
West Coast Publishing

Redistribution 2023-24 Affirmative SAMPLE

Edited by Jim Hanson

Researchers

Brandon Puchowitz, Brett Bricker, Eugene Bressler, Immanuel Eggers,
Matt Stannard, Pranay Ippagunta, Tyler Durbin, William James Taylor

Thanks for using our Policy, LD, Public Forum, and Extemp Materials.

**Please don't share this material with anyone
outside of your school**

including via print, email, dropbox, google drive, the web, etc.

We're a small non-profit; please help us continue to provide our products.

Contact us at jim@wcdebate.com

www.wcdebate.com

AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO

REDISTRIBUTION 2023-2024 WEST COAST PUBLISHING

Finding Arguments in this File

Use the table of contents on the next pages to find the evidence you need or the navigation bar on the left. We have tried to make the table of contents as easy to use as possible. You'll find scenario/impacts, affirmatives, disadvantages, counterplans, and kritiks listed alphabetically in their categories.

Using the Arguments in this File

We encourage you to be familiar with the evidence you use. Highlight (underline) the key lines you will use in the evidence. Cut evidence from our files, incorporate your and others' research and make new files. File the evidence so that you can easily retrieve it when you need it in debate rounds. Practice reading the evidence out-loud; Practice applying the arguments to your opponents' positions; Practice defending your evidence in rebuttal speeches.

Use West Coast Evidence as a Beginning

We hope you enjoy our evidence files and find them useful. In saying this, we want to make a strong statement that we make when we coach and that we believe is vitally important to your success: **DO NOT USE THIS EVIDENCE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR OWN RESEARCH.** Instead, let it serve as a beginning. Let it inform you of important arguments, of how to tag and organize your arguments, and to offer citations for further research. Don't stagnate in these files--build upon them by doing your own research for updates, new strategies, and arguments that specifically apply to your opponents. In doing so, you'll use our evidence to become a better debater.

Copying and Sharing West Coast Evidence?

Our policy gives you the freedom to use our evidence for educational purposes without violating our hard work.

- You may print and copy this evidence for those on your team.
- **You may not electronically share nor distribute this evidence with anyone other than those on your team unless you very substantially change each page of material that you share.**

For unusual situations, you can e-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com and seek our consent.

Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at www.wcdebate.com
2. E-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com
3. Fax us at 877-781-5058

Copyright 2023. West Coast Publishing. All Rights Reserved.

Visit our web page!
www.wcdebate.com

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS 3

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by adopting a federal jobs guarantee, expanding Social Security, and/or providing a basic income.13

TOPIC OVERVIEW 14

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by adopting a federal jobs guarantee, expanding Social Security, and/or providing a basic income.15

AFFIRMATIVE STRATEGIES 17

DEFINITIONS 19

Fiscal redistribution [1/2] 20

Fiscal Redistribution [2/2] 21

Jobs guarantee [1/2] 22

Jobs guarantee [2/2] 23

Social Security [1/2] 24

Social Security [2/2] 25

Basic income [1/2] 26

Basic income [2/2] 27

CLIMATE JOB GUARANTEE AFF 28

Explanation 29

1AC 30

Advantage – CJG Prevents Catastrophic Warming 31

Plan 39

The Plan Solves 40

AFF – AT: T 46

AT: T- FR Must Be Progressive Tax 47

AFF – Climate ADV XT	48
2AC/1AR – XT: Climate ! – Tipping Points	49
2AC/1AR – US K/T Emissions	51
2AC – Warming Outweighs	53
2AC – Warming Disease Impact	55
2AC – AT: Job Tradeoff	56
2AC – AT: Welfare/Public Goods Tradeoff	57
2AC – Green Jobs Explanation	58
AFF – AT: DAs	59
2AC/1AR – AT: CO2 Good DA (Agriculture)	60
2AC – AT: Green Paradox DA	63
2AC – AT: REMs DA	65
2AC/1AR – Plan Popular	68
2AC/1AR – Carbon Tax Popular	73
AFF – AT: CPs	74
2AC – AT: Infrastructure CP	75
2AC – AT: Geoengineering CP (Generic)	76
2AC – AT: Microbubbles CP	77
2AC – AT: Carbon Tax PIC	78
---AT: Cap & Trade CP	79
AFF – Funding Mechanisms	80
AFF – Carbon Tax – XT	81
AFF – Military Mechanism	84
AFF – Deficit Spending	85
JOB GUARANTEE AFFIRMATIVE	86
Federal Jobs Guarantee	87
1AC page 1 of 10	89
1AC page 2 of 10	90
1AC page 3 of 10	91

1AC page 4 of 10	92
1AC page 5 of 10	94
1AC page 6 of 10	95
1AC page 7 of 10	96
1AC page 8 of 10	97
1AC page 9 of 10	98
1AC page 10 of 10	99
Solvency	100
Solvency	101
Solvency	102
Workplace Freedom Advantage	103
Workplace Freedom Advantage	104
Workplace Freedom Advantage	106
Racism Advantage	107
Racism Advantage	108
Infrastructure Advantage	109
Wages Advantage	110
Wages Advantage: Poverty Impacts	111
Nuclear War Worst Impact	112
Answers to Inflation Arguments	113
Answers to Inflation Arguments	114
Answers to Inflation Arguments	115
Answers to "Spending/Deficits Bad" Arguments	116
Answers to "Spending/Deficits Bad" Arguments	117
AT Politics/Public Opinion	118
AT Politics/Public Opinion	119
AT Racial Capitalism Kritik	120
AT Racial Capitalism Kritik	121
AT Neolib/Capitalism Kritik	122

AT UBI 123

AT UBI 124

AT UBI 125

AT Fund the Private Sector Counterplan 127

AT Sovereign Money/Public Banks Counterplans 128

AT Advantage Counterplans/Concrete Kritik Alts 129

AT Stigma/Won't shift to private sector 130

AT Hurts Private Sector 131

SOCIAL SECURITY AFFIRMATIVE 132

File Description 133

1AC 134

AFF EXTENSIONS 140

Inherency – Extensions 141

Harms – Extensions 143

Solvency – Extensions 147

Advantage: Income Inequality 149

Advantage: Disability 151

Plan Text Add On: Reform How Social Security Operates 154

Alternative Plan: Add a Investment Option to Social Security 155

A2 – Social Security Bad for Society 160

A2 – Private Retirement Funding Better 161

A2 – Social Security Expansion Hurts the Economy 162

A2 – Cut Benefits for Higher Earners 165

UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME AFFIRMATIVE 166

Universal Basic Income (UBI) Affirmative/Negative 167

1AC 168

(UBI) Universal Basic Income Case Extensions 176

ADVANTAGES 177

Poverty is increasing now 178

Poverty Advantage Ext. – General impacts/extension	180
Poverty Advantage Ext. – Reliable income is key	181
Poverty Advantage Ext. – UBI boosts the economy	182
Poverty Advantage Ext. – Job security/market	184
Poverty Advantage Ext. – Mental health/Value to life extension	185
Democracy Advantage Extension	186
SOLVENCY	187
A2: Too expensive	188
Wealth Tax solves	189
UBI creates savings	191
Alaska proves UBI solves	192
A2: People will just stop working	193
Alternate funding source: Estate Tax	194
GENERAL CASE ISSUES	196
A2: UBI leads to wasteful spending	197
A2: Just gives money to the rich	198
UBI - OFF-CASE ANSWERS	199
TOPICALITY ANSWERS	200
A2: UBI is not “fiscal redistribution”	201
A2: “UBI is not targeted”	202
KRITIK ANSWERS	203
A2: Feminist Kritiks	204
A2: Capitalism Kritik – Worker empowerment turns	205
A2: Capitalism Kritik – Internal link turn	207
CP ANSWERS	208
A2: USB CP - Permutations	209
A2: USB CP – No solvency	210
A2: USB CP – Housing turn	211
A2: USB CP – Food Banks turn	212

A2: Child Tax Credit CP – Perm Solvency	213
DA ANSWERS	214
Big uniqueness answer to all DAs	215
A2: Economy DAs – Won’t increase inflation	216
A2: Economy DAs – High prices answers	219
A2: Economy DAs – Won’t hurt labor / actually improves the market	220
A2: Politics DAs – Plan is bipartisan	221
A2: Politics DAs – Public likes	222
A2: Politics DAs – Conservatives will get on board	223
EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT (EITC) FAILS	224
Affirmative	225
Frontline – EITC Bad	226
Frontline – EITC Should Not Be Expanded	228
Extensions – EITC Error and Fraud Rate	230
Extensions – EITC Reduces Tax Revenue	232
A2 – EITC Better Than Other Programs	233
A2 – EITC Increases Employment	234
A2 – EITC Is a Tax Break	235
RESPONSES TO DEFICIT SPENDING COUNTERPLAN AFFIRMATIVE	236
Permutation Do The Counterplan	237
The Counterplan Links to the Net-Benefit	239
Taxation is Good for the Economy	240
MMT Hurts The Economy	242
MMT Hurts The Economy	244
MMT Triggers Inflation	245
MMT Triggers Debt Crises	246
MMT Triggers Debt Crises	248
MMT Fails Under This Congress	250
MMT Is All Theory, No Practice	252

MMT Collapses The Dollar	253
The Counterplan Can't Legally Fund Social Security	255
RESPONSES TO HOUSING COUNTERPLAN AFFIRMATIVE	257
The Counterplan Links to Politics	258
Housing Does Not Cause Inequality	260
Housing Does Not Cause Inequality	262
House Ownership is Worse for the Economy	264
Home-Buying Now is Bad	266
New Housing is Impossible	268
The Affirmative Solves Housing	270
Basic Income Solves Housing	272
Jobs Guarantee Solves Housing	274
Social Security Solves Housing	275
RESPONSES TO STATE COUNTERPLAN AFFIRMATIVE	277
AT: Solvency	278
CP fails—causes ideological implementation	279
CP hinders states' vital tasks	280
Fed Key—Entitlements	281
Fed Key—Efficiency	282
Fed Key—Finances	283
Fed Key—Foot dragging	285
Fed Key—Protection of All U.S. Residents	286
Fed Key—Redistribution	288
Fed Key—Social Security	289
Fed Key—Tax evasion	290
Fed Key—Uniformity	291
Federal funding links to federalism	293
AT: "States tailor to geography"	294
Perms	295

Perm do both (Basic Income)	296
Perm do both (Jobs Guarantee)	297
Perm do both—resolves link to federalism	298
Perm resolves impact turns to federalism (crises)	301
State Budgets DA	302
2AC Shell	303
Ext: Higher education key to R&D/Economy	305
Ext: Budget cuts hurt education/economy	306
RESPONSES TO IRS DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE	307
The Plan Does Not Require Taxes	308
The IRS is Degraded Now	310
Tax Enforcement is Bad for Inequality	312
Tax Enforcement is Bad for the Economy	314
The IRA Does Not Solve Climate Change	316
Climate Change is Irreversible	318
Climate Change is Not Existential	320
Answer to the GOP Defunding Link Scenario	322
Answer to the Tax Complexity Link	324
RESPONSES TO OIL PRICES DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE	326
Russian Economy is Low Now	327
Russian Oil Revenue is Low Now	329
Russia Is Not Dependent on Oil	330
High Oil Prices Drive Russian Aggression	332
High Oil Prices Drive Russian Aggression	334
High Oil Prices Lead to War	336
Oil Dependence Leads to War	338
Russia is Revisionist	339
Diversionsary War is Not True	341
High Prices Lead to Iranian Aggression	343

The Disadvantage Does Not Turn the Case	344
US-Russia War is Unlikely	346
RESPONSES TO AGRICULTURE DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE	348
2AC --- Thumpers --- Ag Exports	349
1AR --- Thumpers --- Ag Exports	350
2AC --- Thumpers --- Small Farms	353
1AR --- Thumpers --- Small Farms	354
2AC --- AT: Taxes Link	356
1AR --- AT: Taxes Link	358
2AC --- AT: Tax Link --- UBI	359
2AC --- Small Farms Irrelevant	360
2AC --- Farm Size Doesn't Matter	361
Impact Turn	362
2AC --- Big Agriculture Good	363
2AC --- Small Farms Bad --- Food Prices	365
2AC --- Small Farms Bad --- Precision Agriculture	366
1AR --- Small Farms Bad --- Precision Agriculture	367
2AC --- AT: Climate MPX	370
2AC --- AT: Yield MPX	372
RESPONSES TO ECONOMIC COLLAPSE DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE	375
2AC --- UQ --- Econ Low Now	376
2AC --- Link Turn --- UBI	377
2AC --- Link Turn --- Medicare	378
2AC --- Link Turn --- Green New Deal	379
2AC --- Link Turn --- Jobs Guarantee	380
2AC --- Impact Defense --- Slow Growth Doesn't Cause War	381
2AC --- Impact Defense --- Econ Decline Doesn't Cause War	382
2AC --- Impact Defense --- US Econ Not Key to Global	384
1AR	385

1AR --- UQ --- Econ Low Now	386
1AR --- Link Turn --- UBI	388
1AR --- Link Turn --- Medicare	390
1AR --- Link Turn --- Green New Deal	392
1AR --- Link Turn --- Jobs Guarantee	393
1AR --- Impact Defense --- Slow Growth Doesn't Cause War	394
1AR --- Impact Defense --- Economic Decline Does Not Cause War	396
RESPONSES TO FEDERALISM DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE	397
Uniqueness	398
Centralization Inevitable	399
"New Federalism" Increases Regressive Centralization	400
Evolution of Federalism Inevitable	401
Plan isn't exclusively a states' rights issue (Jobs/Basic Income)	402
Plan isn't exclusively a states' rights issue (Social Security)	404
Thumper—Far-Right Supreme Court Decisions	405
Thumper—Livestock Regulation Case	406
Link Defense	407
No Link—Block Grants	408
No Link—Spending	409
No Link—Taxation is Federal	410
Link Turn—Aff Increases Fiscal Flexibility (general)	411
AT: Executive Overreach	412
Congress Reels in Unilateral War	413
Federalism Harms Separation of Powers/Causes Polarization	415
No Nuclear Extinction—Adaption	416
Thumper—Biden consistently overrides SOP	418
AT: State-led China Climate Cooperation	419
Turn: Climate Competition Good	420
No U.S.-Sino Cooperation	423

No Extinction from Climate Change	424
Federalism Bad	426
Impact turn—economic crisis	427
Impact turn—economic inequality	429
Impact turn—natural disasters	430
State Flexibility Hurts Metropolitan Federalism	431
RESPONSES TO CAPITALISM KRITIK AFFIRMATIVE	432
2AC---FIAT Good	433
! Cap Good	436
! Climate	439
! Catch all	442
AT: Violence	446
! Space	447
Decoupling	449
Tech Good	451
! Tech	452
AT: AI K	455
RESPONSES TO INTERSECTIONALITY KRITIK AFFIRMATIVE	456
Framework Cards	457
General Turns	459
Whitening Turns	461
Capitalism Turns - Links	462
Capitalism Turns – No Solvency	466
Heterosexism / Homophobia Turns	468
Trans exclusion turns	470
Essentialism Turns	471
Coloniality Turns	472
Anti-blackness Turns	473
No Solvency - General	474

No Solvency – Bad Analytic	477
A2: Knowledge Production / Analytical Tool	478
Multidimensionality is preferable	480

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by adopting a federal jobs guarantee, expanding Social Security, and/or providing a basic income.

AFFIRMATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO..... 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... 3

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by adopting a federal jobs guarantee, expanding Social Security, and/or providing a basic income. 15

Topic Overview **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CLIMATE JOB GUARANTEE AFF 21

JOB GUARANTEE AFFIRMATIVE **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

SOCIAL SECURITY AFFIRMATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME AFFIRMATIVE **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO DEFICIT SPENDING COUNTERPLAN AFFIRMATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO HOUSING COUNTERPLAN AFFIRMATIVE **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO STATE COUNTERPLAN AFFIRMATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO IRS DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO OIL PRICES DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO AGRICULTURE DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO ECONOMIC COLLAPSE DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO FEDERALISM DISADVANTAGE AFFIRMATIVE **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO CAPITALISM KRITIK AFFIRMATIVE **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

RESPONSES TO INTERSECTIONALITY KRITIK AFFIRMATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

TOPIC OVERVIEW

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by adopting a federal jobs guarantee, expanding Social Security, and/or providing a basic income.

Overview of words

Many of the words in the resolution are fairly standard for policy debate resolutions, while the key phrase “fiscal redistribution” contains specific, field-contextual meaning, with the potential to strictly limit the scope of the resolution. In this section, we will examine the more uncommon terms in the resolution: fiscal redistribution, federal jobs guarantee, Social Security and basic income. I will conclude with a reference to how “in the United States” can serve a limiting function as well.

The operative phrase of the resolution is “**fiscal redistribution**.” It is well-defined and should be a central guide for constructing affirmative and negative positions. The term encompasses government policies that take money from some group through taxation and transfer those resources in a way that limits economic inequality. So, “tax and transfer” will be the two requirements of even the simplest affirmatives. Beyond that strict requirement, the phrase does offer some flexibility. There is a legitimate definitional debate about whether the phrase requires progressive taxation or not, and whether taxation can be targeted against just a specific group or action.

One other key element of the phrase “fiscal redistribution” is that the transfer of resources must be in cash. So, programs that attempt to ease tax burdens or the poor or provide in-kind benefits (like food stamps) likely do not meet this definition of fiscal redistribution. It is worth digging more into the areas of the resolution: federal jobs guarantee, Social Security and basic income.

A **federal jobs guarantee** is just as it sounds, it is a federal (public) job that the government makes available to those who are willing and interested. It offers at least minimum wage, and a benefits package commensurate with other federal jobs. Broadly designed, a jobs guarantee is intended to eliminate unemployment and introduce price stability into the economy. However, there are narrower versions of job guarantees that can be tailored towards specific segments of the economy. For example, there are advocates for offering federal jobs to those who lose their jobs due to automation. Or, federal jobs to those who are going to lose their job as the economy transitions from fossil fuels. Thus, a jobs guarantee can be used by the government to promote other initiatives beyond simply solving unemployment. These affirmatives are likely topical, and can generate unique advantages that are different than the ones likely to be read under the broader jobs guarantee affirmative.

Expanding **Social Security** is the second area of the resolution. One really important thing to note about this area is that the S’s in Social Security are both capitalized. This is intentional, and potentially extremely limiting. Although “social security” can be broadly defined to include pretty much any government package that improves the financial stability of its citizens, Social Security refers to a very specific program created in the Social Security Act of 1935 that provides pension benefits to retirees and

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

disability assistance to people who cannot work because of their disability. The money that goes into social security comes from payroll taxes, meaning that every paycheck pays something into a “pot” that will be drawn from in the future, once the payer reaches retirement age. There is widespread agreement among economists that the Social Security fund is likely to be insolvent in the long-term, so there are many areas for expansion that will be discussed in the affirmative strategy section. These tweaks deal both with the input stage (expanding what goes into the “pot” of Social Security funding) and the output stage (expanding who is eligible to receive benefits).

Providing a **basic income** is the final area of the resolution. This area, like the other 2 is constrained by the phrase fiscal redistribution, meaning that this area also requires a tax and transfer of cash resources. Interpretations of basic income, depending on the topicality evidence, are either potentially very narrow or very large. The most narrow reading of this phrase is that the only basic income is a universal cash transfer that meets the subsistence needs (basic needs) of everyone in the nation. That could be tailored based on geographic need, for example, Californians getting more than Kansas, but it would be available to all. That affirmative is predictable and there is an extremely solid and deep literature base supporting “universal basic income.” A much broader reading of this term allows the government to tailor income, as a nudging strategy, to specific sectors of the economy or geographies. For example, the state of Alaska has tried to reverse population decline by giving its residents a basic income, but it only goes to people that live in that state. Similarly, there are advocates for giving a basic income solely to those that are in-need professions, like rural nurses. This interpretation of the term “basic income” is probably accurate, but may turn this area into a set of affirmatives that more closely resemble “subsidize ___ activity” instead of providing an across-the-board basic income.

The final resolitional phrase worth noting is “**in the United States.**” Although this seems obvious in the way it influences the resolution, it potentially has implications for the “tax” part of fiscal redistribution. There will be a debate about whether the affirmative is allowed to tax internationally (through a border adjustment tax, for example). It is likely that the affirmative is allowed to topically tax internationally, if the transfer of those resources go to people “in the United States.”

AFFIRMATIVE STRATEGIES

A central component of every affirmative will be a defense of “redistribution,” meaning taking some money via taxes from one portion of the population and transferring it away from that group. That means topical affirmatives, even the most simple ones, will be required to do 2 things: tax and transfer. This is a somewhat strict requirement, but also gives the affirmative flexibility to “mix and match” different taxes with the distribution strategies outlined at the end of the resolution (jobs, Social Security and basic income). The following sections will identify the most likely, and strategic, affirmatives in each of the sub-areas of the resolution.

Federal jobs guarantee

Federal jobs guarantee affirmatives will create federal jobs, potentially available across the entire economy or limited to specific sectors. The primary purpose of a federal jobs guarantee, for economists, is that it is the only way to solve the problem of chronic unemployment. Solving that problem unleashes economic growth and productivity and reduces the need for people to rely on other elements of the social safety net. One potential advantage is that a jobs guarantee encourages entrepreneurship, because people who are currently in jobs that they do not want will feel more capable of leaving their job for a new path, knowing a federal job exists as a fallback. There are also affirmative authors who advocate creating federal jobs in specific areas. Those jobs might be to cull forests, build climate mitigation measures, employ workers from the tech industry or gig economy who are laid off by automation, etc. These affirmatives would not be trying to solve the unemployment problem entirely, but instead addressing the problem on a sector-by-sector basis. Below is a list of possible jobs guarantee plans:

The United States federal government should adopt a federal jobs guarantee.

The United States federal government should adopt a federal climate jobs guarantee, funded through a carbon tax.

The United States federal government should adopt a cybersecurity federal jobs guarantee.

The United States federal government should adopt a federal jobs guarantee for those at risk of losing their jobs through automation, funded through an increase in taxes on corporations.

Social Security

Social Security affirmatives will expand the existing Social Security program. One important thing to note about this area is that is the only one of the three that already exists. The other 2 have to be created, but Social Security is a program that has been around since 1935, so the amount of change required by the affirmative is potentially smaller than the other areas. Similarly, Social Security is already funded through existing payroll taxes. So, although the affirmative would likely have to increase the amount taxed, it would not be through an entirely new or unpredictable tax scheme. Social Security currently fulfills 2 functions, it provides a pension to folks of retirement age and provides disability benefits to those who are not of retirement age but are unable to work. There are 2 genres of affirmatives that fit under this sub-area, affirmatives that are trying to make Social Security more fiscally solvent and affirmatives that are trying to include more people under the Social Security system. There are strong

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

affirmative advocates for both threads of Social Security reform. Below is a list of possible Social Security plans:

The United States federal government should expand Social Security by lowering the retirement age.

The United States federal government should expand Social Security by increasing the yearly allotment for Social Security recipients.

The United States federal government should expand Social Security by increasing payroll tax collections.

The United States federal government should expand Social Security by increasing tax collection outside of the payroll tax system.

The United States federal government should expand Social Security by requiring income-support referrals for children who are homeless or have a disability.

Basic income

Basic income affirmatives will provide, via taxation, a cash transfer at least large enough to cover basic/subsistence-level support. The economic effects of this are potentially massive, as people will be able to purchase more goods and services that they are otherwise reticent to do so now (health care, for example) and feel enhanced job mobility. That means that people who do not enjoy their occupation will be more able to find a different job because of the backstop provided by the government's provision of basic income. Several affirmative advocates talk about basic income strategies as helping the population move from a "scarcity" mindset, where people constantly worry about the finitude of their resources, to an "abundance" mindset, where people can feel capable of escaping the zero-sum mindset associated with every little cost and expenditure. So, where does the money come from? This is where affirmative advocates really start to disagree. Some argue that the best approach for taxation is the one that would garner the most amount of money, for example through a corporate tax or value-added-tax (VAT). Other basic income advocates argue that instead of worrying about how much money is earned, the accompanying tax ought to encourage/discourage specific behavioral changes. For example, some argue that a basic income ought to be funded by a national carbon tax, with the earned revenue being sent back to the general population in "dividend" form. Below is a list of possible basic income plans:

The United States federal government should establish a carbon tax with revenue returned in dividend form as a basic income.

The United States federal government should provide a basic income funded via wealth tax.

The United States federal government should provide a basic income funded via corporate taxation.

The United States federal government should provide a guaranteed income for disabled people.

CLIMATE JOB GUARANTEE AFF

Explanation

The plan is a massive green job guarantee program. Basically, anyone who is ready and able to work would be guaranteed a job by the government. Lots of evidence suggests the government work with municipalities and localities to create jobs where they're needed. The important distinction between a CJG (climate job guarantee) and a regular JG (job guarantee) is that a CJG would have specific criteria for the type of jobs created under the AFF. Only jobs that meet certain environmental sustainability criteria would be created and funded under the plan. Lots of advocates for CJG envision it being as massive of a project as the WPA during WWII.

Huge amounts of federal funds will be needed to create said jobs. There exists good solvency evidence suggesting a few different funding mechanisms through which a CJG can happen. As for this file, I wrote the AFF with a carbon tax mechanism, but I included some other mechanisms that can easily be implemented.

The CJG itself accesses 2 internal links to warming, that aren't very much isolated. 1) A CJG would cause more efficient economic functioning – 10s of millions, including up to 20 million who aren't working at all – would begin doing work to help transition the economy to a zero carbon one. The work the plan creates is important and necessary for the full-scale economic transition required to avoid catastrophic warming. 2) The plan's massively increasing investment in carbon-free energies would likely have the consequence of freezing up investment streams for fossil fuels.

In addition, the carbon tax itself is an excellent internal link to climate change. The literature is pretty heavily favored in defense of taxation being a means of fiscal redistribution, meaning specifying the tax used in the plan should and will probably be an important part of the topic.

1AC

Watermark Sample

Advantage – CJG Prevents Catastrophic Warming

Massive reductions in CO2 emissions are necessary to hold warming at 1.5C – now is key – squo emissions lock-in catastrophic runaway climate change

Fiona Harvey, environment editor at The Guardian, 3/20/2023

"Scientists deliver 'final warning' on climate crisis: act now or it's too late,"

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/mar/20/ipcc-climate-crisis-report-delivers-final-warning-on-15c> (accessed 4/20/2023)

Scientists have delivered a "final warning" on the climate crisis, as rising greenhouse gas emissions push the world to the brink of irrevocable damage that only swift and drastic action can avert. The

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), made up of the world's leading climate scientists, set out the final part of its mammoth sixth assessment report on Monday. The comprehensive review of human knowledge of the climate crisis took hundreds of scientists eight years to compile and runs to thousands of pages, but boiled down to one message: act now, or it will be too late. The UN secretary general, António Guterres, said: "**This report is a clarion call to massively fast-track climate efforts by every country and every sector and on every timeframe. Our world needs climate action on all fronts: everything, everywhere, all at once.**" In sober language, the IPCC set out the devastation that has already been inflicted on swathes of the world. Extreme weather caused by climate breakdown has led to increased deaths from intensifying heatwaves in all regions, millions of lives and homes destroyed in droughts and floods, millions of people facing hunger, and "increasingly irreversible losses" in vital ecosystems. Monday's final instalment, called the synthesis report, is almost certain to be the last such assessment while the world still has a chance of limiting global temperature rises to 1.5C above pre-industrial levels, the threshold beyond which our damage to the climate will rapidly become irreversible. Kaisa Kosonen, a climate expert at Greenpeace International, said: "This report is definitely a final warning on 1.5C. If governments just stay on their current policies, the remaining carbon budget will be used up before the next IPCC report [due in 2030]." **More than 3bn people already live in areas that are "highly vulnerable" to climate breakdown,** the IPCC found, and half of the global population now experiences severe water scarcity for at least part of the year. In many areas, the report warned, we are already reaching the limit to which we can adapt to such severe changes, and weather extremes are "increasingly driving displacement" of people in Africa, Asia, North, Central and South America, and the south Pacific.All of those **impacts are set to increase rapidly,** as we have failed to reverse the 200-year trend of rising greenhouse gas emissions, despite more than 30 years of warnings from the IPCC, which published its first report in 1990. The world heats up in response to the accumulation of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, so every year in which emissions continue to rise eats up the available "carbon budget" and means much more drastic cuts will be needed in future years. Yet there is still hope of staying within 1.5C, according to the report. Hoesung Lee, the chair of the IPCC, said: "**This synthesis report underscores the urgency of taking more ambitious action** and shows that, **if we act now, we can still secure a livable sustainable future** for all." Temperatures are now about 1.1C above pre-industrial levels, the IPCC found. If greenhouse gas emissions can be made to peak as soon as possible, and are reduced rapidly in the following years, it may still be possible to avoid the worst ravages that would follow a 1.5C rise. Richard Allan, a professor of climate science at the University of Reading, said: "Every bit of warming avoided due to the collective actions pulled from our growing, increasingly effective toolkit of options is less worse news for societies and the ecosystems on which we all depend." Guterres called on governments to take drastic action to reduce emissions by investing in renewable energy and low-carbon technology. He said rich countries must try to reach net zero greenhouse gas emissions "as close as possible to 2040", rather than waiting for the 2050 deadline most have signed up to. He said: "**The climate timebomb is ticking.** But today's report is a how-to guide to defuse the climate timebomb. It is a survival guide for humanity. As it shows, the 1.5C limit is achievable." John Kerry, the US special presidential envoy for climate, said: "Today's message from the IPCC is abundantly clear: we are making progress, but not enough. **We have the tools to stave off and reduce the risks of the worst impacts of the climate crisis, but we must take advantage of this moment to act now.**" Monday's "synthesis report" is the final part of the sixth assessment report (AR6) by the IPCC, which was set up in 1988 to investigate the climate and

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

provide scientific underpinning to international policy on the crisis. The first three sections of AR6, published between August 2021 and April 2022, covered the physical science behind the climate crisis, and warned irreversible changes were now almost inevitable; section two covered the impacts, such as the loss of agriculture, rising sea levels, and the devastation of the natural world; and the third covered the means by which we can cut greenhouse gases, including renewable energy, restoring nature and technologies that capture and store carbon dioxide. The “synthesis report” contains no new science, but draws together key messages from all of the preceding work to form a guide for governments. The next IPCC report is not due to be published before 2030, making this report effectively the scientific gold standard for advice to governments in this crucial decade. The final section of AR6 was the “summary for policymakers”, written by IPCC scientists but scrutinised by representatives of governments around the world, who can – and did – push for changes. The Guardian was told that in the final hours of deliberations at the Swiss resort of Interlaken over the weekend, the large Saudi Arabian delegation, of at least 10 representatives, pushed at several points for the weakening of messages on fossil fuels, and the insertion of references to carbon capture and storage, touted by some as a remedy for fossil fuel use but not yet proven to work at scale. In response to the report, Peter Thorne, the director of the Icarus climate research centre at Maynooth University in Ireland, said next year global temperatures could breach the 1.5C limit, though this did not mean the limit had been breached for the long term. “We will, almost regardless of the emissions scenario given, reach 1.5C in the first half of the next decade,” he said. “The real question is whether our collective choices mean we stabilise around 1.5C or crash through 1.5C, reach 2C and keep going.”

A clean job guarantee is crucial for a stable transition to clean energy that minimizes economic disruption

Emma Glasser, Kleinman Center for Energy Policy, June 16, 2020

“The Green New Deal Is the Solution to the Jobs Issue,” University of Pennsylvania, <https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/news-insights/the-green-new-deal-is-the-solution-to-the-jobs-issue/#:~:text=Aside%20from%20the%20immeasurable%20human,the%20end%20of%20the%20century> (accessed 4-22-2023)

In reality, the Green New Deal addresses both concerns—addressing the climate crisis will grow our economy in addition to preventing immense economic losses that would result from inaction. When asking how much it would cost to address the climate emergency, the next question must be what is the cost of doing nothing? Aside from the immeasurable human suffering and invaluable human lives lost to the impacts of climate change, annual losses of hundreds of billions of dollars in some U.S. economic sectors are projected by the end of the century. To put this into perspective, the United States could experience yearly losses greater than the current GDP of many U.S. states. Still, the impact of climate action on our economy and jobs is a concern to many. And these questions are important ones. Addressing the climate emergency, namely achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions, requires large changes in almost all sectors of our economy. Decarbonizing our economy will mean job losses in some sectors, like natural gas and coal, and gains in others, renewable energy and green construction. But do these jobs exist and do they pay well? One of the key first steps in building a sustainable economy is the clean energy transition, i.e. obtaining our energy from non-fossil fuel sources. This transition has never been more feasible. In many regions of the U.S., solar and wind are beating natural gas and becoming the cheapest electricity generation technologies. E2’s 2018 Clean Jobs America report found that clean jobs in the U.S. already outnumbered fossil fuel jobs 3-to-1. And just in solar, jobs have increased by 167% over the last decade. Not only are clean jobs thriving, but their wages are comparable—the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the mean hourly wage for the fossil fuel electric power generation sector is \$41 compared to \$43 for solar and \$39 for wind. But these numbers are just averages, and when you look closer there is a shift in availability and wages of the most common jobs. Power plant operators receiving \$40 an hour will be far and few compared to solar installers and wind technicians, currently receiving \$21 and \$28 an hour respectively. This is a big difference, and one that should not be ignored as the policy details of the Green New Deal are written. Globally, the International Labour Organization estimates a net 18 million jobs will be created by a clean energy transition that meets the Paris Agreement’s 2°C goal. A UMass Amherst study found that every \$1 million dollars shifted from fossil fuels to clean energy results in a net increase of five jobs. And these are just clean energy jobs. Green jobs expand across more sectors than just energy, including zero-emission vehicles and charging infrastructure, building retrofits, agriculture, forestry, and also care work including health care workers and teachers. Although there will be a net increase in jobs, this will not come without losses—the International Labour Organization predicts 6 million lost jobs from a clean energy transition. This is why the Green New Deal’s just transition is crucial. A just transition means ensuring that displaced workers are protected with income support and a federal jobs guarantee—providing the necessary education, experience, and job training to perform low-carbon work with high wages in their communities. It’s great that addressing the climate crisis and ensuring a livable future means creating new jobs, however having these jobs in the right places is just as important as the total number of jobs created. Green jobs must be available in communities where fracking or coal industries are the main employer. These jobs should also be available to frontline and vulnerable communities, those that will be disproportionately affected by climate change. The Green New Deal aims to protect these communities, which include “indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, and youth.” Investing in these communities is not only just, but pivotal for the widespread support necessary to adopt the Green New Deal’s plan for a livable future. The Green New Deal is the solution to the jobs issue. We can mitigate and adapt to climate change, create millions of good jobs, and ensure no one is left behind.

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

A climate jobs guarantee provides the labor power essential to move away from fossil fuels – now is key

Labor Network for Sustainability, non-profit climate policy/pro-labor advocacy group, December 2018

“CLIMATE JOBS FOR ALL: BUILDING BLOCK FOR THE GREEN NEW DEAL,”

https://www.labor4sustainability.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/LNSpdf_dec2018.pdf (accessed 4-20-2023)

2. Climate protection and other public purposes The climate jobs guarantee, by drawing millions of people into the workforce, will provide the labor power needed for an emergency mobilization to transition to a fossil free, climate safe economy, as well as to meet a wide range of other public purposes. In this it resembles the homefront mobilization in World War II through which the war effort was able to meet its need for millions of workers. Without such an increase in the available workforce, the creation of millions of climate jobs will be stymied through labor shortage leading to uncontrolled inflation. The CJG will provide work experience and training that will allow its participants to move into higher skilled, higher wage jobs in the private and public sectors. In addition to climate protection, workers in the JG program will also be able to provide for a wide range of needs that can help reduce injustice and create a better way of life for all. These range from m education to housing to environmental protection and improvement. The WPA produced schools, parks, post offices, and other amenities that we still celebrate today; The JG can do the same.

Climate change is an existential risk, impact filter, and threat multiplier – exacerbates disease, conflict, and food insecurity

Luke Kemp et al., Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, University of Cambridge, August 1, 2022

"Climate Endgame: Exploring catastrophic climate change scenarios,"

<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2108146119#sec-3> (accessed 4/20/2023)

There are four key reasons to be concerned over the potential of a global climate catastrophe. First, there are warnings from history. Climate change (either regional or global) has played a role in the collapse or transformation of numerous previous societies (37) and in each of the five mass extinction events in Phanerozoic Earth history (38). The current carbon pulse is occurring at an unprecedented geological speed and, by the end of the century, may surpass thresholds that triggered previous mass extinctions (39, 40). The worst-case scenarios in the IPCC report project temperatures by the 22nd century that last prevailed in the Early Eocene, reversing 50 million years of cooler climates in the space of two centuries (41). This is particularly alarming, as human societies are locally adapted to a specific climatic niche. The rise of large-scale, urbanized agrarian societies began with the shift to the stable climate of the Holocene ~12,000 y ago (42). Since then, human population density peaked within a narrow climatic envelope with a mean annual average temperature of ~13 °C. Even today, the most economically productive centers of human activity are concentrated in those areas (43). The cumulative impacts of warming may overwhelm societal adaptive capacity. Second, **climate change could directly trigger other catastrophic risks**, such as international conflict, or exacerbate infectious disease spread, and spillover risk. These could be potent **extreme threat multipliers**. Third, **climate change could exacerbate vulnerabilities** and cause multiple, indirect stresses (such as economic damage, loss of land, and water and food insecurity) **that coalesce into system-wide synchronous failures**. This is the path of systemic risk. Global crises tend to occur through such reinforcing “synchronous failures” that spread across countries and systems, as with the 2007–2008 global financial crisis (44). It is plausible that **a sudden shift in climate could trigger systems failures that unravel societies across the globe**. The potential of systemic climate risk is marked: **The most vulnerable states and communities will continue to be the hardest hit in a warming world, exacerbating inequities**. Fig. 1 shows how projected population density intersects with extreme >29 °C mean annual temperature (MAT) (such temperatures are currently restricted to only 0.8% of Earth’s land surface area). Using the medium-high scenario of emissions and population growth (SSP3-7.0 emissions, and SSP3 population growth), by 2070, around 2 billion people are expected to live in these extremely hot areas. Currently, only 30 million people live in hot places, primarily in the Sahara Desert and Gulf Coast (43). Extreme temperatures combined with high humidity can negatively affect outdoor worker productivity and yields of major cereal crops. These deadly heat conditions could significantly affect populated areas in South and southwest Asia(47). Fig. 2 takes a political lens on extreme heat, overlapping SSP3-7.0 or SSP5-8.5 projections of >29 °C MAT circa 2070, with the Fragile States Index (a measurement of the instability of states). There is a striking overlap between currently vulnerable states and future areas of extreme warming. If current political fragility does not improve significantly in the coming decades, then a belt of instability with potentially serious ramifications could occur. Finally, **climate change could irrevocably undermine humanity’s ability to recover from another cataclysm, such as nuclear war**. That is, it could create significant latent risks (Table 1): Impacts that may be manageable during times of stability become dire when responding to and recovering from catastrophe. These different causes for catastrophic concern are interrelated and must be examined together.

Warming causes extinction

Samuel **Miller-McDonald** [M.A. in Environmental Management from Yale University, B.A. in Human Ecology from College of the Atlantic; January 4, 2019]

“Deathly Salvation,” The Trouble, <https://www.the-trouble.com/content/2019/1/4/deathly-salvation> (accessed 4/29/2023)

The global economy is **hurtling** humanity toward **extinction**. Greenhouse gas **emissions** are on track to warm the planet by **six degrees** Celsius above preindustrial averages. A six-degree increase risks killing most **life on earth**, as global **warming did** during the Late Permian when volcanoes burned a bunch of fossilized carbon (e.g., coal, oil, and gas). Called the Great Dying, that event was, according to New York Magazine, “The most notorious [extinction event...]; **it began when carbon warmed** the planet **by five degrees**, accelerated when that warming triggered the release of methane in the Arctic, **and ended with 97 percent of all life on Earth dead.**”

Mainstream **science suggests** that **we’re on our way there**. During the winter of 2017, **the Arctic grew warmer than Europe**, sending snow to the **Mediterranean and Sahara**. The planet may have already passed **irreversible thresholds** that could accelerate **further feedback loops** like **permafrost melt** and loss of **polar ice**. Patches of permafrost aren’t freezing even during winter, necessitating a rename (may I suggest ‘neva frost’?). In the summer of 2018, forests north of the Arctic Circle broke 90 degrees Fahrenheit and burned in vast wildfires. **We’re reaching milestones** far **faster than scientists** have even recently **predicted**. As Guardian columnist George Monbiot noted, “The Arctic meltdown [...] is the kind of event scientists warned we could face by 2050. Not by 2018.” **Mass marine death** that rapidly emits **uncontrollable greenhouse gases** is another feedback loop that seems ready to strike. The ocean is now more **acidic than any time** in the last 14 million years, **killing everything** from snails to whales. **It’s growing rapidly more acidic**. Meanwhile, from the global South to wealthier industrialized countries, **people are** already **dying and being displaced** from the **impacts of extreme climate change** via extreme droughts, floods, wildfires, storms, and **conflicts** like the **Syrian civil war**. **Authoritarianism** is on the rise due **directly** to these **climate emergencies** and **migrations**.

The IPCC has recently alerted the world that **we have** about **a decade** to dramatically **cut emissions** before collapse becomes **inevitable**. We could prevent **human extinction** if we act **immediately**. But the world is unambiguously ignoring climate change. Nations will almost certainly fail to avert biosphere collapse. That is because doing so will require a rapid decarbonization of the global economy.

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Independently, CO2 causes ocean acidification---extinction

Brian **Merchant**, Senior Editor at Motherboard at VICE Media, Inc., Appeared on CNN, MSNBC, BBC World News, and NPR, Vice, April 9, 2015

<http://motherboard.vice.com/read/the-last-time-our-oceans-got-this-acidic-it-drove-earths-greatest-extinction> (accessed 4/22/2023)

The biggest extinction event in planetary history was driven by the rapid acidification of our oceans, a new study concludes. So much carbon was released into the atmosphere, and the oceans absorbed so much of it so quickly, that marine life simply died off, from the bottom of the food chain up. That doesn't bode well for the present, given the disturbingly similar rate that our seas are acidifying right now. Parts of the Pacific, for instance, are already so acidic that sea snails' shells begin dissolving as soon as they're born. The biggest die-off in history, the Permian Extinction event, aka the Great Dying, extinguished over 90 percent of the planet's species—and 96 percent of marine species. A lot of theories have been put forward about why and how, exactly, the vast majority of Earth life went belly up 252 million years ago, but the new study, published in Science, offers some compelling evidence acidification was a key driver. A team led by University of Edinburgh researchers collected rocks in the United Arab Emirates that were on the seafloor hundreds of millions of years ago, and used the boron isotopes found within to model the changing levels of acidification in our prehistoric oceans. Through this "combined geochemical, geological, and modeling approach," the scientists say, they were able to accurately model the series of "perturbations" that unfolded in the era. They now believe that a series of gigantic volcanic eruptions in the Siberian Trap spewed a great fountain of carbon into the atmosphere over a period of tens of thousands of years. This was the first phase of the extinction event, in which terrestrial life began to die out. The study explains that the second phase of the event happened much more quickly. "During the second extinction pulse, however, a rapid and large injection of carbon caused an abrupt acidification event that drove the preferential loss of heavily calcified marine biota," the authors write. So does this study mean we should be especially worried about the phenomenon taking hold today? "Yes," said Dr. Rachel Wood, a professor of carbonate geoscience at the University of Edinburgh and one of the paper's authors. "We are concerned about modern ocean acidification," she told me in an email. "Although the amount of carbon added to the atmosphere that triggered the mass extinction was probably greater than today's fossil fuel reserves, the rate at which the carbon was released was at a rate similar to modern emissions." In other words, the Siberian Traps probably spewed out more carbon in total, but we're spewing out just as fast. And that's overwhelming the planetary equilibrium. "This fast rate of release was a critical factor driving ocean acidification," Wood said. Why? "The rate of release is critical because the oceans absorb a lot of the carbon dioxide (CO2) from the atmosphere, around 30 percent of the carbon dioxide released by humans," Wood said. "To achieve chemical equilibrium, some of this CO2 reacts with the water to form carbonic acid. Some of these molecules react with a water molecule to give a bicarbonate ion and a hydronium ion, thus increasing ocean 'acidity' (H+ ion concentration)." Marine animals whose skeletons are comprised of calcium carbonate—and that's a lot of them (think snails, coral), which form a crucial part of the food chain—dissolved or couldn't form in the first place. And that is what's happening today. "Between 1751 and 1994, surface ocean pH is estimated to have decreased from approximately 8.25 to 8.14, representing an increase of almost 30 percent in H+ ion concentration in the world's oceans," Wood said. That's a major uptick in ocean acidity in a relatively short amount of time, and it's happening because humans have burned fossil fuels like coal, oil, and gas with reckless abandon since the Industrial Revolution. That's fueling climate change, of course, as well as its less-discussed, but potentially equally cataclysmic sibling, ocean acidification. "Scientists have long suspected that an ocean acidification event occurred during the greatest mass extinction of all time, but direct evidence has been lacking until now," study coordinator Dr. Matthew Clarkson said in a statement. "This is a worrying finding, considering that we can already see an increase in ocean acidity today that is the result of human carbon emissions." Much of marine life is already in grave danger from acidification. It's contributing to the bleaching of coral reefs around the world, and, as mentioned before, it's killing sea snails in the Pacific. If it worsens, acidification could threaten the whole of the marine biosphere, and, obviously, the land-dwelling creatures that depend on it too. In 2013, marine scientists released a "State of the Oceans" report that found that the rate of current acidification was "unprecedented." They noted that the seas were acidifying faster than any point in the last 300 million years. That study didn't take into account the new data, of course, but that's the timeline we're dealing with: The last time the oceans were so acidic was in the midst of the greatest extinction in the history of the world.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

It's an existential threat that outweighs anything else.

Dr. **Yew-Kwang**, Winsemius Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technological University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, PhD in Economics from Sydney University, 2019

“Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism”, Global Policy, Volume 10, Number 2, May 2019, pp. 258–266 (accessed 4/21/2023)

Catastrophic **climate change**

Though by no means certain, CCC **causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non-linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points** (e.g.

Barnosky and Hadly, 2016; Belaia et al., 2017; Buldyrev et al., 2010; Grainger, 2017; Hansen and Sato, 2012; IPCC 2014; Kareiva and Carranza, 2018; Osmond and Klausmeier, 2017; Rothman, 2017; Schuur et al., 2015; Sims and Finnoff, 2016; Van Aalst, 2006).⁷

A possibly **imminent tipping point** could be in the form of ‘an **abrupt ice sheet collapse** [that] could cause a **rapid sea level rise**’ (Baum et al., 2011, p. 399). **There are many avenues for positive feedback** in global warming, **including:**

- the replacement of an **ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting** reduces the **reflection** and increases the **absorption of sunlight**, leading to faster warming;
- the **drying of forests** from warming **increases forest fires** and the **release of more carbon**; and
- **higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane** trapped under the ocean floor, producing **runaway global warming**.

Though there are also avenues for **negative feedback**, the **scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback** (Roe and Baker, 2007). **Thus**, the Global Challenges Foundation (2017, p. 25) concludes, ‘**The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC**’.

The threat of sea-level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber (2010) emphasize **the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet-bulb temperature**. They show that ‘**even modest global warming could ... expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress**’ p. 9552 and that **with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level**’ p. 9555, **making extinction much more likely** and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low.

While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that **we cannot rule it out**. Annan and Hargreaves (2011, pp. 434–435) may be right that **there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] ... to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C**’. However, **probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable**. Even if there is only **a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight**. **Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times**.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Plan

The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by adopting a climate job guarantee funded by a carbon tax.

The Plan Solves

The AFF is federally orchestrated and funded – only jobs falling under specific sustainability criteria are part of the guarantee

Ezra Silk, Director of Policy & Strategy; Co-Founder, The Climate Mobilization, Revised March 2019

“The Climate Mobilization Victory Plan,” <https://www.theclimatemobilization.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Victory-Plan-July-2020-Update.pdf> (accessed 4-20-2023)

1. Job Guarantee We can wipe out the long recession of the 21st century just as rapidly as America wiped out the Depression during WWII, if we have the courage and moral vision to mobilize the American people toward the immense project of saving civilization. After declaring a climate emergency, the President must fulfill the obligations of the Humphrey-Hawkins Act (1978) and create a federally funded, locally organized job guarantee program to create true full employment in America, fulfilling at last one of the Four Freedoms championed by FDR in 1941. Acting as the employer of last resort, the government must offer all American citizens who are ready, willing, and able to work the opportunity to work for a base pay of \$15 an hour at a job that contributes to the success of the Climate Mobilization effort. Pay will operate on a sliding scale of up to \$25 an hour. The jobs would guarantee benefits and vacation. The Mobilization Labor Board will coordinate the federally-financed program, but the jobs will be distributed and organized locally by municipal governments and non-profit organizations. Federal funds for labor and materials will be distributed based on the following criteria: ■ Does the work help move America rapidly towards a net zero greenhouse gas emissions economy? ■ Does the work help remove greenhouse gases from the atmosphere? ■ Does the work combat the 6th mass extinction of species? ■ Does the work help transition America to an environmentally sustainable economy that is durable enough to last long into the future? Once in place, the scale of the job guarantee program will grow as private sector employment declines, and vice versa. The American job guarantee we envision would be comprehensive, employing up to 20 million people, depending on the availability of private sector employment, and only allowing for frictional unemployment (brief periods of unemployment as people switch jobs) for those who are ready and willing to work. There should also be a guaranteed 3-month severance package at the same salary for all people laid off as a result of the Mobilization as determined by the Department Of Labor (plus paid job re-training, job search assistance, or financial assistance to move). This guarantee should be extended to 2 years for laid-off worker who enter the job guarantee program. The Department of Labor’s Unemployment Insurance program eligibility requirements must be amended to reflect the new guarantees. The program should also provide for: ■ Substantial student debt relief for all job guarantee enrollees (At least \$10,000 of debt relief per year of service) ■ Guaranteed re-employment in the green jobs sector for coal miners and other fossil fuel workers displaced by the mobilization

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

The plan is funded by a carbon tax. Independently, the plan ushers in a fossil freeze by redirecting existing government investment streams towards clean energy

Labor Network for Sustainability, non-profit climate policy/pro-labor advocacy group, December 2018

“CLIMATE JOBS FOR ALL: BUILDING BLOCK FOR THE GREEN NEW DEAL,”

https://www.labor4sustainability.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/LNSpdf_dec2018.pdf (accessed 4-20-2023)

9. PAYING FOR THE CJG In the long run a **transition to a fossil free economy will** not only **pay for itself**; it will save money compared to fossil fuel “business as usual.” A jobs guarantee program will pay a large part of its cost through the **reductions it will allow in** unemployment insurance, food stamps, Medicaid, and **other social programs** and the value added to the economy by the goods and services it produces – in particular goods and services that reduce the staggering cost of climate change. Our society is currently wasting vast resources. Tens of millions of potential workers are not working. Trillions of dollars – largely provided by the government – sit idle in corporate coffers. Much of the cost of a CJG will ultimately be paid for by **mobilizing such unused and misused resources**. Large investments currently go to maintaining, replacing, and expanding fossil fuel infrastructure. **With a fossil freeze**, that investment stream can be redirected to building a fossil free economy. All the money that would have gone for fossil fuel infrastructure can be placed in investment funds to replace lost energy jobs. **The fossil fuel industry can and should bear much of the burden** for the damage it does to humanity and the planet **through taxes, fees, permit costs**, and other charges **which can be used to pay for the CJG**. This can be done at a state as well as a local level, for example the fees charged under the Washington state climate jobs referendum plan.²¹ Local and state governments are now suing fossil fuel corporations for the damage they have done to people and the environment. Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA – known as the Superfund law) the EPA has the authority to compel polluters to pay for the damage they have done to the environment – even if it happened long before. Comparable **legislation could hold major fossil fuel producers and emitters responsible for** the colossal **damage** they have done to the atmosphere – and the colossal cost of remediating it.

A carbon tax cheapens renewables, suppresses emissions, redistributes wealth, and triggers global follow-on and price linkage.

Ottmar **Edenhofer**, director and chief economist of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research. He is also the director of the Mercator Research Institute on Global Commons and Climate Change and professor of the Economics of Climate Change at the Technische Universität Berlin and he provided scientific advice on carbon pricing to the German Chancellor Angela Merkel, 1-20-2021

"Carbon pricing could be the Biden administration's climate tool", *The Hill*, <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/534985-carbon-pricing-could-be-the-biden-administrations-climate-tool> (accessed 4/28/2023)

What can the new administration do to keep Americans safe from climate risks? There's in fact a whole toolbox to open after 4 years of neglecting the climate issue — but some tools are more effective than others. Of course, the U.S. will get back into the **Paris** Climate Agreement, which was signed by almost all governments worldwide. That's good since climate stabilization efforts need to be international, just like climate impacts do not stop at a country's borders. The world needs the U.S., and the U.S. needs the world. **Yet the Paris Agreement means to bring down each nation's GHG emissions to net zero by mid-century. How can this actually be achieved? Building a national carbon dioxide pricing scheme is what economists like myself find to be the most effective tool.** Putting a price on what destabilizes our climate, on carbon dioxide, really means taxing the bad instead of goods. **Clean renewable energy becomes cheaper when emitting GHGs — most notably carbon dioxide — becomes more expensive.** While the government sets a direction to head for, it is completely up to businesses **which way they choose to get there.** It is a **market-based solution.** This is why it is a nonpartisan policy. The **Biden-Harris administration now has the historic chance to make it a reality.** Yet, for instance, in January 2020 already veteran Republicans such as George P. Shultz, who served as secretary of State under President Ronald Reagan and as secretary of Treasury under President Richard M. Nixon, proposed a carbon tax. They called it the conservative fiscal solution. It is to some extent, but it mainly is one thing: it's reasonable. Part of the good news is that pricing carbon dioxide is not new. California, which alone is the fifth biggest economy of the world, and Massachusetts have already quite some experience with carbon pricing. The same goes for Europe and China, also Canada and Japan — basically the greatest partners and competitors of the U.S. My country, Germany, just established a national pricing scheme to complement the European Emissions Trading System (ETS). The new administration can look at what they did, check what works well and what could be improved. It can ground its action on robust experience of others — and do better. **A U.S. carbon pricing system should work across sectors, from energy production, to industry, transport and to housing and agriculture.** It should include a minimum price to provide a **reliable framework** so businesses have **certainty for planning.** Importantly, **such a pricing scheme can generate substantial income — money that to some extent can be used to compensate low-income families, by sending Christmas checks or by lowering energy taxes or, if a government chooses so, by investing some part of it into improving U.S. infrastructure.** In any case, carbon pricing can be designed revenue neutral, giving back the money to the people. This is not just a matter of making it more acceptable, but a matter of social justice. Poor people pay a relatively greater part of their income for their energy bills than rich ones. Hence we need to compensate the poor. Yes, some things will become more costly under carbon pricing, but the cost of living does not need to increase. If, however, climate destabilization would go on unmitigated, costs will increase — not just for the U.S. as a whole, but also for individual citizens, since for instance supply chains for businesses get interrupted more frequently driving up their costs, and so on. **The science is clear that pushing the clean transformation makes sense economically.** The transition will be difficult, no doubt about that. But **new, green technology also means new, sustainable jobs. It means a new industrial revolution — the next big thing, complementing the digital revolution.** More and more companies around the world — such as tech giant Google and financial powerhouse Blackrock and even truck makers — are aware of that and say they want to be part of the pioneers, not the laggards. In a second step, **after introducing it nationally, a U.S. carbon pricing system could be linked with those in place in Europe and China. This would assure a level playing field for everyone, including U.S. businesses.** Interacting prices would **assure achieving climate stabilization** at the lowest cost because they would happen wherever you get the biggest GHG reduction bang for the buck. **If this linking of pricing schemes would succeed, this could be a real breakthrough in countering climate destabilization. It would mark history.** The U.S. now has the chance to once again become a world leader on this journey to a safe and prosperous future for all. The Biden-Harris administration will be remembered as one that either failed to assure a safe future for our children. Or as one that acted on one of the greatest challenges of our times.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

A climate job guarantee would create tens of millions of inclusive jobs

Greg Carlock et al., Senior Advisor to Data for Progress, September 2018

"A GREEN NEW DEAL A PROGRESSIVE VISION for ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY and ECONOMIC STABILITY,"

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5aa9be92f8370a24714de593/t/5ba14811032be48b8772d37e/1537296413290/GreenNewDeal_Final_v2_12MB.pdf (accessed 4-20-2023)

The jobs guarantee, like the WPA, is based on hiring people without regard to their existing skills and then matching people with available jobs. The jobs created by climate policy will not automatically fit the workers in the CJG program. Conversely, the jobs proposed by most current JG proposals, while worthy, will only incidentally include jobs that help protect the climate. How can a climate jobs guarantee contribute to massive, rapid transition to climate safety and at the same time to a massive, rapid reduction of poverty and economic marginalization? This problem arises in part because the workforce has effectively been divided into a low-wage, low-job quality sector in which people of color, women, youth, and other disfavored groups have been concentrated and a higher-wage, more secure sector which disproportionately includes white men. Those in the higher sector have a far greater opportunity to acquire skills, apprenticeship, union membership, connections, education, and opportunities to move upward. Those in the lower sector are disproportionately excluded from all these. Many of the millions of jobs required to protect the climate will be infrastructure jobs that generally require skills acquired through apprenticeship, education, advanced training, and opportunity to work in favored jobs and industries. But as Tcherneva notes, infrastructure alone is not a particularly effective means of ensuring full employment, given that many infrastructure jobs require high skill level and are male dominated. A JG program must create opportunities for those who are less skilled or incapable of performing intense manual labor.¹⁹ Fortunately, the transition to a climate safe, fossil free economy will entail millions of jobs that do not require a high skill level and are not limited by gender. The report "Green New Deal" by Data for Progress details a wide array of climate-protecting jobs that would be appropriate to the JG workforce.²⁰ It divides these into jobs that require "minimal experience or on-the-job training" and those that require "some experience, education, or certification." MINIMAL EXPERIENCE OR ON-THE-JOB TRAINING • Weatherization and energy efficiency improvements • Waste removal and recycling • Tree-planting • Wetland restoration • Brownfield restoration • Pest management • Soil health testing and remediation • Invasive and exotic species removal • Resilient road construction • Pedestrian and bike lane construction • Open and recreational space creation • Building rehabilitation, remediation, and hardening • Disaster preparedness training • Sewer and water main upgrades • Stormwater management • Administrative support . SOME EXPERIENCE, EDUCATION, OR CERTIFICATION • Energy auditing • Building electrification • Renewable energy systems installation - solar, wind, geothermal • Mass transport electrification • Energy storage technology • Grid modernization and resilience • Water and wastewater treatment • Electric vehicle and biofuel integration • Landfill upgrades and methane capture • Sustainable agriculture and soil restoration • Community education • Communications

The federal govt will work with municipalities to ensure inclusivity and proper implementation

Labor Network for Sustainability, non-profit climate policy/pro-labor advocacy group, December 2018

“CLIMATE JOBS FOR ALL: BUILDING BLOCK FOR THE GREEN NEW DEAL,”

https://www.labor4sustainability.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/LNSpdf_dec2018.pdf (accessed 4-20-2023)

8. HOW A CLIMATE JOBS GUARANTEE WOULD WORK A federal jobs guarantee will require federal legislation, although smallscale experiments can be tried out first at state and local levels. The Department of Labor or another federal agency will host the program and establish guidelines. These could include priority for particular populations such as minorities excluded from the workforce and types of projects like residential energy efficiency. Requests for proposals (RFPs) will invite public, nonprofit, and cooperative agencies to submit proposals. Approved proposals will be listed in a Jobs Bank for job seekers and will be implemented by the organizations submitting them. Local agencies will publicize the CJG, especially to those populations most in need of it. Interested people will be encouraged to visit their local One-Stop Jobs Centers, which will serve as the information and intake hubs for the CJG. Those visiting the Job Centers will be told about the CJG opportunities along with other options. Since the program will be run so that jobs are available to all applicants, those who accept a CJG job will be hired and go to work. Training, education, and apprenticeship programs will be designed to meet the needs of program participants, JG projects, and the wider economy. The program will construct ladders into higher-level employment in the private and public sectors. Participants will be free to leave and seek jobs in private and public sectors. Conversely, those who leave the program will be eligible to return if conditions elsewhere lead them to wish to do so.

A green job guarantee dismantles the “jobs versus environment” dichotomy by making more efficient use of resources

Kate Aronoff, The Intercept – a non-profit news organization, September 21 2018

"ALL OF A SUDDEN, ADDING “GREEN” TO A POLICY IDEA MAKES IT MORE POPULAR,"

<https://theintercept.com/2018/09/21/climate-change-policy-jobs-guarantee/> (accessed 4-22-2023)

The results of this new polling throws a wrench in the “jobs versus environment” narrative often parroted by industry, the right and, recently, the Democratic National Committee. Thanks to talking points dreamed up largely by fossil fuel companies, there’s long been an assumption that environmental progress and widespread economic prosperity are opposing goals. In 2016, however, the clean energy industry created jobs at a rate 12 times greater than the rest of the economy. And according to a report released last year by the Department of Energy, five times as many Americans work near or full-time in green sectors as they do in fossil fuels. Another new study estimates that a breakneck shift away from carbon-intensive fuels could save the global economy a whopping \$26 trillion by 2030. A green job guarantee, Prakash says, is the best policy option available to dismantling the jobs versus environment myth. “Rather than pitting activists and workers against each other,” she says, “the job guarantee offers a program that elevates the lives of working families while addressing the impending existential crisis our generation faces.” Needless to say, job prospects on a world warmed to a degree that is “incompatible with organized global community” — as scientists have described a world plagued by runaway, catastrophic climate change — aren’t great. The Data for Progress survey describes green jobs then as those “scaling up renewable energy, weatherizing homes and office buildings, developing mass transit projects, and maintaining green community spaces,” although the scope could indeed be much larger. A new paper out from a team of Finnish researchers with the BIOS Research Unit — commissioned by the U.N. team overseeing its Sustainable Development Goals — outlines several major areas of work, in food, energy, housing, and transportation. They embrace the idea of a job guarantee (alongside other measures) as a means to “lessen insecurity and the need to compete for environmentally destructive jobs on the individual and the collective level.” As the BIOS team suggests, a job guarantee could create work that poses an alternatives to low-wage positions in industries that rely on carbon-intensive supply chains, like fast food and big-box retail stores. The evidence that a climate-tinged job guarantee is a winning idea would seem to bear out in recent elections, too. While climate hasn’t been a major part of the narrative surrounding insurgent Democratic candidates — Bryce Tlaib, Ilhan Omar in Minnesota, and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez in New York all ran on platforms that included either a Green New Deal or support for a speedy transition away from fossil fuels. For these and other candidates, their climate plans were housed within larger progressive policy visions that see it as the responsibility of the government to provide a basic standard of living to all Americans — including a livable planet. Sunrise and 350 Action have each endorsed candidates running on ambitious climate platforms for federal and state races. If a job guarantee represents a shift away from the kinds of cautious, triangulating politics that have defined the Democratic Party in recent decades, it’s just as much of one for the climate movement — many parts of which have tended to embrace a market-driven approach to scaling back emissions, and de-emphasized the role of regulation and investment. “In the past, the climate movement has been hyper-focused on a carbon pricing and cap-and-trade scheme, in sort of a ‘90s-era iteration of American politics get the right combination of centrist Democrats and Republicans together and get 60 votes in the Senate,” Noisecat says. “One of the interesting things about seeing climate legislation in terms of work and jobs is that it’s a much different frame, and a much different way of imagining what climate policy will look like moving forward.” Prakash echoed that sentiment: “The only solution to the climate crisis at the scale and scope we need is active government intervention. A climate jobs guarantee fully embraces strong government investment and action for the sake of the common good.”

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com