More evidence: revenue decisions are separate

Pomerleau & Asen, 2019

[Kyle Pomerleau, Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute, Elke Asen, Policy Analyst at Center for Global Tax Policy, Carbon Tax and Revenue Recycling: Revenue, Economic, and Distributional Implications, November 6, 2019. <https://taxfoundation.org/research/all/federal/carbon-tax/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

There are many policy choices lawmakers face when designing a carbon tax, one being revenue recycling and its implications. Our analysis shows how economic and distributional effects of a carbon tax critically depend on how the generated tax revenue is used.

## Economic DA Links

#### Carbon tax could cost 5% of global GDP and companies will be liable

Eccles & Mulliken, 21

[Robert G. Eccles, visiting professor of management practice at Oxford University, John Mulliken is the founder of Carbonware.org and was the CTO of Wayfair, Carbon Might Be Your Company’s Biggest Financial Liability, Harvard Business Review, October 07, 2021. <https://hbr.org/2021/10/carbon-might-be-your-companys-biggest-financial-liability> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Economic models and the experience of the EU Emissions Trading System suggests that a price could likely be between $50 and $100 per ton of CO2 in the near term and rise from there. At $100 per ton that would represent five percent of the global economy. Five percent of the global economy is a huge number. But where does this liability sit? With the world’s corporations.

#### Companies don’t recognize their carbon liabilities. Carbon tax now would crush many of them

Eccles & Mulliken, 21

[Robert G. Eccles, visiting professor of management practice at Oxford University, John Mulliken is the founder of Carbonware.org and was the CTO of Wayfair, Carbon Might Be Your Company’s Biggest Financial Liability, Harvard Business Review, October 07, 2021. <https://hbr.org/2021/10/carbon-might-be-your-companys-biggest-financial-liability> ] [NSB] [NWG]

A sad joke for corporate climate activists is that acting on climate plans is always “the next CEO’s job.” But every company has an uncovered “Carbon Short” position based on their emissions, and it needs to recognize this hidden liability today. This short position arises from the carbon emissions produced by their own operations (Scope 1 and 2, in the argot of climate accounting), and their products and services (Scope 3). Most companies don’t recognize this liability because these emissions are priced at zero today, were priced at zero last year, and so it seems natural to assume that they will be priced at zero in the future. One could say that companies are engaging in the carbon futures market, assuming that this fundamental “input cost” will never change. Anyone who works in commodity markets knows that uncovered positions can turn from profit to significant loss in the blink of an eye.

#### Investments in fossil fuels have helped companies recover

Eaton, 23

[Collin Eaton, reporter for The Wall Street Journal's Houston bureau, ESG Blowback: Exxon, Chevron Investors Reject Climate Measures, WSJ, June 1, 2023. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/esg-blowback-exxon-chevron-investors-reject-climate-measures-4532da99>] [Gia] [NSB] [NWG]

Investments in fossil fuels pushed many oil companies to record profits last year, which lured back some investors who had fled after years of meager returns from the industry. Exxon Chief Executive Darren Woods said Wednesday the company had benefited from investing in fossil fuels when others pulled back. Even in Europe, energy executives have shown a willingness to alienate clean-energy investors to tailor strategies to the thirst for fossil fuels. BP and Shell’s record full-year 2022 profits and hefty returns to investors have attracted new investors, and won back some who were dubious of their energy-transition strategies, executives said.

#### Even giant companies like ExxonMobil could get crushed

Eccles & Mulliken, 21

[Robert G. Eccles, visiting professor of management practice at Oxford University, John Mulliken is the founder of Carbonware.org and was the CTO of Wayfair, Carbon Might Be Your Company’s Biggest Financial Liability, Harvard Business Review, October 07, 2021. <https://hbr.org/2021/10/carbon-might-be-your-companys-biggest-financial-liability> ] [NSB] [NWG]

To see the implications for one company, consider the example of ExxonMobil. The company recently had three board members replaced by a small activist investor, Engine No. 1, as a result of its failure to recognize that the energy transition requires some fundamental changes in its strategy and capital allocation decisions. Why were investors so incensed? In 2020 ExxonMobil released 112 million metric tons of CO2 “equivalent” (along with carbon, they also released other greenhouse gasses such as methane). At $100/ton, they would owe $11B annually on their own emissions. Since the company has earned only $8 billion on average over the past five years, this means they would rapidly be bankrupt. That surely is a good way to finally get the attention of their board. Add in the company’s share of the annual $60 billion from pricing the roughly 600 million metric tons of its Scope 3 emissions (it’s not clear how much they could pass on to purchasers) and the situation is even more dire.

#### Plan would increase consumer energy costs by 21 percent

Kaufman, 2019

[Noah Kaufman, Senior Research Scholar at the Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia University, What You Need to Know About a Federal Carbon Tax in the United States, April 02, 2019. <https://www.energypolicy.columbia.edu/publications/what-you-need-to-know-about-a-federal-carbon-tax-in-the-united-states> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Higher energy prices translate into price increases for consumers. Figure 3 shows changes in per capita energy expenditures under the three illustrative carbon tax scenarios. Total annual per capita energy expenditures increase by as much as 6 percent, 21 percent, and 34 percent in the $14/ton, $50/ton, and $73/ton scenarios. In all scenarios, they remain below the per capita expenditure levels at the height of the global commodity boom in 2008.

#### $50 per ton tax increases heating costs by $300 per year—that hurts consumer spending

Ginn, 24

[Vance Ginn, Ph.D., Associate Research Fellow with American Institute for Economic Research, The Economic Folly of a Carbon Tax, July 21, 2024. <https://www.aier.org/article/the-economic-folly-of-a-carbon-tax/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Moreover, the cost of carbon taxes can be significant. Increasing production costs leads to higher prices for goods and services, disproportionately affecting low- and middle-income households — especially when they already suffer from high inflation. This regressive nature undermines its purported environmental benefits, placing a heavier burden on those least able to afford it. For example, a $50-per-ton carbon tax could increase household energy costs by up to $300 annually, hitting hardest those who can least afford it.

#### Carbon tax hurts economy, especially construction sector

Ginn, 24

[Vance Ginn, Ph.D., Associate Research Fellow with American Institute for Economic Research, The Economic Folly of a Carbon Tax, July 21, 2024. <https://www.aier.org/article/the-economic-folly-of-a-carbon-tax/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

A carbon tax functions more like an income tax than a consumption tax, capturing all forms of work, including capital goods production and building construction. These sectors are heavy on carbon emissions, meaning the tax disproportionately burdens them, stifling investment and innovation — much like a progressive income tax, but with broader economic repercussions.

For example, in the US, the construction sector alone accounts for about 40 percent of carbon emissions. A carbon tax would heavily penalize this industry, reducing its capacity to grow, generate new housing, and create jobs. Moreover, implementing a carbon tax involves massive administrative costs. The federal tax code is already complex and costly; a carbon tax would exacerbate these issues.

#### Carbon tax with no revenue recycling is regressive and hurts consumers

Pomerleau & Asen, 2019

[Kyle Pomerleau, Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute, Elke Asen, Policy Analyst at Center for Global Tax Policy, Carbon Tax and Revenue Recycling: Revenue, Economic, and Distributional Implications, November 6, 2019. <https://taxfoundation.org/research/all/federal/carbon-tax/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

If enacted in isolation, a carbon tax would make the federal tax code less progressive. We estimate that a $50 per metric ton carbon tax would reduce the after-tax income of taxpayers in the bottom quintile by nearly 2 percent. Middle-income taxpayers (40%-60% income quintile) would see a slightly smaller reduction in after-tax income or 1.9 percent. Taxpayers in the top 1 percent would see the smallest reduction in after-tax income of about 1.4 percent. By raising the prices of goods and services, a carbon tax reduces real incomes earned by taxpayers.

#### Carbon tax hurts Low-Income and Middle-Class Households

Kaufman, 2019

[Noah Kaufman, Senior Research Scholar at the Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia University, What You Need to Know About a Federal Carbon Tax in the United States, April 02, 2019. <https://www.energypolicy.columbia.edu/publications/what-you-need-to-know-about-a-federal-carbon-tax-in-the-united-states> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Lower-income households could struggle to afford the potential increases in energy prices caused by a carbon tax or other climate policies. Policymakers can ensure that low-income and middle-class households will not be harmed by the carbon tax by using the revenue in ways that benefit these households.

#### Coal-dependent communities hurt worst

Kaufman, 2019

[Noah Kaufman, Senior Research Scholar at the Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia University, What You Need to Know About a Federal Carbon Tax in the United States, April 02, 2019. <https://www.energypolicy.columbia.edu/publications/what-you-need-to-know-about-a-federal-carbon-tax-in-the-united-states> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Communities with rich renewable resources are more likely to capture the clean energy investment a carbon tax would incentivize. In contrast, the largest adverse impacts will be on regions dependent on the coal industry. Figure 7 below shows the decline of coal production in the 2020s under three illustrative carbon tax scenarios. The U.S. coal industry is highly geographically concentrated, meaning a relatively small number of local economies across the country are highly reliant on the coal industry. A recent CGEP/Brookings study highlighted the fiscal risks of climate policy to coal-reliant local governments.

## Politics Links

#### Harris will get the blame—she has already endorsed a carbon tax

Kartch, 24

[John Kartch, Americans For Tax Reform, Kamala Harris Wants to Impose a Carbon Tax, July 26, 2024. <https://www.atr.org/kamala-harris-wants-to-impose-a-carbon-tax/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Add a carbon tax to the long list of new and higher taxes endorsed by Kamala Harris. “Under my plan, there will also be a carbon fee,” Harris said during a CNN “climate crisis town hall” in September 2019. As noted by CBS News, Harris endorsed “a carbon tax, a ‘climate pollution fee,’ a ban on fracking and a commitment to $10 trillion in climate spending.”

#### Republicans unanimously oppose

Kartch, 24

[John Kartch, Americans For Tax Reform, Kamala Harris Wants to Impose a Carbon Tax, July 26, 2024. <https://www.atr.org/kamala-harris-wants-to-impose-a-carbon-tax/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Kamala’s progressive allies in the U.S. House are pushing several carbon tax bills and most recently, nearly every House Democrat indicated support of a carbon tax: Only 10 House Democrats voted for a resolution expressing opposition to a carbon tax. All House Republicans except one voted for the resolution to express opposition to a carbon tax.

#### House vote proves carbon tax is still politically toxic

E & E News, 24

[Emma Dumain, E & E News, Dems join Republicans to pass anti-carbon tax measure, March 22, 2024. <https://www.eenews.net/articles/dems-join-republicans-to-pass-anti-carbon-tax-measure/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The House voted Thursday on a nonbinding resolution to disapprove of a carbon tax — a messaging measure that came at something of a critical moment for bipartisan lawmakers looking to tie trade policy to climate action. The 222-186 vote for H.Con.Res. 86 showed the extent to which the concept of putting a price on the carbon intensity of U.S. goods and services remains politically toxic, both for Republicans who care about lowering greenhouse gas emissions and Democrats in swing districts and tough election fights. All but one Republican — Pennsylvania Rep. Brian Fitzpatrick, a reliable moderate GOP vote on climate issues — supported the resolution. Ten Democrats, mostly those vulnerable to losing seats this November, broke with their party and voted “no.”

#### GOP & core constituents still opposes carbon tax

E & E News, 19

[Nick Sobczyk, E & E News, GOP pollster pitches Republicans on carbon pricing, June 13, 2019. <https://www.eenews.net/articles/gop-pollster-pitches-republicans-on-carbon-pricing/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The GOP is still widely opposed to carbon pricing. So are some of their core constituencies in the advocacy world, including Grover Norquist’s Americans for Tax Reform and groups associated with the Koch political network.

## Elections Links

#### Likely voters oppose a carbon tax 3 to 1

AEA, 23

[American Energy Alliance, New Survey, Same Results: Voters Prefer Affordable Energy over Climate Agenda, June 1, 2023. <https://www.americanenergyalliance.org/2023/06/new-survey-same-results-voters-prefer-affordable-energy-over-climate-agenda-2/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The American Energy Alliance and the Committee to Unleash Prosperity recently sponsored a nationwide survey of 1000 likely voters (3.1 percent margin of error) conducted by MWR Strategies in the first two weeks of May. The survey can be found here (slide deck) and here (written results). AEA President Thomas Pyle issued the following statement: The results of our new survey make it clear that voters prefer energy affordability and choice over government efforts to address climate change and they overwhelmingly reject the associated costs. Despite the narrative driven by the legacy media, there has been little change in voter sentiment with respect to energy and climate change. If anything, voters have even less trust in government when it comes to the types of energy we use or the vehicles we drive. The survey asked about a tax on carbon dioxide. This year, by a margin of 44 percentage points (65-21). Last year, it was opposed by a margin of 40 points (63-23). The year before, it was opposed by 34 points (62-38).

#### Climate policies anger and mobilize GOP voters

Eaton, 23

[Collin Eaton, reporter for The Wall Street Journal's Houston bureau, ESG Blowback: Exxon, Chevron Investors Reject Climate Measures, WSJ, June 1, 2023. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/esg-blowback-exxon-chevron-investors-reject-climate-measures-4532da99>] [Gia] [NSB] [NWG]

The industry and its allies have said some countries, particularly in Europe, were too quick to move away from fossil fuels toward clean energy sources such as solar and wind. A movement against climate activism has gained political traction in the U.S., particularly among Republican voters. Entrepreneur Vivek Ramaswamy, a candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, has made anti-ESG policies a central plank of his campaign. The pushback against ESG measures has also hit investment firms such as BlackRock, which have faced potential boycotts in Texas and other red states. Republican officials in Florida, Texas, Louisiana and South Carolina pulled more than $4 billion in pension and investment funds from BlackRock starting last year.

#### Likely voters in battleground states oppose carbon tax

AEA, 24

[American Energy Alliance, New Survey, Same Results: Americans Reject Carbon Dioxide Taxes in Favor of Affordable and Reliable Energy, January 9, 2024. https://www.americanenergyalliance.org/2024/01/new-survey-same-results-americans-reject-carbon-dioxide-taxes-in-favor-of-affordable-and-reliable-energy/ ] [NSB] [NWG]

The American Energy Alliance and the Committee to Unleash Prosperity recently sponsored a survey of 1600 likely voters equally divided among eight States (Georgia, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Arizona, Nevada, Michigan, Missouri, and Ohio) conducted by MWR Strategies in December 2023. The total sample margin of error is 2.45 percent. The survey results confirm that there has been little change in sentiment and attitudes on energy and climate change. Many of the responses in the survey are either consistent with or more emphatic than what we have found in previous surveys. For example, just 3 percent of respondents identified climate change as the most pressing issue facing the United States, compared to the 59 percent that identified the economy as either the first or second most important issue facing the United States. 51 percent of all voters (including 63 percent of Republicans) oppose a carbon dioxide or energy tax on imported goods. When asked what they would be willing to pay each year to address climate change, the median response was 10 dollars, and 35 percent (including 17 percent of Democrats) said they were unwilling to pay anything. AEA President Thomas Pyle issued the following statement: “The results reconfirm what we already knew: voters are not willing to pay any tax associated with carbon dioxide or energy – including a carbon dioxide or energy tax on imported goods. Those who believe in limited government and free energy markets continue to be allied with the vast majority of voters concerning the destructive and pointless nature of carbon dioxide taxes and on the fundamentals of the climate change issue.”

#### People don’t want a carbon tax—10 times as many see the economy as more important than climate

AEA, 23

[American Energy Alliance, New Survey, Same Results: Voters Prefer Affordable Energy over Climate Agenda, June 1, 2023. <https://www.americanenergyalliance.org/2023/06/new-survey-same-results-voters-prefer-affordable-energy-over-climate-agenda-2/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Michael McKenna, who conducted the research, added some context: As we have seen across a number of years, climate change is not a priority for most. Just 28 respondents (2.8 percent) identified it as the most pressing issue facing the United States, and just 29 more (2.9 percent) identified it as the second most pressing issue facing the United States. Compare this to the 55 percent that identified the economy as either the first or second most important issue facing the United States.

Given that, it is not surprising that there continues to be limited appetite to pay to address climate change. When asked what they would be willing to pay each year to address climate change, the median response was 20 dollars, and 35 percent (including 15 percent of self-identified Democrats) said they are unwilling to pay anything. There has been some rapid erosion in these responses: last year, the median response was 55 dollars.

#### Less than half of Americans support a carbon tax

CENFENG, 22

[CE Noticias Financieras English, Who wants to pay to curb global warming?, November 10, 2022. (NexisUni database) [NSB] [NWG]

Public opinion in the major industrial powers, for example, resists paying more carbon taxes, the cheapest and most direct way to reverse the climate crisis. Strong resistance in major economies to paying more carbon taxes Ninety percent of Americans, according to a Gallup poll, agree that the planet is warming. In Portugal it is more than 95%, according to a Yale University study. However, both Americans and Europeans are reluctant to pay more green taxes. Only 44% of Americans favor a carbon tax, according to a University of Chicago poll, while 29% oppose it. Without public support, no government dares to raise taxes.

#### Even with revenue recycling, people don’t trust the government to use the tax wisely

CENFENG, 22

[CE Noticias Financieras English, Who wants to pay to curb global warming?, November 10, 2022. (NexisUni database) [NSB] [NWG]

Very often, governments have failed to convince citizens of the need for these fiscal measures, even if they compensate for them by reducing taxes on income from work. It is true that the trust between the administration and the people is at rock bottom, but when the fate of the new green taxes is well explained, when public opinion understands that they are fair and effective, the attitude changes. The University of Chicago study is very clear. When the interviewee knows where his or her money is going, the 44% support for green taxes increases. Sixty-six percent, for example, would agree to pay them if they were used to recover natural areas. However, if respondents are told that the money will be used to lower the energy bill in their homes, support barely increases five tenths, to 49%. It is not so much that they do not want to pay, but rather that they do not believe that the government will use the money collected to combat the climate crisis. Achieving this level of trust between the government and taxpayers is, however, very difficult. The political debate divides society. Ideology and emotion prevail over common sense.

#### People might support “climate action,” but they don’t support taxes

When instead of talking about taxes, the public is presented with other solutions to reverse warming, support is much stronger. A worldwide survey conducted by the United Nations, for example, shows that actions to conserve forests and land have 54% support. It is the most popular measure. Greater use of renewable energies is supported by 53% of the global public. The strategy of rewarding companies, households and vehicles that pollute less also receives high marks (50%). The Pew study agrees that two out of three Americans agree with policies that help plant more trees or lower the tax burden on companies that capture CO2 emissions. Majorities of Republicans and Democrats agree that the government should do more to pursue this. Taxation, in any case, is a highly contentious and sensitive issue now that inflation has driven up the cost of living.

#### Public opposes carbon tax

Kotchen, 23

[Matthew Kotchen, Professor of Economics, Yale Environment School: The Pros and Cons of a Global Carbon Tax, Targeted News Service, November 3, 2023. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Q. What are the biggest challenges to enacting a global carbon tax?

Public support is probably the biggest obstacle. There seems to be a fundamental ideology against taxes. Also, in many countries, simply administering a tax is not as easy as it sounds. There is also a big debate about what to do with the revenue.

## States CP Links

#### States already have their own carbon pricing

Patnaik & Kennedy, 21

[Sanjay Patnaik, Director - Center on Regulation and Markets, and Kelly Kennedy, Former Senior Research Assistant - Center on Regulation and Markets, at Brookings Institute, Why the US should establish a carbon price either through reconciliation or other legislation, October 7, 2021. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/why-the-us-should-establish-a-carbon-price-either-through-reconciliation-or-other-legislation/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Even some U.S. states have enacted carbon pricing systems: California launched its cap-and-trade system in 2013, while the state of Washington voted to enact its own carbon pricing system in April 2021. Eleven states1 in the northeastern U.S. participate in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, a localized cap-and-trade system that covers 18 percent of emissions in participating states. The Hawaii state senate has stated its intent to consider a carbon tax in 2022, while legislators in Oregon unsuccessfully tried to create a cap-and-trade system in 2019.

#### States have their own carbon taxes

Gongloff, 24

[Mark Gongloff, Bloomberg Opinion editor and columnist covering climate change, Some Kind of Carbon Tax Is Coming to America, Like It or Not, Bloomberg, June 13, 2024. <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2024-06-13/climate-change-carbon-pricing-is-coming-to-america-like-it-or-not> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Fifty countries now have national systems for pricing carbon, involving a carbon tax, emissions trading or a combination of both, according to the latest World Bank tally. These systems cover 24% of the world’s carbon emissions, up from just 7% in 2013.

Dozens of local governments have their own mechanisms, including California, Massachusetts and Washington. Nineteen countries and 13 more local governments are actively debating or preparing to take up the practice, including six more US states.

#### States are already moving forward with carbon taxes and they have an easier time implementing

Talberth & Carlson, 24

[John Talberth and Ella Carlson, 24 (Talberth holds a Ph.D. in International and Environmental Economics from the University of New Mexico and the founder of Center for Sustainable Economy. Carlson holds a BA from Smith College in Environmental Science & Policy and is the presentations associate for The Climate Reality Project) “Forest carbon tax and reward: regulating greenhouse gas emissions from industrial logging and deforestation in the US” 17 February 2024 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10668-024-04523-7>] [MP] [NSB] [NWG]

To minimize regulatory burdens, the levy could take the form of an increment to existing severance or excise taxes on each thousand board feet (mbf) harvested, which many state governments already have in place. Current rates in Oregon, Washington, and North Carolina range from $0.40–$12.45 mbf−1. A carbon charge would be added based on the product of the forest carbon tax rate adopted ($ tCO2-e−1), and an adjustable emission factor (tCO2-e mbf−1) derived from state-level emissions inventories (demonstrated below). Adjustable emission factors could be adopted through rulemaking, and periodically updated as new or improved information becomes available.

Volume destined for long-lived wood products could have an emission factor lower than volume destined for pulp, paper, or biomass markets, and state agencies could also publish a reduced emission factor on volume harvested from thinning operations as these have lower effects on forgone sequestration. The emission factor associated with forestland conversion could be higher since forgone sequestration would be permanent. Finally, the emission factor could be adjusted based on ecological region(s) of timber harvest, which often have significant differences in the density of carbon stored at a logging site and rates of carbon sequestration. To determine a given taxpayer’s liability, these emission factors would be applied to harvest and land use conversion data supplied by each industrial forestland owner each year and adjusted up or down depending on the share of reported harvest volume being diverted to long-lived or short-lived products and the volume extracted in association with logging roads or development. Much of the information needed to adjust the tax rate up or down for a given forestland owner’s harvest in a given year is already reported to states in association with timber harvest notifications and/or permits as well as quarterly harvest tax returns (See Online Resource 1 for links to relevant forms). As such, state agencies would face a relatively light workload associated with gathering the tax and should only need a minor share of tax revenues for administration.

#### Studies show state carbon taxes expand and increase cooperation on carbon pricing

Coffman, 22

[Makena Coffman, 22 ( Makena is a professor at the University of Hawaii, she serves as the Director for the Institute for Sustainability and Resilience,) “Economic and GHG Impacts of a US State-Level Carbon Tax: the case of Hawai‘I” April 19, 2022 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14693062.2022.2061405#d1e406>] [MP] [NSB] [NWG]

Economists have argued for national carbon pricing to effectively address carbon emissions. With the lack of action by the US government, questions arise about the impacts of state-level implementation of carbon pricing. By modelling the impacts of a carbon tax in Hawai’i, our study informs ongoing discussions of regional carbon pricing, with implications beyond the Hawai’i context. First, our state-level CGE model could be adapted to evaluate proposals in other states with carbon pricing policies before their legislatures. The structure of H-CGE has particular relevance for other states with large tourism sectors possessing some market power, e.g. Nevada, Louisiana, and Alaska. The model also has relevance to other island economies that, like Hawai‘i, generate all of their own electricity and, because they are part of larger political federations, have limited ability to impose border adjustment taxes. US-affiliated examples include Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa. For sovereign island nations – such as Jamaica, Sri Lanka, Tonga, and Fiji, the H-CGE model could be modified to impose relevant trade adjustments.

If Hawai‘i were to adopt a carbon tax at the level of the 2021 federal SCC, Hawai‘i’s cumulative emissions would decline by 10% over twenty years, over and above reductions from other policies already in place. In the absence of a national approach to address the global climate crisis, such state programmes could prove to be valuable demonstration projects that would help catalyze further climate action. This is important because our results strongly suggest that the goal of deep decarbonization is unlikely to be realized solely by the imposition of a carbon tax set at the SCC price by a state government. However, if more states adopt a carbon tax, then the likelihood increases that regional cooperation will emerge and facilitate the adoption of a common carbon price. Thus, state and regional actions to enact carbon pricing could pave the way to the adoption of a national programme.

#### Federal tax fails—States are too diverse

Chan & Sayre, 24

[Nathan W. Chan and Susan Stratton Sayre 24 (Chan is an Associate Professor in the Resource Economics department at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Sayre is an Associate Professor of Economics at Smith College. )“Spatial Microsimulation of Carbon Tax Incidence: An Application to Washington State” 2024 <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/727476#_i37>] [MP] [NSB] [NWG]

That being said, we stress that every state will have unique characteristics that drive distributional consequences across groups and across space, as well as how targeting provisions alters these patterns. This is because there are numerous factors that shape incidence—such as energy sources, housing stock, vehicle dependence, income, and family structure—and these factors will covary in different ways based on the unique features of each locale. This point underscores both a shortcoming and an advantage of our analysis. That is, we would be wary of generalizing specific policy findings from our Washington analysis to comment on carbon tax impacts in other locales. For example, we find that geographically targeted rebates will do little to reduce the regressivity of a carbon tax in Washington, but we cannot know whether the same result holds in other states due to inherent differences across places. On the other hand, the context-specificity of policy impacts also points to a key advantage of SMS: it offers a transparent means for analyzing carbon tax impacts and can easily be adapted to other contexts. SMS is well positioned to elucidate the implications of targeted programs that will be missed by more aggregate analyses. These features are especially useful given that policymakers in different places may be concerned about different types of inequality. For instance, discussions of climate policy in Massachusetts keyed in on concerns about how transportation costs would impact rural residents and proposed a provision to provide extra rebates to households in locations with higher average miles driven. SMS could assess how well this provision addresses the concern for rural residents as well as any unintended distributional consequences that it might have. Thus, our contribution is both empirical and methodological. We analyze the distributional consequences of Washington’s I-732, and we also demonstrate a generalized method that is suitable for a vast array of applications beyond the one we consider here.

An additional contribution is that SMS can offer new insights on the political economy of carbon taxes for researchers and practitioners alike. We provide a glimpse into this point by showing a weak association between support for I-732 and local measures of incidence, in line with Anderson et al. (2023). However, SMS can be mined for additional insights, and we have only scratched the surface. For instance, several states like Washington and Massachusetts have recently considered legislative proposals for carbon charges, and SMS can help legislators better address pocketbook issues on behalf of their constituents. Not only will SMS help legislators understand average impacts of a carbon tax proposal, but also the distribution of those impacts across residents in their districts. Notably, legislators may be interested in different statistics than the ones studied here or those that are commonly considered in economics research. For example, one may wonder: Will fewer than 50% of my constituents be harmed by this policy? or Which targeting provision will ensure that no more than 10% of my constituents will pay more than $200 per year? By generating full distributions of impacts, SMS empowers users to answer a wide range of diverse questions like these. Such political economy questions would be inaccessible with prevailing approaches that rely upon more aggregate data.

## Emissions (Contention 1) Answers

### 1NC

#### US Emissions already decreasing—we are shifting away from coal now

Electricity Maps, 24

[Electricity Mapped 2023 – US, January 31, 2024. <https://www.electricitymaps.com/blog/us-electricity-year-in-review-2023#:~:text=Electricity%20consumption%20remained%20close%20to%202022%20and%202021%20levels&text=US%20electricity%20consumption%20decreased%20by,this%20decrease%20in%20electricity%20demand>. ] [NSB] [NWG]

Emissions from electricity consumption decreased by 5% with a nearly 20% reduction in coal-fired electricity generation

Emissions from electricity consumption decreased in 2023 compared to the two previous years and reached the pandemic levels of 2020. Unlike Europe, this was not a consequence of demand reductions but was mainly caused by the coal-to-gas transition. Although emissions decreased, the US has not yet reduced its fossil-based electricity production despite continuous investments in wind and solar generation. The US is today still dependent on fossil fuels, especially to meet sudden increases in power demand and it remains a major challenge for its grid decarbonization. With such development speed in variable renewables production however, the US could generate more electricity from wind and solar than coal in 2024 which would be a first milestone in its long grid decarbonization journey.

#### US energy demand decreasing

Electricity Maps, 24

[Electricity Mapped 2023 – US, January 31, 2024. <https://www.electricitymaps.com/blog/us-electricity-year-in-review-2023#:~:text=Electricity%20consumption%20remained%20close%20to%202022%20and%202021%20levels&text=US%20electricity%20consumption%20decreased%20by,this%20decrease%20in%20electricity%20demand>. ] [NSB] [NWG]

US electricity consumption decreased by nearly 2% in 2023 compared to 2022. According to the IEA, slowing economic growth contributed to this decrease in electricity demand.

#### IRA means more investment in renewables

RWE Resources News, 24

[RWE Resources News, Advanced Power Announces Investment Tax Credit Purchase, January 4, 2024. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Advanced Power's purchase of renewable energy investment tax credits supports vision of a clean, reliable energy future. The 2022 Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) made the transfer of renewable energy tax credits possible. The IRA aims to accelerate the transition to a clean energy economy and drive increased deployment of new, clean electricity resources. Section 6418 of the Internal Revenue Code allows for the transfer (sale) of certain renewable energy tax credits from renewable energy project developers to a qualified third party.

#### No urgency—recent slow growth has already reduced global emissions

Lilico, 23

[Andrew Lilico, Executive Director and Principal of Europe Economics, Prevention is no longer an option. We must adapt to climate change, The Telegraph, July 27, 2023. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

The second sense in which Lord Frost is right arises because our economies are growing so much slower than we had anticipated. Our emissions can drop if we reduce emissions per unit of GDP we create – but they can also drop if the GDP is lower. Lower growth means it is more feasible for us to achieve targets such as Net Zero, but it also makes it less environmentally urgent to achieve those targets so soon, because we are and have been emitting a lot less carbon than we had anticipated.

### Ext. on IRA Solves

#### IRA increases renewable energy sector

The Hill, 24

[Zack Budryk, Staff, the Hill, Biden administration announces tax breaks to push higher pay for green energy workers, June 18, 2024. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

The Treasury Department on Tuesday announced final rules for prevailing wage and registered apprenticeships (PWA) under the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), saying that qualifying employers in the renewable energy sector will be eligible for a fivefold increase in the available tax credit.

Under the finalized rules, taxpayers will be eligible for the increased credit if they pay the prevailing wage, or the average wage in a given field within a given area. About three quarters of IRA renewable energy projects are sited in counties with median household incomes below the national average, according to a Treasury analysis.

#### IRA funds expansion of energy efficiency and renewable energy

Impact News Service, 24

[Impact News Service, USDA Rural Development Agency Seeks Applicants for the Rural Energy for America, March 15, 2024. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

USDA Rural Development has available the Rural Energy for America Program (REAP) to help farmers and rural, small, for-profit businesses install renewable energy systems or make energy efficiency improvements. Funding for the REAP grants has increased sharply due to the funding available through the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) passed by Congress in 2022. Renewable energy projects may be eligible for up to $1,000,000 or 50% of eligible project costs, whichever is less. Energy Efficiency Improvement projects may be eligible for up to $500,000 or 50% of eligible project cost, whichever is less. Submission of a REAP application is strongly encouraged due to the increased availability of funds and per project funding. Renewable energy projects can include: Solar PV, Solar Thermal, Wind, Geothermal, Biomass and Anaerobic Digester projects. Energy Efficiency Improvement projects can include: HVAC upgrades, lighting replacements, grain dryer replacements, fans and motors, along with other improvements as outlined in the energy audit.

## Solvency (Contention 2) Answers

### 1NC

#### No Solvency. Carbon tax emission reduction models are uncertain

Ginn, 24

[Vance Ginn, Ph.D., Associate Research Fellow with American Institute for Economic Research, The Economic Folly of a Carbon Tax, July 21, 2024. <https://www.aier.org/article/the-economic-folly-of-a-carbon-tax/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Climate science is ever evolving, and economic models predicting the outcomes of carbon taxes are fraught with uncertainties. Placing high costs on consumers based on unsettled science and unpredictable economic impacts is not a prudent policy approach. We should promote voluntary measures and technological advancements that naturally reduce emissions through market activity.

#### Demand is inelastic--carbon tax will fail

Corcoran, 23

[Terence Corcoran, columnist, Financial Post, Carbon taxes are a perversion of free-market economic theory, November 3, 2023. <https://financialpost.com/opinion/carbon-taxes-perversion-free-market-economic-theory> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The idea that high and rising carbon prices can be used to remove carbon from the economy runs up against the fact that carbon-based fossil fuels are currently part of the foundation for most economic activity. They are essential today, to the point where industry and consumers cannot do without them. They are, as economists say, price inelastic. A doubling or even a quadrupling via taxation will not end demand for fossil fuels without killing economic activity.

#### Canada proves: Carbon Tax fails to reduce emissions

Government of Alberta, 24

[Statement of the Government of Alberta, in Financial Wire, Rebranding the carbon tax won't fix a failure, February 15, 2024. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

"The federal government, in its flawed environmental activism, imposed a punitive carbon tax that did not reduce emissions, but instead, raised the cost of everything. "Now, five years later, the federal carbon tax is universally known as a resounding failure. The carbon tax has punished Canadians while failing to reduce emissions. "Canadians are struggling to pay a carbon tax on top of the federal government's self-inflicted inflation crisis. We know that the carbon tax is costing Alberta families hundreds of dollars each year.

#### Europe proves: Carbon taxes fail

Ginn, 24

[Vance Ginn, Ph.D., Associate Research Fellow with American Institute for Economic Research, The Economic Folly of a Carbon Tax, July 21, 2024. <https://www.aier.org/article/the-economic-folly-of-a-carbon-tax/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Countries implementing carbon taxes, like some in Europe, have seen mixed results. Emissions reductions have been minimal, while economic growth has been hampered. These policies often result in job losses and decreased global competitiveness, showcasing the unintended consequences of such interventions. For instance, France’s carbon tax led to widespread protests and economic disruption, illustrating such policies’ social and economic challenges.

#### No solvency. Other countries have an incentive NOT to comply

Leo & Singh, 22

[Utkarsh Leo, Lecturer in Law at the School of Justice, University of Central Lancashire, Nidhi Singh, Co-Founder & Counsel, BlackPearl Chambers (Advocates & Solicitors), Why the planet needs legally binding obligations to limit climate-mitigation 'free-riders,' World Economic Forum, June 22, 2022. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/06/incentives-free-rider-problem-climate-change-mitigation/#:~:text=Planet%20Earth%20is%20in%20crisis,without%20contributing%20to%20the%20costs>. ] [NSB] [NWG]

Further, this “non-excludable” characteristic of climate change mitigation creates a free-rider problem – an instance where a country receives the benefits of reduced GHG emissions without contributing to the costs. A country implementing a green policy incurs 100% of the cost – either in the form of adopting low carbon technologies or other short-term transition costs for switching to cleaner energy – but receives lesser benefits (in comparison to the costs incurred). Primarily because benefits from climate change mitigation spill beyond national borders due to the global nature of the atmosphere. This spillover-effect creates strong incentives for a large number of nations to free-ride at the expense of others. Ironically, it motivates them to invest resources in national objectives where benefits do not spill beyond national borders. When a number of countries follow such acts of rational self-interest; it results in a collective disaster – an unsustainable exploitation of the environment. Additionally, it is rather unfortunate that the existing international climate governance architecture has fallen short to address this free-riding syndrome.

#### Carbon tax is not enough to overcome tech lock-in

Rosenbloom et al, 2020

[Daniel Rosenbloom, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Jochen Markard, Department of Management, Technology, and Economics, ETH Zürich, Frank W. Geels, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester,and Lea Fuenfschilling, Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy, Lund University, Why carbon pricing is not sufficient to mitigate climate change—and how “sustainability transition policy” can help, April 8, 2020. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2004093117> ] [NSB] [NWG]

By increasing the relative price of carbon-intensive goods and services, carbon pricing is understood to incentivize the adoption of existing low-carbon technologies and (indirectly) stimulate the development of low-carbon innovations (2). Investments in low-carbon alternatives are not only encouraged through present carbon prices but also through expectations about future carbon price increases.

It is, however, unclear how strong such innovation effects actually are and whether carbon pricing can generate more than incremental changes. Tvinnereim and Mehling (12), for instance, review the record of several prominent carbon pricing strategies and find that they have, to date, helped realize limited opportunities for innovation and system-wide transformation. Rather, current trajectories and emission reductions deviate little from business-as-usual scenarios, even in the case of Sweden’s $140 (USD) carbon price for the transport and building sectors. Others have observed similar patterns (13–15). This suggests that, in practice, carbon pricing strategies tend to promote the optimization of established business models and technologies but neglect more fundamental system change necessary for deep decarbonization.

While optimization remains important, it does little to confront carbon lock-in, encourage radical innovation, or avoid dead-end paths (16). Indeed, research indicates that investments in long-lived, carbon-intensive infrastructures, such as natural gas, are still ongoing, even in jurisdictions with prominent carbon pricing regimes (12, 17). Retiring these investments prematurely in order to align with deep decarbonization pathways will be politically difficult and costly (i.e., due to compensation for affected firms and communities).

In contrast, we argue that incremental change alone is insufficient to pursue low-carbon pathways at the required pace. Established systems are characterized by deep lock-ins (e.g., large sunk costs in infrastructure and cultural conventions underpinning user practices) that encourage movement along established development trajectories (18, 19). Deliberately accelerating transitions, therefore, involves weakening lock-ins (e.g., removing fossil fuel subsidies and banning carbon-intensive technologies) and supporting system building for low-carbon alternatives (e.g., stimulating new innovations, business models, and markets).

#### Carbon tax alone fails-5 reasons

Rosenbloom et al, 2020

[Daniel Rosenbloom, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Jochen Markard, Department of Management, Technology, and Economics, ETH Zürich, Frank W. Geels, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester,and Lea Fuenfschilling, Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy, Lund University, Why carbon pricing is not sufficient to mitigate climate change—and how “sustainability transition policy” can help, April 8, 2020. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2004093117> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Realizing deep decarbonization at the pace necessary to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change has emerged as a pressing challenge for policymakers (1). As a result, the debate about appropriate policy responses has intensified. Many experts and societal actors see carbon pricing as the primary way forward (2–4). Some even use it to argue against other policies, such as fuel efficiency standards. Viewed as the most efficient approach to cut greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, carbon pricing incentivizes actors to seek the lowest-cost abatement options for their specific circumstances. Consequently, many economists argue that carbon pricing should be the cornerstone of a climate policy response.

We question this reasoning. Carbon pricing faces five major issues that limit its use for accelerating deep decarbonization. First, carbon pricing frames climate change as a market failure rather than as a fundamental system problem. Second, it places particular weight on efficiency as opposed to effectiveness. Third, it tends to stimulate the optimization of existing systems rather than transformation. Fourth, it suggests a universal instead of context-sensitive policy approach. Fifth, it fails to reflect political realities.

### Ext. on “Tough to set the price”

#### No solvency: Uncertainty makes setting tax level difficult

Peace & Ye, 20

[Janet Peace & Jason Ye, Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, Market Mechanisms: Options for Climate Policy, April 2020. <https://www.c2es.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/market-mechanisms-options-climate-policy.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Assessing the cost to society from pollution is often difficult. While some damages caused by pollution are relatively easy to estimate in monetary terms, others are much more challenging to quantify. For example, if pollution causes a reduction in the fish population for a commercial fishery, we can estimate the damages based on the lost value of the fish at market prices. If, however, wetlands are destroyed or a species becomes extinct, it is not clear how society should assign a specific economic value to that loss. Other complications make it difficult to put a precise dollar figure on the costs imposed by a unit of pollution. They involve questions of how damages that apply to future generations should be valued in today’s decisions, and how to quantify consequences when there is a range of possible outcomes or the potential exists for a low-probability, high-impact event.

### Ext. on “Canada Proves”

#### US has hit emissions targets without a carbon tax, Canada failed with one

Goldstein, 23

[Lorrie Goldstein, Tillsonburg News, Tillsonburg News, U.S. reduces emissions without carbon tax, July 6, 2023. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Biden's climate change policy was contained in his 2022 legislation, the Inflation Reduction Act which earmarked almost US$400 billion in incentives and tax credits for everything from clean technologies to support for the fossil fuel industry. Except for putting a price on some methane emissions from the oil and gas sector starting in 2024, the IRA is all carrot and no stick when it comes to cutting emissions. That's resulted in Canada having to get into bidding wars with the U.S. by providing massive public subsidies to entice international developers of so-called clean energy technologies, such as the manufacturers of batteries for electric vehicles, to Canada. On Saturday, the Trudeau government is imposing the clean fuel regulations, which will raise the price of gasoline by up to 17 cents a litre by 2030, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer. All of this raises the question of why the U.S., by relying on technological innovation without a carbon tax, has been more successful at cutting emissions than Canada with one. Both countries had targets of reducing emissions to 17 per cent below 2005 levels by 2020. The Americans hit their target, reducing emissions by 21 per cent. Canada missed it with a nine per cent cut. While both U.S. and Canadian emissions rose in 2021 as the global economy began to recover from the economic downturn caused by the pandemic, Canadian emissions were down 8.4 per cent compared to 2005, America's double that.

#### US has done better without a carbon tax than Canada has with one

Goldstein, 23

[Lorrie Goldstein, Tillsonburg News, Tillsonburg News, U.S. reduces emissions without carbon tax, July 6, 2023. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Why doesn't Prime Minister Justin Trudeau ever criticize U.S. President Joe Biden for failing to impose a national carbon tax on Americans? Aren't we constantly being told putting a price on greenhouse gas emissions is the best way to combat climate change? If so, why doesn't our largest trading partner have one? The other question is why has the U.S. been more successful at lowering emissions, without a carbon tax, than Canada has with one? While Trudeau implemented Canada's carbon tax in 2019, the U.S. has rejected one going all the way back to when climate change guru Al Gore was vice-president in the Bill Clinton administration, a policy that continued through the George W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump and Biden administrations.

### Ext. on “Others won’t comply/Free Riders”

#### Current climate agreements lead to free-riders

Leo & Singh, 22

[Utkarsh Leo, Lecturer in Law at the School of Justice, University of Central Lancashire, Nidhi Singh, Co-Founder & Counsel, BlackPearl Chambers (Advocates & Solicitors), Why the planet needs legally binding obligations to limit climate-mitigation 'free-riders,' World Economic Forum, June 22, 2022. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/06/incentives-free-rider-problem-climate-change-mitigation/#:~:text=Planet%20Earth%20is%20in%20crisis,without%20contributing%20to%20the%20costs>. ] [NSB] [NWG]

Planet Earth is in crisis and global efforts to mitigate climate change have so far fallen short. The voluntary nature of international climate agreements means that some countries have become 'free-riders': where one nation receives the benefits of reduced GHG emissions without contributing to the costs.

#### No solvency. Countries will make commitments, but won’t back them up with domestic policy changes

Leo & Singh, 22

[Utkarsh Leo, Lecturer in Law at the School of Justice, University of Central Lancashire, Nidhi Singh, Co-Founder & Counsel, BlackPearl Chambers (Advocates & Solicitors), Why the planet needs legally binding obligations to limit climate-mitigation 'free-riders,' World Economic Forum, June 22, 2022. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/06/incentives-free-rider-problem-climate-change-mitigation/#:~:text=Planet%20Earth%20is%20in%20crisis,without%20contributing%20to%20the%20costs>. ] [NSB] [NWG]

Under international law, there is no legal mechanism to address the free-riding syndrome – because international agreements are voluntary arrangements. As a result, they lack strong incentives to penalize withdrawal from an agreement or for not meeting the commitments. In the climate context, the result is anarchy. Powerful countries choose to cooperate only if a proposed new agreement serves its interest. For instance: the United States, a major emitter, did not ratify the Kyoto Protocol on grounds that it was unfair to industrialised nations – resulting in its silent death. Similarly, on the issue of lack of incentives, the current Paris Agreement – which aims to limit global warming to preferably 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels – mostly relies on countries to devise and update pledges (or Nationally Determined Contributions) that have no legally binding obligations. The result is, most countries make big pledges at conferences, but most of them lack domestic policy backing. For example, at the 26th session of the Conference of the Parties in Glasgow, UK, China (the world’s largest emitter) pledged to reach carbon neutrality by 2060 but offered almost no detail on how, raising concerns about its viability. No wonder, the world is on track for a 2.7°C warming that will have profound impacts on lives worldwide.

### Ext. on “Carbon tax alone fails”

#### Carbon taxes alone won’t solve. Climate change requires a much more comprehensive approach

Rosenbloom et al, 2020

[Daniel Rosenbloom, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Jochen Markard, Department of Management, Technology, and Economics, ETH Zürich, Frank W. Geels, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester,and Lea Fuenfschilling, Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy, Lund University, Why carbon pricing is not sufficient to mitigate climate change—and how “sustainability transition policy” can help, April 8, 2020. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2004093117> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Carbon pricing is often presented as the primary policy approach to address climate change. We challenge this position and offer “sustainability transition policy” (STP) as an alternative. Carbon pricing has weaknesses with regard to five central dimensions: 1) problem framing and solution orientation, 2) policy priorities, 3) innovation approach, 4) contextual considerations, and 5) politics. In order to address the urgency of climate change and to achieve deep decarbonization, climate policy responses need to move beyond market failure reasoning and focus on fundamental changes in existing sociotechnical systems such as energy, mobility, food, and industrial production. The core principles of STP can help tackle this challenge.

#### Carbon tax alone fails. Only works as part of a comprehensive set of systemic changes

Rosenbloom et al, 2020

[Daniel Rosenbloom, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Jochen Markard, Department of Management, Technology, and Economics, ETH Zürich, Frank W. Geels, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester,and Lea Fuenfschilling, Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy, Lund University, Why carbon pricing is not sufficient to mitigate climate change—and how “sustainability transition policy” can help, April 8, 2020. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2004093117> ] [NSB] [NWG]

In summary, the dominant logic of contemporary climate policy, in which carbon pricing is the central policy response, is deeply flawed. Given the aforementioned shortcomings, carbon pricing should not be the primary policy strategy to combat climate change. Instead, carbon pricing should be used as part of a policy mix that promotes innovation and decline, accounts for political dynamics, varies between sectors and over time, and aims at profound system change.

#### Can’t solve GHG emissions without systemic change. Carbon tax alone fails.

Rosenbloom et al, 2020

[Daniel Rosenbloom, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Jochen Markard, Department of Management, Technology, and Economics, ETH Zürich, Frank W. Geels, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester,and Lea Fuenfschilling, Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy, Lund University, Why carbon pricing is not sufficient to mitigate climate change—and how “sustainability transition policy” can help, April 8, 2020. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2004093117> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The underlying rationale for carbon pricing is appealing in its simplicity: GHG emissions are viewed as a negative externality because the social costs flowing from climate change impacts are not reflected in the market price of carbon-intensive goods and services (6). Climate change is framed as the consequence of a market failure that can be corrected by placing a price on carbon so that actors also pay for the social cost of their carbon-intensive activities and reduce their demand for such goods and services.

Framing the climate challenge as a market failure, however, fails to seriously appreciate its scope and depth. Indeed, the climate challenge has been referred to as a “grand challenge” (7) or “super wicked problem” (8) that has thus far resisted traditional policy approaches.

We argue that climate change can be more appropriately understood as a system problem. Core societal functions, such as heating or mobility, are met through large and deeply entrenched sociotechnical systems made up of interconnected technologies, infrastructures, regulations, business models, and lifestyles (1). Over many decades, these systems have become increasingly locked into the combustion of fossil fuels and the associated release of GHG emissions. Consider, for instance, how the design of cities has developed alongside the diffusion of the gasoline-powered personal automobile; how norms about comfort and attire have become entwined with energy-intensive indoor temperature regulation; and how important political and economic interests have become entrenched with fossil fuel-based resource development or electricity provision.

Addressing the climate challenge, therefore, involves fundamental changes to existing systems, referred to as “sustainability transitions” (5). These transitions entail profound and interdependent adjustments in sociotechnical systems that cannot be reduced to a single driver, such as shifts in relative market prices. In mobility, for example, a low-carbon transition might encompass interacting developments around new vehicle technologies (e.g., autonomous electric cars), infrastructures (e.g., vehicle charging stations and high-speed rail), business models (e.g., mobility as a service and intermodal transport), and regulation (e.g., emission performance standards) but also changes in city planning (e.g., reduced urban sprawl) and lifestyles (e.g., telework and local vacations). The market failure framing fails to appreciate the broad scope of the climate challenge and the sweep of system elements that must undergo change. And so, the resulting solution orientation is far from sufficient.

#### Carbon tax can’t work in all areas and all sectors

Rosenbloom et al, 2020

[Daniel Rosenbloom, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Jochen Markard, Department of Management, Technology, and Economics, ETH Zürich, Frank W. Geels, Alliance Manchester Business School, University of Manchester,and Lea Fuenfschilling, Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy, Lund University, Why carbon pricing is not sufficient to mitigate climate change—and how “sustainability transition policy” can help, April 8, 2020. <https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.2004093117> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Carbon pricing strategies tend to be predicated on the notion that, eventually, all emissions are covered so that all prices will be corrected such that no economic decision would escape carbon pricing’s regulatory impact (2). This means that all jurisdictions and economic sectors should be included, ideally with uniform price signals (6). In the absence of uniform pricing, there is a risk that some nations will free-ride on the efforts of others and that firms will relocate to places with lower or no carbon prices (i.e., “carbon leakage”).

Three issues confront this universal approach. First, the required levels of coordination and cooperation are unrealistic, as carbon pricing encounters a fragmented international climate policy landscape (20). In the absence of a global sovereign and considering the great diversity of national circumstances (where countries have different responsibilities for generating the problem, vulnerabilities, and resources to adapt and support mitigation), cooperation or convergence among emission pricing frameworks remain elusive. Second, a universal approach will require well-functioning institutional structures and high levels of regulatory competences and monitoring systems, which do not exist everywhere. Third, carbon pricing strategies tend to ignore that policies need to be tailored to local and/or sectoral contexts in order to address specific sources of lock-in and opportunities for innovation.

Carbon pricing functions well in sectors, such as electricity, with large, fixed-point sources, where alternative technologies are available and polluters cannot easily relocate; it’s more difficult to implement in agro-food, transport, and heavy industry (14). Agro-food systems are characterized by manifold commodities, dispersed production (millions of farmers) in highly variable contexts (soil conditions, climate, local communities), and deeply entrenched cultural conventions, such as tastes and dietary habits (21), which all make it extremely difficult to assess the level of an effective carbon price and implement this throughout the system. Existing and proposed carbon prices also face problems in transport, often translating into pennies on the gallon. Such effects fall short of inducing the needed lifestyle changes or even being distinguished from standard oil market fluctuations.

This highlights the major difference between systems across different sectors, scales, and locations. The geophysical resources, infrastructures, actor networks, and availability of low-carbon alternatives diverge markedly from one system to another. Thus, the specific package of policy solutions (e.g., performance standards versus technology mandates) will also vary accordingly. And, given the above-mentioned challenges facing a uniform global response, climate policy will be defined by layered and interacting efforts within and across different contexts (22).

## Warming Answers

### 1NC

#### Climate models are not reliable—too much uncertainty

NIPCC, 2019

[Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), Climate Change Reconsidered II, 2019. <https://climatechangereconsidered.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Full-Book.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Equilibrium climate sensitivity (ECS), a measure of expected warming when CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere double, is yet another source of controversy in climate science. The IPCC’s estimate of ECS is one-third higher than most recent estimates in the scientific literature (Michaels, 2017). There is so much uncertainty in climate models and so many new discoveries being made that a single “true” estimate of ECS is probably impossible to calculate.

#### No Solvency. Natural variability may outweigh human contributions.

NIPCC, 2019

[Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), Climate Change Reconsidered II, 2019. <https://climatechangereconsidered.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Full-Book.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Reconstructions of average global surface temperature differ depending on the methodology used. The warming of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has not been shown to be beyond the bounds of natural variability.

#### Extinction scenarios are not realistic—adapting is the best option

Lilico, 23

[Andrew Lilico, Executive Director and Principal of Europe Economics, Prevention is no longer an option. We must adapt to climate change, The Telegraph, July 27, 2023. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Mainstream climate experts are already having this debate: they are asking whether we need greater focus on adaptation (while still mitigating). Why does our political class find debates about adaptation difficult? Partly, it is because some activists, such as Just Stop Oil, Extinction Rebellion or Greta Thunberg, claim that adaptation is not feasible. They say that climate change will end human civilisation as we have known it, potentially leading to the entire or effective extinction of the human race. That is not, however, the mainstream view of many scientists and economists who work on climate change. Rather, their view is that global warming could lead to large changes in our environment. Significant parts of the world currently heavily populated (particularly in the tropics) could become effectively uninhabitable while other parts (particularly in the far North) currently unsuitable for high-density human habitation would become more habitable. At the same time, at higher temperatures both climate and weather are likely to become more volatile – including increased frequency of storms, flooding and other weather events. These would be significant changes, but it would be perfectly feasible for humans to adapt to them – just as we have adapted to living in a wide range of climatic conditions around the globe. The issue is not whether adapting would be technically feasible. It is whether it would be desirable either in ethical or practical terms. Are we willing to accept a materially warmer world, with humans living in different parts of it? Are we willing to accept the large numbers of extinctions of animal and plant species major climate change would entail (along, in due course, with the greater flourishing of species currently less successful and of new species yet to evolve)? Are we willing to accept the political consequences of a large shift in the patterns of human habitation across the world, with (perhaps over the period of a century or two) many hundreds of millions fewer people living in the tropics and hundreds of millions extra living further North or South?

#### No Solvency. Too late for mitigation. We would actually have to REMOVE carbon to meet 2°C goals

CMCC Foundation, 21

[Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change, Reducing Ocean acidification by removing carbon dioxide: Two targets for cutting-edge research, April 13, 2021. <https://phys.org/news/2021-04-ocean-acidification-carbon-dioxide-cutting-edge.html> ] [NSB] [NWG]

It is now widely recognized that in order to reach the target of limiting global warming to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels (as the objective of the Paris agreement), cutting the carbon emissions even at an unprecedented pace will not be sufficient, but there is the need for development and implementation of active Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR) strategies.

#### Even meeting emission targets will NOT reduce warming

Lindzen, et al, 24

[R. Lindzen, Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences, MIT, W. Happer, Department of Physics, Princeton University, and W. A. van Wijngaarden, Department of Physics and Astronomy, York University, Net Zero Averted Temperature Increase, June 11, 2024. <https://co2coalition.org/publications/net-zero-averted-temperature-increase/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

As shown by (1), (23), (25) and (26), there appears to be no credible scenario where driving U.S. emissions of CO2 to zero by the year 2050 would avert a temperature increase of more than a few hundredths of a degree centigrade. The immense costs and sacrifices involved would lead to a reduction in warming approximately equal to the measurement uncertainty. It would be hard to find a better example of a policy of all pain and no gain.

### Ext. on “Uncertainty/Models”

#### Vote on presumption. The Affirmative can establish hypothetical risks, but can’t establish those outweigh the costs.

NIPCC, 2019

[Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), Climate Change Reconsidered II, 2019. <https://climatechangereconsidered.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Full-Book.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The NIPCC authors, building on previous reports in the CCR series as well as new literature reviews, find that while climate change is occurring and a human impact on climate is likely, there is no consensus on the size of that impact relative to natural variability, the net benefits or costs of the impacts of climate change, or whether future climate trends can be predicted with sufficient confidence to guide public policies today. Consequently, concern over climate change is not a sufficient scientific or economic basis for restricting the use of fossil fuels.

#### Many factors may not be accurately reflected in the models

NIPCC, 2019

[Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), Climate Change Reconsidered II, 2019. <https://climatechangereconsidered.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Full-Book.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Solar irradiance, magnetic fields, UV fluxes, cosmic rays, and other solar activity may have greater influence on climate than climate models and the IPCC currently assume.

#### IPCC glosses over uncertainty

NIPCC, 2019

[Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), Climate Change Reconsidered II, 2019. <https://climatechangereconsidered.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Full-Book.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Two other topics concerning methodology are the role of consensus in science and ways to manage and communicate uncertainty. Consensus may have a place in science when it is achieved over an extended period of time by independent scientists following the conventions of the Scientific Method. This is not the context in which it is invoked in climate science, and consequently it has been the cause of controversy and polarization of views (Curry, 2012; Lindzen, 2017). Uncertainty is unavoidable in science, but it can be reduced using techniques such as Bayesian inference and honestly communicated to other researchers and the public. Instead of following best practices, the IPCC and its followers make many unmerited declarative statements and issue seemingly confident predictions without error bars (Essex and McKitrick, 2007; Frank, 2015).

### Ext. on “Too Late—Must Adapt”

#### Warming is inevitable, but adaptation is feasible

Lilico, 23

[Andrew Lilico, Executive Director and Principal of Europe Economics, Prevention is no longer an option. We must adapt to climate change, The Telegraph, July 27, 2023. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Adapting to climate change will be feasible and is a necessity given the extent to which warming is now inevitable. Slower GDP growth and thus slower climate change ought to make greater efforts at adaptation more attractive. It shouldn’t be left to Lord Frost alone to point this out.

#### Too Late to prevent—Must adapt

Lilico, 23

[Andrew Lilico, Executive Director and Principal of Europe Economics, Prevention is no longer an option. We must adapt to climate change, The Telegraph, July 27, 2023. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Lord Frost this week said in a Lords debate that the UK should focus more on adapting to climate change and less on trying to prevent or mitigate it. He’s surely right, in two senses. First, given the extent to which the Earth now appears certain to heat up, preventing climate change is no longer an option. We must adapt, and we must provide adequate plans, resources and policy frameworks to achieve and incentivise that. Despite the many, many policies which attempt to mitigate climate change, it now seems inevitable that the world will pass the 1.5C or 2C increases in average global temperature, relative to the pre-Industrial period, that are likely to induce large changes in the climate. We have special taxes (e.g. fuel duty), a cap-and-trade emissions trading system for limiting the volume of various forms of emissions, building and appliances regulations. These are proving quite successful – particularly in the UK and the EU – but are unlikely at the global level to be sufficient to meet the 1.5C or 2C goals.

### Ext. on “No reduced Warming”

#### Neither US nor global reductions will have a measurable effect on warming

Lindzen, et al, 24

[R. Lindzen, Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences, MIT, W. Happer, Department of Physics, Princeton University, and W. A. van Wijngaarden, Department of Physics and Astronomy, York University, Net Zero Averted Temperature Increase, June 11, 2024. <https://co2coalition.org/publications/net-zero-averted-temperature-increase/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Using feedback-free estimates of the warming by increased atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO2) and observed rates of increase, we estimate that if the United States (U.S.) eliminated net CO2 emissions by the year 2050, this would avert a warming of 0.0084 ◦C (0.015 ◦F), which is below our ability to accurately measure. If the entire world forced net zero CO2 emissions by the year 2050, a warming of only 0.070 ◦C (0.13 ◦F) would be averted. If one assumes that the warming is a factor of 4 larger because of positive feedbacks, as asserted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the warming averted by a net zero U.S. policy would still be very small, 0.034 ◦C (0.061 ◦F). For worldwide net zero emissions by 2050 and the 4-times larger IPCC climate sensitivity, the averted warming would be 0.28 ◦C (0.50 ◦F).

#### No reduced warming

Lindzen, et al, 24

[R. Lindzen, Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences, MIT, W. Happer, Department of Physics, Princeton University, and W. A. van Wijngaarden, Department of Physics and Astronomy, York University, Net Zero Averted Temperature Increase, June 11, 2024. <https://co2coalition.org/publications/net-zero-averted-temperature-increase/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Many people are surprised by how little warming would be averted from adoption of net zero policies. For example, if the United States achieved net zero emissions of carbon dioxide by the year 2050, only a few hundredths of a degree Celsius of warming would be averted. This could barely be detected by our best instruments. The fundamental reason is that warming by atmospheric carbon dioxide is heavily 'saturated,' with each additional ton of atmospheric carbon dioxide producing less warming than the previous ton.

## Ocean Acidification Answers

#### This advantage is not independent. If we win emissions are not increasing or that the plan won’t solve, this advantage goes away.

#### No Solvency. Overfishing outweighs acidification

World Economic Forum, 2020

[Jodie L. Rummer, Associate Professor & Principal Research Fellow, James Cook University, Bridie JM Allan, Lecturer/researcher, University of Otago, Ian A. Bouyoucos, Postdoctoral fellow, James Cook University, Mirjam van der Mheen, Fellow, University of Western Australia, Irfan Yulianto, Lecturer of Fisheries Resources Utilization, IPB University, Charitha Pattiaratchi, Professor of Coastal Oceanography, University of Western Australia, The mighty Pacific Ocean is in peril - this is why, World Economic Forum, December 9, 2020. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/12/pacific-ocean-peril-overfishing-pollution-plastic-climate-cahnge/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Humans take about 80 million tonnes of wildlife from the sea each year. In 2019, the world’s leading scientists said of all threats to marine biodiversity over the past 50 years, fishing has caused the most harm. They said 33% of fish species were overexploited, 60% were being fished to the maximum level, and just 7% were underfished. The decline in fish populations is not just a problem for humans. Fish play an important role in marine ecosystems and are a crucial link in the ocean’s complex food webs.

#### No solvency. Even with reductions, it will take TENS of THOUSANDS of years for ocean pH to recover

Australian Academy of Science, 15

[Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg Fellow of the Australian Academy, Director, Global Change Institute, The University of Queensland, Dr Richard Matear, Senior Research Scientist, Division of Marine and Atmospheric Research, CSIRO (Australia's national science agency), Professor Emma Johnston, School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of New South Wales, More than just temperature—climate change and ocean acidification, May 15, 2015. <https://www.science.org.au/curious/earth-environment/ocean-acidification> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The oceans are going to feel the effects of CO2 for a long time—it takes tens of thousands of years for oceans to recover their pH once it has been changed

#### New review shows ocean acidification claims exaggerated

Webster, 16

[Ben Webster, environment editor, “Scientists 'are exaggerating carbon threat to marine life',” The Times (London), March 1, 2016. (Lexis)] [NSB] [NWG]

Claims that coral reefs are doomed because human emissions are making the oceans more acidic have been exaggerated, a review of the science has found. An "inherent bias" in scientific journals in favour of more calamitous predictions has excluded research showing that marine creatures are not damaged by ocean acidification, which is caused by the sea absorbing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. It has been dubbed the "evil twin of climate change" and hundreds of studies have claimed to show that it destroys coral reefs and other marine life by making it harder for them to develop shells or skeletons.

#### Oceans will NEVER be acidic—only slightly less alkaline

Webster, 16

[Ben Webster, environment editor, “Scientists 'are exaggerating carbon threat to marine life',” The Times (London), March 1, 2016. (Lexis)] [NSB] [NWG]

"The oceans will never become acid because there is such a huge buffering capacity in the oceans. We simply could never release enough CO2 into the atmosphere to cause the pH to go below 7 [the point in the pH scale at which a solution becomes acidic]. "If they had called it something else, such as 'lower alkalinity', it wouldn't have been as catchy," he said.

### Ext. on “Alternate causes”

#### Tourism is a bigger threat than climate change

Ross, 16

[John Ross, Science Reporter, The Australian, Scientists float doom over sparkling reef, March 2, 2016. (Lexis)] [ellipses in original] [NSB] [NWG]

Sydney tourist Jeremy Fox yesterday snorkelled the coral around Green Island, off Cairns, and said the reef was sparkling but tourism pressures appeared a greater risk than climate change. Tais Szigali, from New York, said: "I've never seen anything like this. It's like something out of Finding Nemo." She questioned how long this could last. "Seeing how many people and boats come out here, I don't know how long this can be done without damage."

### Ext. on “Impact Exaggerated”

#### More than half of studies show little or no effect

Ross, 16

[John Ross, Science Reporter, The Australian, Scientists float doom over sparkling reef, March 2, 2016. (Lexis)] [ellipses in original] [NSB] [NWG]

Howard Browman, editor of the Journal of Marine Science, said journal articles on ocean acidification - a term that was not in use before 2000 - had exploded from just five in 2005 to 600 a decade later. "(It) has probably been the most-studied single topic in marine science in recent times," said Dr Browman, who is also principal research scientist at the Norwegian Institute of Marine Research. He said a handful of influential scientific journals and lobbying by international organisations had turned ocean acidification into a major issue. "Such journals tend to publish doom and gloom stories ... stated without equivocation. "Some of these, typically published in high-impact journals and covered by the mass media, predict an ocean acidification-generated calamity." In an effort to achieve a "more balanced interpretation", Dr Browman invited papers on ocean acidification and encouraged studies showing no effect. More than half of the 44 papers selected for publication found that raised levels of CO2 had little or no impact on creatures including crabs, limpets, sea urchins and sponges.

#### New review finds Ocean acidification exaggerated and alternate causes more important

Webster, 16

[Ben Webster, environment editor, “Scientists 'are exaggerating carbon threat to marine life',” The Times (London), March 1, 2016. (Lexis)] [NSB] [NWG]

The review found that many studies had used flawed methods, subjecting marine creatures to sudden increases in carbon dioxide that would never be experienced in real life.

"In some cases it was levels far beyond what would ever be reached even if we burnt every molecule of carbon on the planet," Howard Browman, the editor of ICES Journal of Marine Science, who oversaw the review, said. He added that this had distracted attention from more urgent threats to reefs such as agricultural pollution, overfishing and tourism.

#### Doom and gloom bias has exaggerated the issue

Webster, 16

[Ben Webster, environment editor, “Scientists 'are exaggerating carbon threat to marine life',” The Times (London), March 1, 2016. (Lexis)] [ellipses in original] [NSB] [NWG]

Dr Browman, who is also principal research scientist at the Norwegian Institute of Marine Research, found there had been huge increase in articles on ocean acidification in recent years, rising from five in 2005 to 600 last year. He said that a handful of influential scientific journals and lobbying by international organisations had turned ocean acidification into a major issue. "Such journals tend to publish doom and gloom stories ... stated without equivocation," he said. The bias in favour of doom-laden articles was partly the result of pressure on scientists to produce eye-catching work, he added.

#### More than half of studies showed little or no effect

Webster, 16

[Ben Webster, environment editor, “Scientists 'are exaggerating carbon threat to marine life',” The Times (London), March 1, 2016. (Lexis)] [NSB] [NWG]

Dr Browman invited scientists around the world to contribute studies on ocean acidification for a special edition of his journal. More than half of the 44 studies selected for publication found that raised levels of CO2 had little or no impact on marine life, including crabs, limpets, sea urchins and sponges. Dr Browman said that the edition had demonstrated that there was "a body of work out there that people had difficulty publishing elsewhere" and that "not every study shows that Nemo is going to be doomed", a reference to the reef-dwelling clownfish in the Disney film Finding Nemo. The term ocean acidification was also a misnomer, he said, because it suggested that the oceans could become acidic instead of alkaline.

#### Coral bleaching exaggerated

Ross, 16

[John Ross, Science Reporter, The Australian, Scientists float doom over sparkling reef, March 2, 2016. (Lexis)] [ellipses in original] [NSB] [NWG]

Dr Browman, a marine scientist for 35 years, said he was not saying that ocean acidification posed no threat, but "a higher level of academic scepticism" should be applied. His observations have coincided with claims of the "worst coral bleaching" in almost a generation around Lizard Island in the Great Barrier Reef's north. WWF Australia's reef campaigner Louise Matthiesson said climate change was principally responsible. The taskforce's convener, Terry Hughes, said the problem had been overstated. "Current reports of coral bleaching on the GBR do not equate to a mass bleaching event."

### Ext. on “Turn-Makes other causes worse”

#### Focus on Ocean acidification exaggerates impacts and undermines research on more important causes.

Ross, 16

[John Ross, Science Reporter, The Australian, Scientists float doom over sparkling reef, March 2, 2016. (Lexis)] [NSB] [NWG]

A penchant for "doom and gloom stories" has skewed academic reporting of the damage increasing oceanic CO2 concentrations are inflicting on coral reefs, a scientific review has found. An influential marine biologist says an "inherent bias" in scientific publishing, which causes journals to favour calamitous predictions over less alarming findings, has been exaggerated in studies of ocean acidification. The bias is driving scientists to avoid research into the more immediate threats, such as overfishing, tourism and agricultural run-off, as pressure to publish forces them to pursue headline-grabbing topics.

## Trade Wars Answers

#### There is NO evidence that the US will pass CBAM legislation. Their evidence says there were proposals, but none of them got out of committee last Congress. Their evidence says there is “support,” but NO evidence that there are ENOUGH votes to PASS both houses of Congress.

#### Empirically denied—the WTO dispute system has been dead for 5 years and the only impact has been more bilateral agreements

Zhou & Crochet, 24

[Weihuan Zhou is Associate Professor and Co-Director of the China International Business and Economic Law Centre, Faculty of Law and Justice, UNSW, Victor Crochet is PhD student at Cambridge University, Fixing fragmentation in the settlement of international trade disputes, East Asia Forum, February 24, 2024. <https://eastasiaforum.org/2024/02/24/fixing-fragmentation-in-the-settlement-of-international-trade-disputes/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Fragmentation in global trade is not new. With the slow development of multilateral trade rules at the World Trade Organization (WTO), governments have turned to free trade agreements (FTAs). As of 2023, almost 600 bilateral and regional trade agreements have been notified to the WTO, leading to growing fragmentation in trade rules, business activities and international relations. But until recently, trade dispute settlements have predominantly remained within the WTO. Governments historically used the WTO as their preferred forum but this changed after the WTO’s appellate court, the Appellate Body, stopped functioning in December 2019 because the United States blocked the appointment of new Appellate Body judges.

#### No solvency. The US blocking appointments is the actual cause of WTO dispute process collapse

Hopewell, 21

[Dr Kristen Hopewell, Associate Professor, and Canada Research Chair in Global Policy, University of British Columbia, interviewed by Ben Horton of Chatham House, Lessons from Trump’s assault on the World Trade Organization, Chatham House, August 10, 2021. <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/08/lessons-trumps-assault-world-trade-organization> ] [NSB] [NWG]

What caused this disruption to the appellate body?

Starting in 2017, the United States began blocking all new appointments to the appellate body as the terms of its judges expired. Without a functional appellate body to hear cases, the country ruled against in a dispute can bypass a panel’s decision just by filing an appeal, which has major implications for the WTO’s ability to mediate disputes. This move was part of a wider approach to global governance under President Donald Trump, which I have characterized as an assault on the liberal trading order.

#### No Solvency. EU CBAM is already provoking retaliation

Beaumont-Smith, 24

[Gabriella Beaumont-Smith, Former trade policy analyst at CATO Institute, Are Carbon Border Adjustments a Dream Climate Policy or Protectionist Nightmare?, Policy Analysis No. 978, July 30, 2024. <https://www.cato.org/policy-analysis/are-carbon-border-adjustments-dream-climate-policy-or-protectionist-nightmare#would-cbam-be-consistent-wto-rules-or-invite-retaliation> ] [NSB] [NWG]

For example, India’s Commerce Ministry is exploring retaliatory measures; at the WTO’s 13th Ministerial Conference in February 2024, India brought formal complaints about the EU’s CBAM. The commerce minister raised concerns about “the increasing use of trade protectionist unilateral measures, which are sought to be justified in the guise of environmental protection.” Other countries, including Brazil, China, and South Africa, are vocal opponents of the EU’s CBAM.

#### No Solvency. EU CBAM provisions violate WTO anyway

Smith, 23

[Tori K. Smith, Former Director of International Economic Policy at the American Action Forum, U.S. Carbon Border Adjustment Proposals and World Trade Organization Compliance, Insight, February 8, 2023. <https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/u-s-carbon-border-adjustment-proposals-and-world-trade-organization-compliance/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The EU’s new CBAM is likely to reignite debate in Congress over whether to create a similar mechanism in the United States. Europe’s CBAM could run afoul of WTO rules in several areas, which should give pause to U.S. policymakers. Compliance with WTO commitments should be a top priority when considering any new tariff or tax, Therefore, any proposal for a U.S. CBAM should be met with increased scrutiny, particularly considering that such measures are untested at the WTO.

### Ext. on No Credibility Now

#### WTO DS credibility suffering now

Thai News Service, 24

[Thai News Service, India: Commerce Minister Piyush Goyal urges trust and implementation in WTO decisions, March 4, 2024. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Indian minister Goyal reiterated India's stance on the necessity of a robust dispute settlement system, emphasizing that it is essential for maintaining fairness, predictability, and effectiveness in international trade. India's Commerce Minister Piyush Goyal underscored the urgent need for rebuilding trust within the World Trade Organization and ensuring the effective implementation of its decisions at the 13th Ministerial Conference in Abu Dhabi. The minister also stressed the restoration of the appellate body, which has been inactive since December 2019, as a crucial step towards upholding the rules-based global trade order. The non-functionality of the appellate body, attributed to the blocking of member appointments by the United States, has raised doubts about the credibility of the WTO and its ability to resolve trade disputes. Indian minister Goyal reiterated India's stance on the necessity of a robust dispute settlement system, emphasizing that it is essential for maintaining fairness, predictability, and effectiveness in international trade. India recalled the commitment of WTO Members of 12th Ministerial Conference to conduct discussions with the view to have a fully and well-functioning dispute settlement system accessible to all members by 2024.

### Ext. on EU Violates anyway

#### Other countries are already going after the EU CBAM

Majkut, 23

[Joseph Majkut, Joseph Majkut is director of the Energy Security and Climate Change Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), The United States Should Learn to Live with EU CBAM, January 17, 2023. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/united-states-should-learn-live-eu-cbam> ] [NSB] [NWG]

It should be no surprise that the biggest exporters of carbon-intensive goods into the European Union are up in arms. The BRIC countries have called it discriminatory, unilateral, and in violation of World Trade Organization (WTO) rules. Before its invasion of Ukraine and the resulting sanctions, Russia was the top exporter of the goods that will be covered by the CBAM, according to researchers from adelphi. China was second and India was eighth. For these countries, the CBAM is a source of disruption and makes their exports into Europe less competitive. Brazil was 11th, just behind the United States.

#### EU CBAM provisions violate WTO anyway

Smith, 23

[Tori K. Smith, Former Director of International Economic Policy at the American Action Forum, U.S. Carbon Border Adjustment Proposals and World Trade Organization Compliance, Insight, February 8, 2023. <https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/u-s-carbon-border-adjustment-proposals-and-world-trade-organization-compliance/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

In the case of the European Union’s CBAM, that its ETS and the carbon tariff are tied to the average ETS price could represent equal application of the measure on imports and domestic goods. The EU, however, offers free allowances to some of the covered products domestically, and while those will be phased out over time, their existence could potentially constitute a GATT violation.[10]

#### EU CBAM provisions violate WTO anyway

Smith, 23

[Tori K. Smith, Former Director of International Economic Policy at the American Action Forum, U.S. Carbon Border Adjustment Proposals and World Trade Organization Compliance, Insight, February 8, 2023. <https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/u-s-carbon-border-adjustment-proposals-and-world-trade-organization-compliance/> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The EU’s CBAM could run afoul of these commitments because it gives special treatment to countries that already have a carbon price. This is estimated to benefit South Korea and Singapore by allowing them to lessen their price when sending products to the EU. It is also likely that some countries, such as Switzerland, Norway, Iceland, and Liechtenstein, could be fully exempt from the CBAM because they all have an ETS that is tied to the EU’s.[13]

## Debt Answers

#### This trades off with their emissions advantages. If they get a lot of revenue, it is because people are paying the tax, which means they are still emitting carbon.

#### Revenue will be lower because of loss of other tax revenue

Kaufman, 2019

[Noah Kaufman, Senior Research Scholar at the Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia University, What You Need to Know About a Federal Carbon Tax in the United States, April 02, 2019. <https://www.energypolicy.columbia.edu/publications/what-you-need-to-know-about-a-federal-carbon-tax-in-the-united-states> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Net revenues are likely to be lower because payments of the carbon tax leave individuals and businesses with less income, and thus lower tax payments on that income. This is referred to by the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office as the “Income and Payroll Tax Offset.” A recent analysis of carbon tax proposals indicates this offset could reduce government revenue by about 23 percent of the annual carbon tax revenue.

#### No Solvency. Their evidence just says the tax will increase revenue, NOT that the revenue will be enough to reduce overall debt by a noticeable amount.

#### No Solvency. Increases in mandatory spending will swamp carbon tax revenue

CRS, 23

[Congressional Research Service, Trends in Mandatory Spending, November 7, 2023. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R44641> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Over the next decade, mandatory spending is projected to stabilize at about 14.1% of GDP before rising in the first years of the 2030s. Discretionary spending, an estimated 6.7% of GDP in FY2023, is projected to decline gradually to 6.0% of GDP in FY2033. The two largest components of mandatory spending, as shown above, are Social Security and major federal health care programs, such as Medicare and Medicaid.

#### No Solvency. Congress will just spend the new revenue

House Budget Committee, 24

[House Budget Committee, It’s Not a Revenue Problem; It’s a Spending Problem, January 31, 2024. <https://budget.house.gov/press-release/its-not-a-revenue-problem-its-a-spending-problem> ] [NSB] [NWG]

Revenues in the first quarter of FY2024 were $1.1 trillion, an $83 billion or eight percent increase from this time last year. At the same time, the deficit has grown by more than a fifth. These numbers paint a clear picture that Congress doesn’t have a revenue problem, but a spending problem—no matter how much money the government raises by shaking down the taxpayer, Democrats in Congress and the White House will still spend all that and then some. We don’t need to raise taxes. What we need now more than ever is uncommon courage from our elected leaders to change the wasteful and reckless spending culture in Washington.

#### No US economic collapse. Safeguards prevent.

Green, 24

[Jon Green, Encompass Advisors (financial advisers), What Could Happen If the US Economy Collapsed?, January 24, 2024. <https://www.encompassadvisors.com/post/a-us-economic-collapse-what-could-happen> ] [NSB] [NWG]

An economic collapse is a complete breakdown of the market and economy. This event is not a bearish trend or a recession—it goes far beyond the normal crisis. There are minimal safeguards for financial institutions and governments to combat such a reality. Furthermore, the dismantling of primary financial instructions or the national government can trigger or exacerbate a collapse. The United States has never suffered a complete collapse—although the Great Depression teetered on the edge of ruin.

## Air Pollution Answers

#### This advantage is not independent. If we win emissions are not increasing or that the plan won’t solve, this advantage goes away.

#### No solvency. Their impacts are based on global numbers, but they only act in the US.

#### No significance. EPA regulations are improving air quality now.

States News Service, 24

[Allergy & Asthma Network, States News Service, ALLERGY AND ASTHMA NETWORK OPPOSES THE WEAKENING OF EPA CLEAN AIR RULES, June 20, 2024. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has taken steps to improve public health by ruling on stronger standards to cut carbon emissions and reduce air pollution. However, some members of Congress want to weaken EPA's implementation of these standards. A statement released by the 26 organizations urged Congress to safeguard the Clean Air Act instead of weakening the EPA rules. The rules include stronger emission standards for new cars to reduce air pollution and protect respiratory health. Other EPA standards include:

Particulate Matter (PM) standards

Limits on methane and other oil and gas pollution

Greenhouse gas standards for new trucks and buses

Limits on mercury and toxic air pollution

Limits on carbon pollution from power plants

#### EPA estimates exaggerate the risk

NIPCC, 2019

[Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), Climate Change Reconsidered II, 2019. <https://climatechangereconsidered.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Full-Book.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

A review of the evidence shows the EPA and other government agencies exaggerate the public health threat posed by fossil fuels. While the combustion of fossil fuels without pollution abatement technology does release chemicals that could be harmful to humans, other animal life, and plants, the most important issue is not the quantity of emissions but levels of exposure (Calabrese and Baldwin, 2003; Calabrese, 2005, 2015). By all accounts, air quality improved in the United States and other developed countries throughout the twentieth century and the trend continues in the twenty-first century (Goklany 2012; EPA, 2018a).

#### No connection to fossil fuels—deaths from air pollution have declines while fossil fuel use has increased

Lueken, 23

[Linnea Lueken, Research Fellow with the Arthur B. Robinson Center on Climate and Environmental Policy, Climate kooks continue to push bogus claims, December 3, 2023. (NexisUni database)] [NSB] [NWG]

Air pollution is next; the WHO asserts that outdoor air pollution driven by fossil fuel emissions kills millions, particularly in the form of particulate matter. This figure is refuted by real world data. Worse still for the claim, they admit that deaths from air pollution have fallen over time, even as fossil fuel use increased. Even the U.N.'s climate body does not connect global warming to 'air pollution weather,' or temperature inversion conditions that may cause ground level ozone.

#### Air pollution is unlikely to kill anyone in the US

NIPCC, 2019

[Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), Climate Change Reconsidered II, 2019. <https://climatechangereconsidered.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Full-Book.pdf> ] [NSB] [NWG]

The authors of Chapter 6 conclude that air pollution caused by fossil fuels is unlikely to kill anyone in the United States in the twenty-first century, though it may be a legitimate health concern in rapidly growing developing countries that rely on biofuels and burning coal without modern emission control technologies.