

---

# West Coast Publishing

---

## Redistribution 2023-24 Negative 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](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com)**

[www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)

# NEGATIVE 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](mailto:jim@wcdebate.com) and seek our consent.

### Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at [www.wcdebate.com](http://www.wcdebate.com)
2. E-mail us at [jim@wcdebate.com](mailto: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](http://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](http://www.wcdebate.com)*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

NEGATIVE 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. <sup>14</sup>	
NEGATIVE STRATEGIES	15
TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS	17
Topicality: Fiscal Redistribution Means Tax	18
Topicality: Fiscal Redistribution Requires a Progressive Tax	19
Topicality: Federal Jobs Guarantee Must be Universal	20
Topicality: Basic Income Must be Universal	21
Topicality: Social Security is Not Medicare For All	22
CLIMATE JOB GUARANTEE NEG	23
NEG – Warming Impact/Solvency	24
1NC – Skill Shortage Solvency Takeout	25
1NC – Warming Doesn't Cause Extinction	26
2NC – XT: No xtn	28
1NC – Adaptation Solves Warming	29
2NC – XT: Adaptation	30
1NC – A/C to Emissions	32
1NC/2NC – AT: Ocean Acidification !	33
1NC/2NC – AT: Resource Wars !	34
1NC/2NC – AT: Runaway Warming	35
1NC/2NC – AT: Weather Extremes	37
NEG – Carbon Tax	38
1NC/2NC – Carbon Tax Fails	39

1NC/2NC – AT: Carbon Tax Modeled	44
NEG – Geoengineering CP	45
1NC – Geoengineering CP – Microbubbles	46
2NC – XT Microbubbles Solvency	48
2NC – AT: Geoengineering Bad DA	49
NEG – Renewables Bad DA	50
1NC – Green Paradox DA	51
1NC – REM Tradeoff DA	53
2NC – XT: Green Paradox	56
2NC – XT: REM !	60
2NC – XT: REM Link	61
NEG – CO2 Good DA	62
1NC – CO2 Good DA	63
2NC – XT CO2 Good	69
JOB GUARANTEE NEGATIVE	73
Inflation Disadvantage	74
Inflation Disadvantage	75
Inflation Disadvantage	76
Inflation Disadvantage	77
Targeted Guarantee Counterplan	78
Capitalism Kritik	79
Capitalism Kritik	80
Capitalism Kritik	81
Racial Capitalism Kritik	82
Racial Capitalism Kritik	83
Racial Capitalism Kritik	84
No Solvency	85
No Solvency/UBI Better than FJG	86
FJG Kills Economy	87

FJG Doesn't Solve Economy	88
FJG Doesn't Solve Economy	89
FJG Doesn't Solve Poverty	90
Workplace Freedom Answers	91
Racism Answers	92
Infrastructure Answers	93
SOCIAL SECURITY NEGATIVE	94
A2 Harms – Link	95
A2 Harms – Impact	98
A2 Solvency – Cost	99
A2 Solvency	100
A2 – Social Security Necessary	102
A2 – Investment Option Expansion of Social Security Plan	104
DA – Economy	105
Extensions – Econ DA	107
DA – Social Security Hurts Immigrants	108
CP – Raise the Age for Social Security Benefits	109
CP – Negative Income Tax	111
UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME NEGATIVE	113
T/Theory	114
I-Spec	115
(I-Spec) Implementation Spec – 1NC	116
(I-Spec) Implementation Spec – Violation Extension	117
(I-Spec) Implementation Spec – Education Extension	118
(I-Spec) Implementation Spec – Ground Extension & No Solvency	119
Counterplans	121
(UBS) Universal Basic Services CP	122
1NC	123
Answers to permutations – Mutually exclusive	124

CP Solvency - A2: Vagueness / I-Spec	125
CP Solvency - General	126
CP Solvency – Gender advantage	127
Disadvantages	128
Politics	129
Politics Links – GOP Hates	130
Politics Links – Tax code internal links	131
Economy Disadvantages	132
Economy Links – UBI is super expensive	133
A2: UBI boosts the workforce	135
Kritiks	136
Capitalism links – Tax the Rich links	137
Capitalism links – Reformism links	138
General Case Answers	140
Solvency Answers	141
A2: “Alaska proves it works”	142
Advantage Answers	143
A2: General Poverty Advantage	144
Poverty link turns / No solvency	145
A2: Poverty stigmatization	146
EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT (EITC) WORKS	147
Frontline – EITC Good	148
Frontline – EITC Should Be Expanded	149
Extensions – EITC Encourages Work	151
Extensions – EITC Solves Income Inequality	153
A2 – Better Fiscal Redistributions Programs	155
A2 – EITC Not That Helpful	157
DEFICIT SPENDING COUNTERPLAN NEGATIVE	158
Explanation	159

Negative	160
Deficit Spending Counterplan 1NC [1/2]	161
Deficit Spending Counterplan 1NC [2/2]	163
General Solvency	164
General Solvency	166
Social Security Solvency	167
Basic Income Solvency	168
Basic Income Solvency	170
Job Guarantee Solvency	171
Counterplan Promotes Shift to MMT-Mindset	173
Taxes Hurt The Economy	175
Taxes Hurt The Economy	177
Taxes Hurt Political Capital	178
Answer To MMT Leads to Inflation	180
Answer To Deficit Spending Bad	181
Answer To Deficit Spending Bad	182
Answer To Permutation Do Both	183
Answer To Permutation Do Counterplan	184
HOUSING COUNTERPLAN NEGATIVE	186
Explanation	187
Negative	188
Housing Counterplan 1NC [1/2]	189
Housing Counterplan 1NC [2/2]	190
The Counterplan Solves Housing	191
The Counterplan Solves Housing	192
Federal Assistance is Key	194
The Counterplan is a Prerequisite	196
Housing Solves Economic Inequality	198
Studies Demonstrate Housing Solves Inequality	200

Housing Solves Populism	202
Housing Solves Racial Inequality	204
Housing Solves Segregation	206
Housing Solves Climate Change	208
Housing Solves Disease and Health	210
The Counterplan Avoids Politics Links	212
Theory	213
STATES COUNTERPLAN NEGATIVE	214
1NC Shell	215
Solvency	216
CP Spills Up/AT: Federal Protections Key	217
States solve—Climate Policy	218
States solve better—Food Stamps/Cash Assistance	219
States solve better—Geographical Location	220
States solve better—Inequality	222
States solve better—Innovation	223
States solve better—Jobs Guarantee/Basic Income	224
States solve better—(P)redistribution	225
States solving now—Basic Income	226
States solving now—Health Insurance	228
States solving now—Labor Rights	230
States solving now—Minimum Wage	231
CP solves link to Politics DA	232
AT: CP causes “Race to the Bottom”	233
AT: CP fails due to polarization	234
AT: Federal funding plank links to federalism	235
AT: States are inefficient	236
AT: Fed Key to financing the CP	237
AT: Fed Key to overturn preemptive laws	238



AT: Fed Key to uniformity	239
AT: Perm	241
Perm fails—Links to Federalism	242
Perm fails—Preemption	244
AT: Perm do the CP/Normal Means	245
AT: State Budgets DA	246
Uniqueness—States are experiencing budget surpluses	247
No Link—CP solves State Budgets	248
Plan links to State Budgets	250
AT: Economy	251
AT: States Fail in Crisis	252
IRS DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE	253
Explanation	254
Negative	255
IRS Tradeoff DA 1NC [1/2]	256
IRS Tradeoff DA 1NC [2/2]	258
IRS is Sufficiently Funded Now	259
IRS Solves Climate Change Now	261
IRS Promotes Tax Compliance Now	263
Taxing the Wealthy Overstretches the IRS	264
Taxing the Wealthy Causes IRS Funding Cuts	265
IRS Resources are Finite	267
IRS Overstretch Turns the Case	269
IRS Solves Inequality	270
IRS Solves Warming	272
IRS Solves Deficit	273
Answer to Congress Can't Repeal IRA Funding	274
Answer to The Plan Doesn't Increase Taxes	275
Answer to The Plan Doesn't Increase Taxes on Wealthy	276

Answer to Warming is Inevitable	278
OIL PRICES DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE	280
Explanation	281
Oil Prices Disadvantage Shell [1/2]	282
Oil Prices Disadvantage Shell [2/2]	283
Russian Economy Is High	285
Russian Oil Sales are High Now	287
The Plan Lowers Oil Prices	289
The Plan Decreases Crude Oil Prices	291
Green Transitions Trigger Russian Collapse	293
Warming Policy Devastates Oil Exporters	295
Solving Warming Hurts Fossil Fuel Exporters	297
The Perception of Solving Warming Triggers the Link	299
Green Transition Triggers Aggression and War	300
Oil is Key to the Russian Economy	301
Reduced Oil Demand Hurts Russian Economy	302
Russia Will Rally-Around-the-Flag	303
Russian Economic Decline Leads to War	304
The Disadvantage Leads to War	306
The Disadvantage Turns the Case	308
Answer To Plan Solves Russian Aggression	309
Answer To Low Oil Prices Good	310
Answer To Russia Can Diversify From Oil	311
AGRICULTURE DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE	313
Agriculture DA	314
1NC – UBI Harms Farms DA	315
Uniqueness	317
2NC --- UQ/AT: Thumpers	318
Link	320

2NC --- Link --- Generic	321
2NC --- Link --- UBI	322
2NC --- Link --- Job Guarantee	324
2NC --- Link --- Medicare	325
2NC --- Link --- Green New Deal	326
Internal Link	329
2NC --- Internal Link --- Taxes Bad for Farmers	330
2NC --- Internal Link --- Small Farms Key to Food Security	334
Impact UQ/Booster	335
2NC --- US Farms Key to Global Security	336
2NC --- Food Wars MPX	339
2NC --- Impact Add-on --- Warming	340
Small Farms Good/Big Farms Bad	342
2NC --- Yes Trade Off	343
2NC --- Small Farms Good --- Top Level	344
2NC --- Small Farms Good --- Yield	348
2NC --- Small Farms Good --- Biodiversity	350
2NC --- Small Farms Good --- Soil	352
2NC --- AT: Big Farms Good --- Warming	354
ECONOMIC COLLAPSE DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE	356
Notes	357
1NC Shells	358
1NC --- Economic Collapse DA vs. UBI	359
1NC --- Economic Collapse DA vs. Medicare	363
1NC --- Economic Collapse DA vs. Job Guarantee	367
1NC --- Economic Collapse DA vs. Green New Deal	370
2NC/1NR – UQ	373
2NC --- UQ --- No Rate Hikes Now	374
2NC --- UQ --- Econ High Now/Inflation is Decreasing	375

2NC/1NR - Links	377
2NC Links --- UBI	378
2NC Links --- Medicare	381
2NC Links --- Job Guarantee	384
2NC Links --- Green New Deal	389
2NC/1NR – Internal Links	391
2NC Internal Link --- Inflation = Recession	392
2NC/1NR – Impacts	394
2NC --- Turns Case Tool Box	395
2NC --- Yes Econ Decline War	396
2NC --- Impact Mod --- China	398
2NC --- Impact Mod --- Sustainable Development	400
FEDERALISM DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE 403	
1NC Shell	405
Uniqueness	409
Ext: States manage welfare policy	410
Ext.: Decentralization needed now	412
AT: Centralization Inevitable/Thumpers	413
Links	415
Basic Income	416
Congress	417
Courts	418
Federal Programs Funding	419
Green New Deal	420
Jobs Guarantee	421
Preemption (turns case)	422
Redistributive Carbon Tax	423
Social Security	424
State-Federal Cooperative Programs	425

Work-based Supplemental Income	427
Worker Definition Laws	428
Executive Overreach Module	429
Biden Unilateral War Powers Risks Russian Nuclear War	430
Any U.S. Nuke Deployment Causes Extinction	431
Separation of Powers Key Now	432
Ext: Federalism solves Separation of Powers/Executive Overreach	433
AT: Deterrence Means No US-Russia Nuclear War	434
AT: Domestic Policy doesn't reflect Overreach in Foreign Affairs	435
China Energy/International Cooperation Module	436
2NC—China Cooperation	437
Ext.: U.S-Sino Cooperation Key	440
Ext: States broker international agreements	442
AT: Federalism Impact Turns	443
AT: Economic Inequality	444
AT: Economy	445
AT: Inequality (general)	446
AT: Labor Rights/Corporate Interests	449
AT: National Crises	450
CAPITALISM KRITIK NEGATIVE	452
K---Capitalism---Negative	453
Summary	454
1NC---Shell	455
Framework	458
2NC---Impact Calc	460
AT: Pinker	464
! Capitalism	465
! Tech	468
! Disease	469

Sustainability	470
External	473
! Totalitarianism	476
! Necropolitics	477
AT: Green Tech	478
Alternative Solves	483
INTERSECTIONALITY KRITIK NEGATIVE	487
Essay	488
1NC	489
Kritik Extensions	493
Link Extension	494
Economic Redistribution – Cash Transfers	495
Inequalities – General Links	496
Economic Inequalities	497
Labor / Employment	498
(UBI) Universal Basic Income	499
Guaranteed Basic Income - General	501
Guaranteed Basic Income GOOD – Better than UBI	502
Work requirements for assistance	503
Child Tax Credit	504
Policy reforms – Prior question	506
Gender identities are marginalized	507
Climate change	508
Impact Extension	510
Knowledge production	511
Alternative Extension	512
Solvency: Analytic tool	513
Alternative: Analytic Lens	515
Answers to 2AC Arguments	517

A2: Link of Omission 518

A2: Multidimensionality 520

A2: Oppression Olympics 521

**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.**

NEGATIVE 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. .... 16

CLIMATE JOB GUARANTEE NEG ..... 22

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

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

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

DEFICIT SPENDING COUNTERPLAN NEGATIVE ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

HOUSING COUNTERPLAN NEGATIVE ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

STATES COUNTERPLAN NEGATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

IRS DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

OIL PRICES DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

AGRICULTURE DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

ECONOMIC COLLAPSE DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

FEDERALISM DISADVANTAGE NEGATIVE..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CAPITALISM KRITIK NEGATIVE ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

INTERSECTIONALITY KRITIK NEGATIVE ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**



# NEGATIVE STRATEGIES

## Counterplans

**Tax PIC:** As noted above, affirmatives are required to “tax and transfer” because of the strict definition of the phrase fiscal redistribution. The tax part of that dual requirement provides fertile opportunity for negative ground. One counterplan will be to deficit spend to fund the affirmative’s initiative, instead of taxing. Another will be to choose a non-tax funding strategy (penalties or fees) and use that revenue to fund the affirmative’s initiative. These strategies will be great against affirmatives that do not have a built-in defense of their “tax” and will pair well with several of the disadvantages listed below.

**States counterplan:** As with every domestic topic, the states counterplan will be making an appearance. States can raise revenue and fund fiscal redistribution efforts. One of the classic cases of basic income actually exists at the state level, the Alaskan basic income. Although states do not currently have Social Security programs, nor a jobs guarantee, both could be created through fiat. Some affirmatives will refute the states counterplan with modeling advantages. In addition, affirmatives are likely to leverage their “tax” advantage versus these counterplans, because the states are more constrained in their ability to tax holdings in other countries nor are they able to install taxes at the border. The net-benefit to this counterplan could be federalism or politics.

**Federal, but non-Congressional, counterplans:** Article 1 of the constitution clearly designates the responsibility for “laying and collecting” taxes in Congress. So, affirmatives, because of the “Tax” requirement, will be forced to use Congress. This opens up a variety of negative options, using the Supreme Court or agencies to try to solve the affirmative’s harms. These counterplans will struggle to raise revenue, because that is Congress’ job, but they may function as “advantage counterplans”: solving the affirmative’s harms through a different mechanism and agent. The best net-benefit to these counterplans are politics and taxes bad.

## Disadvantages

**Business confidence:** This disadvantage argues that the affirmative hurts the confidence of businesses, and therefore harms the broader economy. The links are manifold. First, every plan will increase taxes. Those taxes may be directly on corporations or may trigger corporate fear because of tax instability and uncertainty. Second, many affirmatives will try and solve a problem that helps businesses. For example, jobs guarantee affirmatives will try to lower the supply of cheap/available labor and give workers an option to leave their job if unhappy. That would likely trigger business fears. Similarly, a “basic income” has a touted benefits of preventing “job lock,” which means that workers would be more willing and able to leave their current job. Even Social Security expansion might harm businesses. Because businesses must pay part of the payroll tax, any increase in that would fall directly on business bottom-lines.

**Inflation:** This disadvantage argues that the plan increases the general price of goods, and therefore reduces the purchasing power of consumers. We saw a mini experiment on this front during the COVID pandemic. The government provided checks to most Americans, and that meant that there was more money circulating in the economy. However, businesses, in response to that increase in demand increased the cost of their goods, which then lowered the purchasing power of those checks. Given the

***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](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

delicate balance that the Fed walks, regarding interest rates, this disadvantage will be timely and have short-term impacts. Affirmatives will respond to this by arguing that the “tax” of the plan means that the affirmative does not actually increase the overall amount of money in circulation, it just redistributes purchasing power to those in need.

**Politics:** Each of the affirmative proposals listed above comes with vehement resistance, especially among moderates and the political right. Part of this resistance comes from the “tax” requirement of each affirmative. No politician can raise taxes without triggering a firestorm of controversy. Even beyond the tax, affirmatives will likely be broadly discussed as “socialist” or “part of the Green New Deal.” Those labels will mean that the plan is likely to hurt the politicians pursuing it, which can have negative ramifications on both the Congressional and Presidential agenda.

### Critiques

**Capitalism:** This critique argues that the affirmative is capitalist or furthers tenets of neoliberal capitalism. This topic lends itself quite well to aff-specific capitalism critiques. At a broad level, each affirmative could be credibly accused of trying to “save” capitalism but removing some of the pernicious effects that come with the system (unemployment, poverty, etc.). Many affirmatives will have advantages about trying to boost productivity or entrepreneurial spirits, which also provide strong links to this critique.

**Modern Monetary Theory:** This critique argues that the affirmative’s “tax and transfer” has the strong starting point, because we should not be focused on the question “how do we pay for it?” For monetary sovereigns, that question is unnecessary and is the driving force behind neoliberal austerity. Instead, we should ask “what goods does this produce?” and avoid explicitly tying spending to “pay-fors.” MMT authors argue that this is the best way to produce an egalitarian economy and defuse the race towards defunding the social safety net.

**Race-based K’s:** Most affirmatives on this year’s topic will have a relatively simple explanation for inequality: economics. That explanation will be driven by the fact that most affirmatives will be constrained to providing an economic solution to the problem of inequality. Several critical race scholars take umbrage with that explanation. Instead, they argue that transatlantic slavery, Jim Crow, racist immigration policy and the legacy of anti-black racism in the United States are more historically valid explanations for inequalities in the United States.

## TOPICALITY ARGUMENTS

## **Topicality: Fiscal Redistribution Means Tax**

### **Interpretation: Fiscal redistribution requires a tax and transfer of public assistance**

Alexander **Hicks**, Professor of Sociology, Northwestern University, **1986**

“Class Influence on Redistributive Policy,” Journal of Political and Military Sociology, Vol. 14 (accessed 4/15/2023)

The present redistributive policy focus is on a particular type of government redistribution that may be called direct fiscal redistribution to the poor (hereafter DFRP). Fiscal redistribution refers here to redistribution of money and in-kind income among strata of households by means of both government spending and taxing (i.e., fiscal) activities. For example, increased generosity in public assistance payment levels and reliance upon progressive income as opposed to regressive sales taxes can provide positive fiscal redistribution. Direct fiscal redistribution refers to that part of such redistribution that can be accounted for in terms of government's relatively direct and immediate give-and-take of expenditures and taxes to and from income strata of households. Current evidence suggests that such redistribution is considerable in advanced capitalist political democracies, especially vis-à-vis the poor (e.g., Reynolds and Smolensky, 1977; Hicks and Swank, 1984b). During the 1970s DFRP apparently augmented the "pre-fisc" income share of poor households in the U.S. by over 100 percent (see Reynolds and Smolensky, 1977: 74 on the U.S.; and Hicks and Swank, 1984b on advanced capitalism).

### **Violation: The plan does not increase taxes to generate revenue for redistribution.**

#### **Prefer our interpretation:**

- 1. Limits. Forcing an affirmative to tax provides a functional limit, because the only viable affirmatives will have to defend both a tax and transfer.**
- 2. Ground. “Taxes bad” is core negative ground and central to all questions of agent disadvantages. Absent this requirement, affirmative can be small minor repairs and can read the best counterplans as affirmatives.**

**Topicality is a voting issue for fairness and education. Evaluate topicality based on competing interpretations, the negative doesn't need to prove in-round abuse, just that their interpretation is better for a season-long of debate.**

## **Topicality: Fiscal Redistribution Requires a Progressive Tax**

**Interpretation: Fiscal redistribution requires installing a progressive tax**

Alexander **Hicks**, Professor of Sociology, Northwestern University, **1986**

“Class Influence on Redistributive Policy,” *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, Vol. 14 (accessed 4/15/2023)

The present redistributive policy focus is on a particular type of government redistribution that may be called direct fiscal redistribution to the poor (hereafter DFRP). Fiscal redistribution refers here to redistribution of money and in-kind income among strata of households by means of both government spending and taxing (i.e., fiscal) activities. For example, increased generosity in public assistance payment levels and reliance upon progressive income as opposed to regressive sales taxes can provide positive fiscal redistribution. Direct fiscal redistribution refers to that part of such redistribution that can be accounted for in terms of government's relatively direct and immediate give-and-take of expenditures and taxes to and from income strata of households. Current evidence suggests that such redistribution is considerable in advanced capitalist political democracies, especially vis-à-vis the poor (e.g., Reynolds and Smolensky, 1977; Hicks and Swank, 1984b). During the 1970s DFRP apparently augmented the "pre-fisc" income share of poor households in the U.S. by over 100 percent (see Reynolds and Smolensky, 1977: 74 on the U.S.; and Hicks and Swank, 1984b on advanced capitalism).

**Violation: The plan does not institute a progressive tax.**

**Prefer our interpretation:**

- 1. Bidirectionality. Progressive taxation prevents bidirectional affs that distribute resources from the poor to the rich.**
- 2. Ground. Progressive taxation gives the negative core generics, like progressive taxation bad and counterplans to regressively tax. Their interpretation includes both regressive and progressive taxes, so the negative will always be less prepared to engage one or the other.**

**Topicality is a voting issue for fairness and education. Evaluate topicality based on competing interpretations, the negative doesn't need to prove in-round abuse, just that their interpretation is better for a season-long of debate.**

# CLIMATE JOB GUARANTEE NEG

## NEG – Warming Impact/Solvency

## **1NC – Skill Shortage Solvency Takeout**

**Skills Gap – green jobs require a high degree of skill – not enough people fill-in to solve their advantages**

Davide **Consoli et al**, research fellow at INGENIO with PhD in Economics, June 2016

“Do green jobs differ from non-green jobs in terms of skills and human capital?”, Research Policy, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048733316300208> (accessed 4-22-2023)

To put matters in context, recall that non-routine tasks require analytical and interpersonal skills to deal with non-predictable work environments while routine skills are intensive in occupations based on the execution of explicit instructions (e.g. book-keeping, clerical work, automated productions) (Autor et al., 2003, Levy and Murnane, 2004). Our results suggest that the task content of green occupations – both green emerging and green enhanced – is less routinised than that of their peer non-green jobs. That is to say, the spectrum of work activities has not reached a level of maturity so that they can be specified in instructions. This is especially so for analytical tasks, and resonates with the remark that green technology is still at early stages and, thus, that it requires scientific and technical creativity to be mastered and operationalised by the workforce (Vona and Consoli, 2015). Moving to other dimensions of human capital, education, experience and on-the-job training (Table 6), the differences between green occupations and similar non-green occupations are more substantial. This is especially the case for Green enhanced skills occupations which require 1.9 percent more years of education than comparable non-green occupations, about 13 weeks when evaluated at the overall sample mean. The relative difference increases substantially for Green enhanced skills when considering additional years of experience (43 percent, corresponding to about ten months when evaluated at the overall sample mean) and years of training (41 percent, corresponding to about 15 weeks when evaluated at the overall sample mean). For what concerns Green emerging occupations no differences are found in terms of years of education and years of experience, while they require 18 percent more years of training than non-green occupations (slightly less than seven weeks when evaluated at the overall sample mean). These results point to interesting differences within the group of green occupations, and the prominence of on-the-job training programmes as opposed to formal education for new Green emerging occupations resonates with the basic tenet of human capital theory (e.g. Becker, 1962).<sup>15</sup>



## 1NC – Warming Doesn't Cause Extinction

### No way warming rises to extinction

Toby Ord, Senior Research Fellow in Philosophy at Oxford University, , March 3, 2020

“The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity,” Hachette Books p. 110-112 (Accessed 4/23/2023)

But the purpose of this chapter is finding and assessing threats that pose a direct existential risk to humanity. Even at such extreme levels of warming, it is difficult to see exactly how climate change could do so. Major effects of climate change include reduced agricultural yields, sea level rises, water scarcity, increased tropical diseases, ocean acidification and the collapse of the Gulf Stream. While extremely important when assessing the overall risks of climate change, none of these threaten extinction or irrevocable collapse.

Crops are very sensitive to reductions in temperature (due to frosts), but less sensitive to increases. By all appearances we would still have food to support civilization.<sup>85</sup> Even if sea levels rose hundreds of meters (over centuries), most of the Earth's land area would remain. Similarly, while some areas might conceivably become uninhabitable due to water scarcity, other areas will have increased rainfall. More areas may become susceptible to tropical diseases, but we need only look to the tropics to see civilization flourish despite this. The main effect of a collapse of the system of Atlantic Ocean currents that includes the Gulf Stream is a 2°C cooling of Europe—something that poses no permanent threat to global civilization.

From an existential risk perspective, a more serious concern is that the high temperatures (and the rapidity of their change) might cause a large loss of biodiversity and subsequent ecosystem collapse. While the pathway is not entirely clear, a large enough collapse of ecosystems across the globe could perhaps threaten human extinction. The idea that climate change could cause widespread extinctions has some good theoretical support.<sup>86</sup> Yet the evidence is mixed. For when we look at many of the past cases of extremely high global temperatures or extremely rapid warming we don't see a corresponding loss of biodiversity.<sup>87</sup>

[FOOTNOTE]

We don't see such biodiversity loss in the 12°C warmer climate of the early Eocene, nor the rapid global change of the PETM, nor in rapid regional changes of climate. Willis et al. (2010) state: “We argue that although the underlying mechanisms responsible for these past changes in climate were very different (i.e. natural processes rather than anthropogenic), the rates and magnitude of climate change are similar to those predicted for the future and therefore potentially relevant to understanding future biotic response. What emerges from these past records is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another, but there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world.” There are similar conclusions in Botkin et al. (2007), Dawson et al. (2011), Hof et al. (2011) and Willis & MacDonald (2011). The best evidence of warming causing extinction may be from the end-Permian mass extinction, which may have been associated with large-scale warming (see note 91 to this chapter).

[END FOOTNOTE]

so the most important known effect of climate change from the perspective of direct existential risk is probably the most obvious: heat stress. We need an environment cooler than our body temperature to be able to rid ourselves of waste heat and stay alive. More precisely, we need to be able to lose heat by sweating, which depends on the humidity as well as the temperature.

A landmark paper by Steven Sherwood and Matthew Huber showed that with sufficient warming there would be parts of the world whose temperature and humidity combine to exceed the level where humans could survive without air conditioning.<sup>88</sup> With 12°C of warming, a very large land area—where more than half of all people currently live and where much of our food is grown—would exceed this level at some point during a typical year. Sherwood and Huber suggest that such areas would be uninhabitable. This may not quite be true (particularly if air conditioning is possible during the hottest months), but their habitability is at least in question.

***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](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

However, **substantial regions** would also **remain below** this threshold. **Even with an extreme 20°C of warming** there would be **many** coastal areas (and some **elevated regions**) that would have no days above the temperature/humidity threshold.<sup>89</sup> **So there would remain large areas** in which **humanity and civilization could continue**. A world with 20°C of warming would be an unparalleled human and environmental tragedy, forcing mass migration and perhaps starvation too. This is reason enough to do our utmost to prevent anything like that from ever happening. However, our present task is identifying existential risks to humanity and **it is hard to see how any realistic level of heat stress could pose such a risk**. So the runaway and moist greenhouse effects remain the only known mechanisms through which climate change could directly cause our extinction or irrevocable collapse.

This doesn't rule out unknown mechanisms. We are considering large changes to the Earth that may even be unprecedented in size or speed. It wouldn't be astonishing if that directly led to our permanent ruin. The best argument against such unknown mechanisms is probably that the PETM did not lead to a mass extinction, despite temperatures rapidly rising about 5°C, to reach a level 14°C above pre-industrial temperatures.<sup>90</sup> But this is tempered by the imprecision of paleoclimate data, the sparsity of the fossil record, the smaller size of mammals at the time (making them more heat-tolerant), and a reluctance to rely on a single example. Most importantly, anthropogenic warming could be over a hundred times faster than warming during the PETM, and rapid warming has been suggested as a contributing factor in the end-Permian mass extinction, in which 96 percent of species went extinct.<sup>91</sup> In the end, we can say little more than that **direct existential risk from climate change appears very small**, but cannot yet be ruled out.

## 2NC – XT: No xtn

### **Scientific consensus is on our side – warming doesn't cause xtn**

Jack **Elbaum**, Hazlitt Writing Fellow at the Foundation for Economic Education, Writing has been Featured in The Wall Street Journal, Newsweek, The New York Post, and the Washington Examiner; Foundation for Economic Education, 2021,

“3 Environmental Doomsday Myths, Debunked,” <https://fee.org/articles/3-environmental-doomsday-myths-debunked/> (accessed 4/24/2023)

#### **Myth #1: Human Extinction Due To Climate Change Is Imminent**

At the source of much anxiety about climate change is the belief that humans are likely to go extinct sometime in the near future due to its effects. But that belief is **just not correct**.

Even the scientists **most concerned** about climate change rebuke this assertion. Michael **Mann**, who is a professor of atmospheric science at Penn State and a **superstar** of the movement to fight climate change, wrote that "There is **no evidence** of climate change scenarios that would render **human beings** extinct."

In Michael Shellenberger's book, Apocalypse Never, he notes that Stanford University atmospheric scientist Ken Caldeira also said that "climate change does **not** threaten human **extinction**."

Some of the fear about human extinction undoubtedly started after Rep. Alexandria **Ocasio-Cortez** declared, in 2019, that "The world is going to end in twelve years if we don't address climate change." But, as Shellenberger documents in his book, climate scientists from NASA said that "All the time-limited frames are **bulls--t**," and a paleoclimate researcher at the University of Wisconsin-Madison said that her statement was a "mischaracterization."

In short, there are **virtually no scientists** who believe, and there is **no science** to support, the idea that **humans will go extinct** from climate change.

## 1NC – Adaptation Solves Warming

### **No impact to warming – adaption inevitable**

Bjorn **Lomborg**, President of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, Former Director of the Danish Government's Environmental Assessment Institute, PhD in Political Science at the University of Copenhagen, M.A. in Political Science at the University of Aarhus, BA from the University of Georgia; Wall Street Journal, October 21, 2021

“Climate Change Calls for Adaptation, Not Panic,” <https://www.wsj.com/articles/climate-change-adaptation-panic-exaggerating-disaster-11634760376> (Accessed 4/27/23)

It's easy to construct climate disasters. You just find a current, disconcerting trend and project it into the future, while ignoring everything humanity could do to adapt. For instance, one widely reported study found that **heat waves** could kill thousands more Americans by the end of the century if global warming continues apace—but only if you assume people won't use more air conditioning. Yes, the climate is likely to change, but so is human behavior in response.

Adaptation doesn't make the cost of global warming go away entirely, but it does reduce it dramatically. Higher temperatures will shrink harvests if farmers keep growing the same crops, but they're likely to adapt by growing other varieties or different plants altogether. Corn production in North America has **shifted** away from the Southeast toward the Upper Midwest, where farmers take advantage of longer growing seasons and less-frequent extreme heat. When sea levels rise, governments build defenses—like the levees, flood walls and drainage systems that protected New Orleans from much of Hurricane Ida's ferocity this year.

Nonetheless, many in the media push unrealistic projections of climate catastrophes, while ignoring adaptation. A new study documents how the **biggest bias** in studies on the rise of sea levels is their tendency to ignore human adaptation, exaggerating flood risks in 2100 by as much as 1,300 times. It is also evident in the breathless tone of most reporting: The Washington Post frets that sea level rise could “make 187 million people homeless,” CNN fears an “underwater future,” and USA Today agonizes over tens of trillions of dollars in projected annual flood damage. All three rely on studies that implausibly assume no society across the world will make any adaptation whatever for the rest of the century. This isn't reporting but scaremongering.

You can see how far from reality these sorts of projections are in one heavily cited study, depicted in the graph nearby. If you assume no society will adapt to any sea-level rise between now and 2100, you'll find that vast areas of the world will be routinely flooded, causing \$55 trillion in damage annually in 2100 (expressed in 2005 dollars), or about 5% of global gross domestic product. But as the study emphasizes, “in reality, societies are likely to adapt.”

By raising the height of dikes, the study shows that **humanity can negate almost all that terrible projected damage** by 2100. Only 15,000 people would be flooded every year, which is a remarkable improvement compared with the 3.4 million people flooded in 2000. The total cost of damage, investments in new dikes, and maintenance costs of existing dikes will fall sixfold between now and 2100 to 0.008% of world GDP.

Adaptation is much more effective than climate regulations at staving off flood risks. Compare the two types of policies in isolation. Without any climate mitigation to help, dikes would still safeguard more than 99.99% of the flood victims you'd see if global warming continued on current trends. Instead of 187 million people flooded in 2100, there would be only 15,000. Climate policy achieves much less on its own. Without adaptation, even stringent regulations that keep the global temperature rise below 2 degrees Celsius would reduce the number of flood victims only down to 85 million a year by the end of the century.

Stringent climate policy still has only a mild effect when used in concert with dikes: Instead of the 15,000 flood victims you'd get with only adaptation, you'd have 10,000. And getting there would cost hundreds of trillions of dollars, which is hardly mitigated by the \$40 billion drop in total flood damage and dike costs climate regulations would achieve. As I've explained in these pages before, this kind of policy has a high human cost: the tens of millions of people pricey climate regulations relegate to poverty.

You don't have to portend doom to take climate change seriously. Ignoring the benefits of adaptation may make for better headlines, but it badly misinforms readers.

***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](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

## 2NC – XT: Adaptation

### Adaptation eliminates all the negative impact.

Bjorn **Lomborg**, President of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, Former Director of the Danish Government's Environmental Assessment Institute, PhD in Political Science at the University of Copenhagen, M.A. in Political Science at the University of Aarhus, BA from the University of Georgia; Wall Street Journal, August 9, 2021

“Don’t Buy the Latest Climate-Change Alarmism,” <https://nypost.com/2021/08/09/dont-buy-the-latest-climate-change-alarmism/> (accessed 4/27/2023)

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change just released its latest climate report, and reactions from politicians and media pundits could not have been more predictable.

Fitting the apocalyptic narrative many have spun lately, the always-breathless Guardian literally summarized this scientific report as finding mankind “guilty as hell” of “climate crimes of humanity.” (Needless to say, the report never says any such things.)

UN Secretary-General António Guterres called the findings a “code red for humanity,” saying we can only avert catastrophe by acting in the next couple of months. Of course, the United Nations has a long history of claiming catastrophe is right around the corner: The first UN environment director claimed half a century ago that we had just 10 years left, and the then-head of the IPCC insisted in 2007 that we had just five years left.

In contrast to the hyperventilating media, the report is actually serious and sensible (and very, very long). It doesn’t surprise, since it is a summary of already-published studies, yet it reconfirms that global warming indeed is real and a problem.

But it also highlights how much one-sided thinking takes place in the climate conversation. Since the heat dome in June, there has been a lot of writing about more heat deaths. And the IPCC confirms that climate change indeed has increased heatwaves. However, the report equally firmly, if virtually unacknowledged, tells us that global warming means “the frequency and intensity of cold extremes have decreased.”

This matters because globally, many more people die from cold than from heat. A new study in the highly respected journal Lancet shows that about half a million people die from heat per year, but 4.5 million people die from cold.

As temperatures have increased over the past two decades, that has caused an extra 116,000 heat deaths each year. This, of course, fits the narrative and is what we have heard over and over again. But it turns out that because global warming has also reduced cold waves, we now see 283,000 fewer cold deaths.

You don’t hear this, but so far climate change saves 166,000 lives each year.

Likewise, we have heard a lot about flooding in Germany and elsewhere being caused by climate change. But the new UN report tells us it has “low confidence in the human influence on the changes in high river flows on the global scale” — and low confidence in attributing “changes in the probability or magnitude of flood events.” The report tells us that the evidence isn’t there to say floods are caused or driven by climate change.

It also mentions climate upsides like the fact that more CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere has acted as a fertilizer and created a profound global greening of the planet. One NASA study found that over a period of 35 years, climate change has added an area of green equivalent to twice the size of the continental United States. But don’t expect to read about this in any of the breathless articles on climate impact.

The UN report only deals with the physical impact of climate change, but of course, much of what really matters is how humans handle this. Often the real problem of rising sea levels is converted into a catastrophe by arguing that nobody will adapt and everyone will drown or be displaced. Remember when news reports told us that rising seas will displace an astonishing 187 million people, potentially “drowning” entire cities like Miami in 80 years?

***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](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

In reality, humans adapt, as Holland has shown. That's why many models show that adaptation will reduce the number of flooded people 12,000-fold. As in the past, rising prosperity will continue to reduce flood impacts, and climate change will merely slow down this reduction slightly.

Ultimately, this is why the scare stories on climate impacts are vastly overblown and not supported by this new climate report. One of the clearest ways to see this is through climate economics. Because of climate change, the average person worldwide will be "only" 436 percent as well off in 2100 as they are now, instead of 450 percent.

This is not the apocalypse but a problem we should fix smartly.

### **Innovation will respond, averting catastrophe.**

Bjorn Lomborg, President of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, Former Director of the Danish Government's Environmental Assessment Institute, PhD in Political Science at the University of Copenhagen, M.A. in Political Science at the University of Aarhus, BA from the University of Georgia; Wall Street Journal, August 9, 2021

"Even With Climate Change, the World Isn't Doomed," <https://www.wsj.com/articles/climate-change-world-doomed-gdp-warming-earth-11632338084> (accessed 4/27/2023)

Young people across the world are terrified of climate change, according to a forthcoming Lancet study. More than 45% of people 16 to 25 in the 10 countries surveyed are so worried that it affects their daily life and functioning. Almost half of young Americans believe "humanity is doomed," and two-thirds think "the future is frightening." But while climate change is a problem, panic is unwarranted.

The data show that humanity has overcome much larger threats over the past century. In 1900, if humanity had gotten rid of air pollution—mostly indoor pollution caused by smoky fuels like wood and dung—the benefit would have been equivalent to global gross domestic product rising 23%. To a young audience, that might look like an insufficient measure of well-being, but higher GDP means better health, lower mortality, greater access to education and in general a better standard of living. By 2050 the problem of air pollution will be mostly solved. And that's only one of the many issues humanity has shorn down over the last 100 years, according to data 21 top economists and I gathered.

The challenge climate change poses, both to the environment and society, looks rather small compared to those humanity has already met. Nobel Prize-winning climate economist William Nordhaus has shown that a 6.3-degree Fahrenheit rise in world temperatures by 2100—which is probable if policy makers do little to stop climate change—would cost only 2.8% of global GDP a year. The United Nations' latest estimate puts it even lower at 2.6% of GDP for a 6.6-degree Fahrenheit increase.

Moreover, the U.N. expects the average person to be 450% as rich in 2100 as today, absent the cost of climate change. Following current temperature projections, global warming would knock that down to only 434% as rich. That's a problem, but it isn't the end of the world.

Caring about the environment and human well-being doesn't mean we should terrify young people about climate change. Instead, we should encourage them to pursue innovation. That's what saved humanity from much greater dangers in the past and what will help us now.

***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](http://www.wcdebate.com)***

## 1NC – A/C to Emissions

**Alt cause – developing countries are responsible for more than 50% of annual emissions and don't have the resources to adapt**

Amar **Bhattacharya**, Senior Fellow - Global Economy and Development, Center for Sustainable Development @ Brookings Institute, March 3, 2023

"Developing countries are key to climate action," <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2023/03/03/developing-countries-are-key-to-climate-action/> (accessed 4/20/2023)

**Developing countries** will be the most severely affected by accelerating climate change and, even excluding China from the calculation, **are likely to emit more than half the annual global total of** greenhouse gas (GHG) **emissions** as early as 2030. But **the international community has not focused sufficiently on the range of development, adaptation, and resilience priorities and constraints these countries face** in tackling the world's interwoven emissions mitigation imperative. In an effort to help shift the global policy frame toward the crucial perspectives of developing countries themselves, we recently published an edited volume, *Keys to climate action: How developing countries could drive global success and local prosperity*. Within the volume, a wide range of distinguished contributors present both country case studies (on Bangladesh, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, and South Africa) and wider geography-focused assessments (on East Africa, Africa as a whole, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the V20 group of vulnerable countries), in addition to an assessment of the overarching financing challenges. As a collection, these studies describe how **climate change is hindering local development efforts** while also providing new opportunities. They draw attention to the vital importance of elevating developing country perspectives in driving global climate action. They also offer central insights on the diverse and evolving issues that need to be front-of-mind when considering the relevant challenges.

## 1NC/2NC – AT: Ocean Acidification !

### No acidification impact --- Historic CO2 levels disprove

Patrick **Moore**, Chair of the Energy, Ecology and Prosperity program at the Frontier Centre for Public Policy, Co-Founder of Greenpeace and former Director of Greenpeace International, Ph.D. in ecology from the Institute of Animal Resource Ecology, University of British Columbia, 2015

“OCEAN “ACIDIFICATION” ALARMISM IN PERSPECTIVE”, Frontier Centre for Public Policy  
<https://fcpp.org/sites/default/files/documents/Moore%20-%20Ocean%20Acidification%20Alarmism.pdf>  
(accessed 4/26/2023)

All the CO2 in the atmosphere came from inside the Earth. During the early life of the planet, the Earth was much hotter, and there was much more volcanic activity than there is today. The heat of the core caused carbon and oxygen to combine to form CO2, which became a significant part of the Earth’s early atmosphere, perhaps the most abundant component until photosynthesis evolved. Most of the CO2 in the oceans comes from the atmosphere, although some is injected directly from ocean vents. It is widely accepted that the concentration of CO2 was higher in the Earth’s atmosphere before modern-day life forms evolved during the Cambrian Period, which began 544 million years ago. It was also at that time that a number of marine species evolved the ability to control calcification, an example of the more-general term “biomineralization.”<sup>13</sup> This allowed these species to build hard shells of calcium carbonate (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) around their soft bodies, thus providing a type of armour plating. Early shellfish such as clams arose more than 500 million years ago, when atmospheric CO2 was 10 to 15 times higher than it is today.<sup>14</sup> Clearly, the pH of the oceans did not cause the extinction of corals or shellfish or they would not be here today. Why, then, are we told that even at today’s much lower level, CO2 is already causing damage to calcifying species? The most common argument is along the lines of “today’s species of corals and shellfish are not adapted to the level of CO2 that ancient species were familiar with. Acidification is happening so quickly that species will not be able to adapt to higher levels of CO2.” This is nonsensical in that from a biochemical perspective there is no reason to believe these species have lost their ability to calcify at the higher CO2 levels that existed for millions of years in the past. The ancestors of every species alive today survived through millennia during which conditions sometimes changed very rapidly, such as when an asteroid caused the extinction of dinosaurs and many other species 65 million years ago. While many more species became extinct than are alive today, it must be said that those species that came through these times have proven the most resilient through time and change. [Figure Omitted] As far as is known, there was only one other period in the Earth’s history when CO2 was nearly as low as it has been during the past 2.5 million years of the Pleistocene Ice Age. During the late Carboniferous Period and into the Permian and Triassic Periods, CO2 was drawn down from about 4,000 ppm to about 400 ppm, probably owing to the advent of vast areas of forest that pulled CO2 out of the atmosphere and incorporated it into wood and thus into coal (see Figure 1). We know from Antarctic ice cores that CO2 was drawn down to as low as 180 ppm during the Pleistocene, only 30 ppm above the threshold for the survival of plants, at the peak of glacial advances (see Figure 2). These periods of low atmospheric CO2, as is the case at present, are the exception to the much longer periods when CO2 was more than 1,000 ppm, and often much higher. For this reason alone, the possibility that present and future atmospheric CO2 levels will cause significant harm to calcifying marine life should be questioned. However, a number of other factors bring the ocean acidification hypothesis into question.

*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](http://www.wcdebate.com)*



## 1NC/2NC – AT: Resource Wars !

### **No resource wars from climate change – most comprehensive study**

Craig Idso, adjunct scholar at Cato, June 2, 2016

“Elevated CO2 and Temperature Enhance the Grain Yield and Quality of Rice,” Cato at Liberty, <http://www.cato.org/blog/elevated-co2-temperature-enhance-grain-yield-quality-rice> (accessed 4/19/2023)

Introducing their important work, Buhaug et al. (2015) note that earlier research suggests there is “a correlational pattern between climate anomalies and violent conflict” due to “drought-induced agricultural shocks and adverse economic spillover effects as a key causal mechanism linking the two phenomena.” But is this really so? Seeking an answer to this question, the four Norwegian researchers compared half a century of statistics on climate variability, food production and political violence across Sub-Saharan Africa, which effort, in their words, “offers the most precise and theoretically consistent empirical assessment to date of the purported indirect relationship.” And what did they thereby find? Buhaug et al. report that their analysis “reveals a robust link between weather patterns and food production where more rainfall generally is associated with higher yields.” However, they also report that “the second step in the causal model is not supported,” noting that “agricultural output and violent conflict are only weakly and inconsistently connected, even in the specific contexts where production shocks are believed to have particularly devastating social consequences,” which fact leads them to suggest that “the wider socioeconomic and political context is much more important than drought and crop failures in explaining violent conflict in contemporary Africa.” “Instead,” as they continue, “social protest and rebellion during times of food price spikes may be better understood as reactions to poor and unjust government policies, corruption, repression and market failure,” citing the studies of Bush (2010), Buhaug and Urdal (2013), Sneyd et al. (2013) and Chenoweth and Ulfelder (2015). In fact, they state that even the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report concludes “it is likely that socioeconomic and technological trends, including changes in institutions and policies, will remain a relatively stronger driver of food security over the next few decades than climate change,” citing Porter et al. (2014).” And so we learn that alarmist claims of future climate-change-induced reductions in agricultural production that lead to social unrest and violent conflicts simply are not supported by real-world observations.