

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

PROS OF BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS (ARGUMENTS)	2
PRO-01: Reducing Impacts of Climate Change	3
First... Climate Change Poses Greater Threat Than Nuclear War	3
According to... Bloomberg News, September 10, 2023	3
Also... Driving Force Behind Climate Change	3
According to... the Environmental Center, University of Colorado Boulder, February 25, 2021	3
Finally... Tremendous Emissions from Plastics Industry	3
According to... PBS.org, November 1, 2023	3
PRO-02: Reducing Environmental Threats	4
First... Environmental Damage Causing Grave Concern	4
According to... Greenpeace, September 7, 2023	4
Also... Reduced Production is Key to Results	4
According to... National Geographic, July 7, 2022	4
Finally... Single-Use Plastics Choking the Oceans	4
According to... United Nations Africa Renewal, July 2017	4
PRO-03: Reducing Health Risks	5
First... Plastics' Chemicals are Hazardous to Human Health	5
According to... PBS.org, November 1, 2023	5
Also... Buildup Reaches Crisis Point	5
According to... the United Nations Environment Program, June 5, 2023	5
Finally... Spreading Harmful and Potentially Deadly Diseases	5
According to... The Vanella Group, September 20, 2023	5
PRO-04: Reducing Exploitation of Developing Countries	6
First... Suffering from Environmental Injustices	6
According to... PBS.org, November 1, 2023	6
Also... Sending Plastic Waste to Poorer Countries	6
According to... DW News, January 7, 2020	6
Finally... U.S. Companies Exploiting Developing Countries	6
According to... The Guardian, October 5, 2018	6
CONS OF BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS (ARGUMENTS)	7
CON-01: Shifting to Harmful Alternatives	8
First... Alternatives Worse for the Environment	8
According to... Competitive Enterprise Institute, July 13, 2018	8
Also... Alternatives Will Be Unsustainable	8
According to... TIME Magazine, November 28, 2023	8
Finally... Causing Potentially Greater Harm	8
According to... Enhesa, Last Accessed: December 2023	8
CON-02: Harming the Economy	9
First... Increasing Costs for Businesses & Consumers	9
According to... Competitive Enterprise Institute, July 13, 2018	9
Also... Major Ramifications for the U.S. Economy	9
According to... the Reason Foundation, October 24, 2022	9
Finally... Significant Risk to Employment	9
According to... the Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, Last Accessed: December 2023	9
CON-03: Causing Threats to Health and Safety	10
First... Increasing Health Risks	10
According to... Competitive Enterprise Institute, July 13, 2018	10
Also... Agricultural Substitutions Jeopardize Food Security	10
According to... Communications Earth & Environment, September 25, 2023	10
Finally... Trade-offs to Public Health and Safety	10
According to... the Reason Foundation, October 24, 2022	10

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

PROS OF BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS (ARGUMENTS)

INTRODUCTION (First Speakers)

[First Speech: 4 min]

Hello, my name is... _____ .

Today, we will discuss: Single-Use Plastics.

My partner and I believe that "Banning Single-Use Plastics" is... Desirable.

To begin, let's discuss... _____ .

THE FRAMEWORK (Both Sides)

[Keywords] Ban, and Single-Use Plastics

Definition: Ban [Later!]

According to... Investopedia, September 21, 2023

"Student debt is money borrowed by individuals to cover the cost of education."

So... student debt 'forgiveness' would mean not having to repay the loan.

Definition: Single-Use Plastics [Later!]

According to... Investopedia, September 21, 2023

"Student debt is money borrowed by individuals to cover the cost of education."

So... student debt 'forgiveness' would mean not having to repay the loan.

[Value]

*Our value is... **Quality of life.***

[Criteria]

*Our criteria is... **On balance.***

"So, the side that "on balance" provides the most Quality of Life for the most people should win the debate."

Our Advocacy is... [later!]

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

PRO-01: Reducing Impacts of Climate Change

Banning Single-Use Plastics will... reduce climate change.

Because... when we reduce the production of plastics and reduce the need for burning plastic waste, we can greatly reduce the emissions of greenhouse gasses.

For example...

First... Climate Change Poses Greater Threat Than Nuclear War

According to... Bloomberg News, September 10, 2023

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-09-10/biden-says-climate-change-poses-greater-threat-than-nuclear-war>

It states.... President Joe Biden said the sole threat to humanity's existence is climate change, and that not even nuclear conflict poses a similar danger. "The only existential threat humanity faces, even things more frightening than a nuclear war, is global warming," Biden said Sunday during a news conference in Hanoi, Vietnam. The president added "we're going to be in real trouble" if, in the next decade or two, warming goes above the 1.5C temperature increase that scientists consider a tipping point for increasing the chances of extreme weather events. "There's no way back from that," Biden continued. "And so there's a lot we can do in the meantime."

In other words... no other threat, not even nuclear war, poses as significant danger to humanity's existence.

This means... we must ban single-use plastics in order to reduce the production and disposal of plastics. Failure to do so puts literally billions of lives at risk.

Also... Driving Force Behind Climate Change

According to... the Environmental Center, University of Colorado Boulder, February 25, 2021

<https://www.colorado.edu/center/2021/02/25/climate-impact-single-use-plastics>

It states... Single-use plastics are becoming increasingly prevalent across the world. These plastics most obviously create eyesoros and pose a threat to the natural ecosystems they make their way into. However, these plastics are also a driving force behind climate change.

In other words... Single-use plastics not only threaten ecosystems, but also contribute to the threat of climate change.

This means... if we ban single-use plastics, we protect billions of lives because when we reduce production of plastics and reduce the burning of plastic waste, we are significantly reducing the impact of global warming.

Finally... Tremendous Emissions from Plastics Industry

According to... PBS.org, November 1, 2023

<https://www.pbs.org/wnet/peril-and-promise/2023/11/how-single-use-plastics-hurt-our-oceans-and-warm-our-planet/>

It states... How does the production of plastic contribute to climate change? The production, use, and disposal of plastic creates significant greenhouse gas emissions that cause climate change. Greenhouse gases escape from fossil fuels extracted and refined to make plastic. Fossil fuels are used to make plastic in an energy-intensive process. "When you add together all the greenhouse gas emissions related to plastic, they are greater than the emissions of every single country except for the U.S., China, India and Russia ... If plastic were a country, it would be the fifth largest emitter of greenhouse gases in the world," Leavitt said.

In other words... The production and disposal of plastic and its waste create significant amounts of greenhouse gasses. If the plastic industry was a country, it would rank 5th in the world for greenhouse gas emissions.

This means... banning single-use plastics could make a tremendous reduction of the greenhouse gasses, which threaten our very existence; all current and future life depends on reducing such gasses.

Imagine... the potential catastrophic consequences of not taking action...

- Failing to ban single-use plastics will put billions of lives at risk of extinction. Nothing outweighs this!
- Failing to ban, will also risk the destruction of both natural and human habitats.
- Rising sea levels will contaminate fresh water and billions of people will die in wars over fresh water!

Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will reduce climate change.

"Our next argument is..." [or] "So, for all these reasons, please vote for the PRO. Thank you."

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

PRO-02: Reducing Environmental Threats

Banning Single-Use Plastics will... reduce threats to the environment.

Because... when we reduce the production of plastics and reduce the amount of plastic waste, we can greatly reduce the threats to biodiversity, ecosystems, and wildlife.

For example...

First... Environmental Damage Causing Grave Concern

According to... Greenpeace, September 7, 2023

<https://www.greenpeace.org/aotearoa/story/plastic-pollutions-devastating-impact-on-wildlife/>

It states... Plastic pollution's impact on wildlife is a grave concern that demands immediate attention and concerted efforts. The alarming consequences of plastic ingestion, entanglement, habitat degradation, chemical contamination and ecosystem disruption paint a bleak picture of the state of our planet's ecosystems. However, it's not too late to reverse the damage. Using less plastic and making sure to recycle helps. But it isn't enough. We need to stop plastic production at source. We're calling on the government to ban plastic bottles. Join the movement.

In other words... The impact of plastic pollution on wildlife demands immediate attention and poses alarming consequences for the planet's ecosystems. Animals are suffering and dying, and habitats are being destroyed. Reduce and recycling won't work unless we reduce production.

This means... when we ban single-use plastics, we reduce the kinds of plastic waste that is destroying precious habitats and killing defenseless animals.

Also... Reduced Production is Key to Results

According to... National Geographic, July 7, 2022

<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/environment/article/california-sweeping-new-plastics-law-could-be-a-game-changer>

It states... In the end, what sets the new California plastics law apart is the requirement that reduces plastic production, says George Leonard, the Ocean Conservancy's chief scientist. "It goes to the heart of the question—the growth of plastic production as a driver in environmental change. Is it everything? No. But it's going to bend the curve in a more practical way than anything that came before."

In other words... the chief scientist from Ocean Conservancy says that policies requiring a reduction in plastic production are necessary to address the heart of the problem.

This means... banning single-use plastics will address the root causes of the plastic waste problem destroying vital habitats and ecosystems.

Finally... Single-Use Plastics Choking the Oceans

According to... United Nations Africa Renewal, July 2017

<https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/may-july-2017/plastics-pose-biggest-threat-oceans>

It states... Oceans are choking on plastic junk—millions of tonnes of water bottles, soda bottles, drinking straws and single use plastic bags. Worse still, what we see floating on the surface accounts for only 5% of all the plastic litter that has been dumped into the sea. According to Ocean Conservancy, a US environmental non-profit, the other 95% is beneath the surface, where it strangles underwater creatures and wrecks aquatic ecosystems. 99% of all seabirds will have ingested plastic by 2050 if nothing is done to reverse the trend. "Oceans are now clogged with plastics, especially discarded fishing gear and single-use plastics," Ms. Earle told Africa Renewal in an interview.

In other words... Oceans are clogged with millions of tons of single-use plastic debris, which strangles sea creatures and destroys ecosystems.

This means... we need to ban single-use plastics in order to reduce the amount of plastic waste, which threatens millions of animals and protects habitats from being contaminated.

Imagine... the tremendous good we can do for the environment...

- Protecting millions of marine animals from suffering and death.
- Preventing millions of habitats from being poisoned.
- Reducing the plastic waste choking the world's oceans.

Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will reduce environmental threats.

"Our next argument is..." [or] "So, for all these reasons, please vote for the PRO. Thank you."

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

PRO-03: Reducing Health Risks

Banning Single-Use Plastics will... reduce serious health risks.

Because... when we reduce the production of plastics and reduce the amount of plastic waste, we can greatly reduce the risks from chemicals leaching into the soil, our water being contaminated, and chemicals in the air due to burning.

For example...

First... Plastics' Chemicals are Hazardous to Human Health

According to... PBS.org, November 1, 2023

<https://www.pbs.org/wnet/peril-and-promise/2023/11/how-single-use-plastics-hurt-our-oceans-and-warm-our-planet/>

It states... How does plastic affect human health, animal health, and the environment – particularly our oceans? Humans are eating, drinking, and breathing microplastics. Scientists are still studying how we might be affected by the plastics that are making their way into our food, water, and air, but what they do know should cause alarm. Dr. Warner highlighted that The United Nations has calculated there are 13,000 chemicals that are used to make plastic. We know that a quarter of those are hazardous to human health. Half of them haven't even been tested yet, so we do not yet know what they do to human health. She explained, "They're trade secrets. They don't have to tell us what chemicals they've added to the plastic that we're using."

In other words... the plastic industry is putting unknown chemicals into the plastics, many of which are hazardous to our health. These chemicals are in our drinking water, in the food we eat, and are even in the air that we breathe.

This means... by banning single-use plastics, we protect the health of millions of people by reducing the amount of pollution and waste that comes from the making and burning of plastics.

Also... Buildup Reaches Crisis Point

According to... the United Nations Environment Program, June 5, 2023

<https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/may-2023/understanding-plastic-pollution-and-its-impact-lives>

It states... Overall, 46 per cent of plastic waste is landfilled, while 22 per cent is mismanaged and becomes litter. Unlike other materials, plastic does not biodegrade. It can take up to 1,000 years to break down, so when it is discarded, it builds up in the environment until it reaches a crisis point. This pollution chokes marine wildlife, damages soil and poisons groundwater, and can cause serious health impacts.

In other words... plastic waste is reaching a crisis point as it builds up in the environment contaminating our soil and our groundwater leading to serious health impacts.

This means... if we don't ban single-use plastic, then we are putting millions of lives at risk from serious contamination.

Finally... Spreading Harmful and Potentially Deadly Diseases

According to... The Vanella Group, September 20, 2023

<https://www.vanellagroupmn.com/the-environmental-and-health-impacts-of-single-use-plastics-and-what-we-can-do-to-reduce-their-use>

It states... What are the health impacts of single-use plastics? In addition to environmental impacts, single-use plastics can also negatively affect human health: Potential to harbor pathogens: Plastic waste can serve as a vector for pathogens like E. coli and Salmonella to spread and persist in the environment. Reusing plastic items runs contamination risks, even with washing. COVID-19 virus can survive on plastics. Hospital waste with plastic syringes, gloves, and IV tubes could expose waste workers to infection.

In other words... plastic waste can spread serious diseases such as E. coli, Salmonella, or even Covid. Single use plastic medical supplies can spread harmful diseases as well.

This means... we must ban single use plastics in order to reduce the spread of harmful infections, which would protect millions of people. Even mosquitoes will breed in the dirty water found in plastic debris and then spread diseases too.

Imagine... the serious health risks from inaction...

- Millions of people and animals are at risk from microplastics in our food, air, and water.
- Millions more will suffer from chemical contamination from our food supply.
- Seriously harmful diseases can be spread from the surface of plastic waste.

Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will reduce health risks.

"Our next argument is..." [or] "So, for all these reasons, please vote for the PRO. Thank you."

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

PRO-04: Reducing Exploitation of Developing Countries

Banning Single-Use Plastics will... reduce exploitation.

Because... when we reduce the production of plastics and reduce the amount of plastic waste, we can greatly reduce the plastic waste being sent to other countries; less to sell, and less washing up on their shores. In our own country, we can reduce the amount of pollution made by plastics and the amount of burning to dispose of single-use plastics.

For example...

First... Suffering from Environmental Injustices

According to... PBS.org, November 1, 2023

<https://www.pbs.org/wnet/peril-and-promise/2023/11/how-single-use-plastics-hurt-our-oceans-and-warm-our-planet/>

It states... What are the environmental justice implications of plastic? Leavitt emphasized that plastic pollution is an environmental justice issue both in the U.S. and around the world. The U.S. plays a significant role in the global plastic pollution problem. According to a 2022 study, in 2016, the U.S. produced 42 million tons of plastic waste. Leavitt explained that plastic disproportionately affects people living in "fenceline communities," which according to the Climate Reality Project are people who live directly next to highly polluting facilities, including large manufacturing facilities or fossil fuel infrastructure. These facilities pollute the air, water and soil of the nearby neighborhoods, which oftentimes are historically marginalized neighborhoods with residents of lower incomes, or Black, Latino or Indigenous people.

In other words... Single-use plastics are an environmental justice issue in both the U.S. and for the rest of the world too. Producing and disposing of plastics disproportionately harm "fenceline communities" who are often marginalized people such as low-income families and people of color.

This means... by banning single-use plastics, we can greatly reduce the production and burning of plastic waste, making millions of lives better by reducing the effects of environmental racism and other injustices.

Also... Sending Plastic Waste to Poorer Countries

According to... DW News, January 7, 2020

<https://www.dw.com/en/the-dirty-business-of-plastic-waste/video-49894611>

It states... In many countries, storage and recycling capacities are inadequate. Many prosperous countries send their trash to poorer ones. If it's sorted, some kinds can be recycled. If it's all jumbled together, it often ends up on illegal dumps or is burned.

In other words... many wealthy countries including the United States who does this more than the other countries, are dumping their plastic waste onto the poorer countries; exploiting their poverty. The waste ends up in their landfills instead of ours. Their people breathe the toxic fumes instead of ours.

This means... by not banning single-use plastics, we will generate as much as 40% extra, unnecessary plastic waste, which will ultimately be sent to island nations on their beaches or shipped through the ports so it's no longer our problem.

Finally... U.S. Companies Exploiting Developing Countries

According to... The Guardian, October 5, 2018

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2018/oct/05/huge-rise-us-plastic-waste-shipments-to-poor-countries-china-ban-thailand-malaysia-vietnam>

It states... Campaigners said the analysis, which Unearthed shared with the Guardian, shows the US is exploiting developing countries where there is no regulatory framework to ensure plastic waste is processed in an environmentally friendly way. "Instead of taking responsibility for their own waste, US companies are exploiting developing countries that lack the regulation to protect themselves," said John Hocevar, Oceans campaign director for Greenpeace USA. The waste, some of which consists of household recycling produced in the US, includes single-use plastic bottles, plastic bags and food wrappings, said Hocevar. It can, however, contain toxic materials. "It's a problem for the US and other developed countries to produce, often, toxic material which they can't or won't take care of themselves."

In other words... the United States is sending its plastic waste from single-use plastics to developing countries by exploiting their lack of regulations and as such worthless and often toxic plastic waste is being forced on them.

This means... if we ban single-use plastic, we can reduce the amount of plastic waste we send to other countries and it will at least have value to them from being recycled without forcing them to burn it or overwhelm their landfills.

Imagine... the following Unethical/immoral impacts...

- Exploitation through greed and corruption allows our waste to be dumped on other communities.
- Our companies work with black market criminals to smuggle waste into unsuspecting nations.
- Millions of people suffering due to the toxins from our trash that they are now forced to live with.

Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will reduce exploitation.

"Our next argument is..." [or] *"So, for all these reasons, please vote for the PRO. Thank you."*

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

CONS OF BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS (ARGUMENTS)

INTRODUCTION (First Speakers)

[First Speech: 4 min]

Hello, my name is... _____ .

Today, we will discuss: Single-Use Plastics.

My partner and I believe that “Banning Single-Use Plastics” is... [Undesirable].

To begin, let's discuss... _____ .

[Summary Speech: 3 min]

In this speech, I will **defend** each of my team's arguments.

Optional: But first, let's discuss the framework.

The first argument I will **defend** is... _____ .

THE FRAMEWORK (Both Sides)

[Keywords] Ban, and Single-Use Plastics

Definition: Ban [Later!]

According to... Investopedia, September 21, 2023

“Student debt is money borrowed by individuals to cover the cost of education.”

So... student debt 'forgiveness' would mean not having to repay the loan.

Definition: Single-Use Plastics [Later!]

According to... Investopedia, September 21, 2023

“Student debt is money borrowed by individuals to cover the cost of education.”

So... student debt 'forgiveness' would mean not having to repay the loan.

[Value]

Our value is... **Quality of life.**

[Criteria]

Our criteria is... **On balance.**

“So, the side that “on balance” provides the most Quality of Life for the most people should win the debate.”

Our Advocacy is... [later!]

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

CON-01: Shifting to Harmful Alternatives

Banning Single-Use Plastics will... force a shift to harmful alternatives

Because... when single-use plastics are banned, companies will search for the lowest price alternatives, which are just as bad for litter and require more energy and resources to produce. Ironically, the ban will end up making things worse.

For example...

First... Alternatives Worse for the Environment

According to... Competitive Enterprise Institute, July 13, 2018

<https://cei.org/blog/five-reasons-banning-plastics-may-harm-the-environment-and-consumers/>

It states... Plastics have important environmental benefits. In many ways, plastics are better for the environment than other alternatives because they are more efficient and use less energy during production and transport. Plastic consumer goods like straws, foam cups, and utensils are less energy intensive to produce than alternatives like paper or aluminum. Production of these items takes more resources, creates more waste, and results in more pollution than the production of disposable plastic items. Reusable items like foam cups, straws, and bags require more than 100 uses—and in more than 1,000 in the case of foam cups—justify the energy required to produce them.

In other words... the alternatives will require more resources, will create more waste, and will create more greenhouse gasses and pollution compared to their plastic counterparts.

This means... the ban will not only fail to fix the root causes, but it will lead to even worse pollution than before.

Also... Alternatives Will Be Unsustainable

According to... TIME Magazine, November 28, 2023

<https://time.com/6339914/plastic-alternatives-pollute/>

It states... One proposed solution is to replace these plastics with alternatives: biodegradable utensils, compostable wrappers, plant-based bottles, and compressed-fiber plates and bowls. Theoretically, these products could seamlessly slot into existing supply chains, requiring no sacrifice on the part of consumers, who are clamoring for more sustainable options. But production is limited in scale, more expensive than conventional plastic, and it's not yet clear that the alternatives are actually better for human and planetary health: most plant-based plastics are, on a molecular level, identical to their fossil-fuel-sourced siblings and last just as long in the environment. Other substitutes require many of the same toxic chemical additives as conventional plastics to keep them waterproof, flexible, durable, and colorfast.

In other words... the alternatives, require many of the same chemicals to keep them durable, and waterproof, which means they will still end up in landfills and in the oceans.

This means... instead of the ban reducing waste, we will still have colorful waste, poisoned with chemicals, which animals will eat, and the air, water, and air will still become toxic. It won't be made of plastic, but it will be just as bad.

Finally... Causing Potentially Greater Harm

According to... Enhesa, Last Accessed: December 2023

<https://www.enhesa.com/resources/article/are-bans-the-solution-to-plastic-pollution/>

It states... It is also worth learning from the experience of banning plastic bags; the ban led to an increase in the prevalence of unregulated thicker plastic bags. There is also research that suggests that alternatives to plastic bags such as cotton bags or paper bags also have environmental impacts that cannot be neglected (either greenhouse gas emissions, the use of pesticides and the use of copious amounts of water). For example, the fact that the alternatives currently available may actually have a greater (or different) environmental impact or that people and companies shift to using other plastics that are allowed.

In other words... banning single-use plastics leads to companies making slightly thicker plastics, which people will continue to use because it is convenient. Other alternatives consume more energy, giving off more greenhouse gasses and also increase the use of pesticides and reduce freshwater resources.

This means... a ban on single use plastics will make the environment, human health, and any harms to communities even worse, because alternatives will be worse than the plastics we tried to replace. Their side makes things worse!

Imagine... the potential catastrophic consequences of the ban...

- The ban creates more environmental damage than single use – hard to believe but true.
- Millions of people and animals will suffer from similar chemicals being added to the alternatives.
- The entire PRO case makes things worse, which means their arguments are reasons to vote for the CON.

Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will force a shift to harmful alternatives.

“Our next argument is...” [or] “So, for all these reasons, please vote for the CON. Thank you.”

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

CON-02: Harming the Economy

Banning Single-Use Plastics will... cause severe economic harm

Because... without access to abundant and affordable plastics, the costs of replacing these items will harm small businesses, displace millions of workers, and may bankrupt the plastics industry.

For example...

First... Increasing Costs for Businesses & Consumers

According to... Competitive Enterprise Institute, July 13, 2018

<https://cei.org/blog/five-reasons-banning-plastics-may-harm-the-environment-and-consumers/>

It states... Plastics are economical. In addition to being more efficient and sanitary, plastic consumer products are also less expensive to produce than paper or aluminum alternatives. Because these items are cheaper to make, they are also less expensive for consumers both in the United States and around the globe. Bans of such economical items simply increase costs for businesses and ultimately consumers.

In other words... plastic products are less expensive to produce than the alternatives and as such, when plastics are banned, it drives up the costs for both businesses and consumers.

This means... banning single-use plastics would increase prices similar to inflation making everything including food, more expensive,. Millions of families, particularly low-income families, will suffer disproportionately to the rest of society.

Also... Major Ramifications for the U.S. Economy

According to... the Reason Foundation, October 24, 2022

<https://reason.org/commentary/the-governments-bad-idea-to-stop-using-single-use-plastics/>

It states... The Government Services Administration is considering phasing out single-use plastics from its supply chain and procurement processes, which would have major ramifications for America's economy and the functioning of its production and service sectors. Due to the size and market power of the GSA, the proposed rule's impacts would likely ripple through the national plastics economy and the personal plastics economy of individual Americans, who would find their choices to use single-use plastics impacted, perhaps considerably.

In other words... agencies within the U.S. government are planning to ban single-use plastics which could seriously put the U.S. economy at risk by harming the producers and the service providers ability to function.

This means... a nationwide ban on single-use plastics would pose and even greater risk to businesses and the overall economy. Literally hundreds of millions of people would suffer serious economic harm from reduced economic activity.

Finally... Significant Risk to Employment

According to... the Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, Last Accessed: December 2023

[https://uniformityofcommerce.org/documents/Plastic%20Bag%20Fact%20Sheet\[1\].pdf](https://uniformityofcommerce.org/documents/Plastic%20Bag%20Fact%20Sheet[1].pdf)

It states... Economic Effects: Business sales and profits are negatively affected by plastic bag bans. Plastic bag bans not only provide an unfair advantage to retailers in a geographic area without a plastic bag ban, they also have additional unintended consequences. The theft of store shopping carts and shopping baskets is higher in areas with plastic bag bans. Additionally, customers use more plastic produce bags, which undercuts the effect of the ban. Overall, plastic bag bans increase prices for consumers, decrease profit for producers, and decrease economic activity in the area affected by the plastic bag ban. Employment Effects: Banning plastic bags reduces retail employment. According to a survey on the economic effects of the plastic bag ban in Los Angeles County, stores that were inside the ban area reduced their employment by more than 10% while stores outside the ban area increased their employment by 2.4%. Retail jobs are not the only jobs that would be affected if a plastic bag ban were implemented. A large portion of plastic bags are made in the United States, and the plastics manufacturing industry employs more than 30,000 people whose jobs would be at stake if plastic bag bans became widespread.

In other words... banning single-use plastics such as bags can make businesses immediately less competitive, which threatens to reduce economic activity in the local as well as the national economy and threatens job security for workers.

This means... banning single-use plastics will pose a significant risk to businesses and the economy – as millions of families suffer from fewer jobs and lost income due to the significant increase in costs that ban will cause for businesses.

Imagine... the potential economic harm from banning single-use plastics...

- The ban threatens to bankrupt businesses, and millions of jobs will be lost.
- Millions of families will struggle not only with job loss, but from the higher prices as well.
- We risk causing massive inflation, which reduces economic activity and growth – leading to a recession.

Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will severely harm the economy.

"Our next argument is..." [or] "So, for all these reasons, please vote for the CON. Thank you."

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (ver. 12.22)

CON-03: Causing Threats to Health and Safety

Banning Single-Use Plastics will... cause significant risks to health & safety

Because... some single-use items are unsafe to use more than once, particularly in the medical field. Food security will be at risk from requiring the agriculture industry to shift away from single-use plastic mulch films, which are necessary for crop yields. Forcing them to reuse the plastic is toxic for the soil and the alternatives will drive up food costs.

For example...

First... Increasing Health Risks

According to... Competitive Enterprise Institute, July 13, 2018

<https://cei.org/blog/five-reasons-banning-plastics-may-harm-the-environment-and-consumers/>

It states... Plastic is more sanitary and safer to use than other alternatives. Plastic items are more sanitary than other alternatives. For example, reusable bags often harbor bacteria and could pose a health risk for consumers. Plastic packaging reduces food waste and makes possible transporting and serving food in a way that reduces disease transmission. Recent claims to the contrary do not hold water.

In other words... banning single-use plastics would cause increased health risks from disease-causing bacteria inside reusable bags and would increase food waste. Plastic items are more sanitary and are much safer than the alternatives.

This means... the ban puts tens of millions of families at greater risk of getting sick from spoiled food and/or bacteria.

Also... Agricultural Substitutions Jeopardize Food Security

According to... Communications Earth & Environment, September 25, 2023

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-023-00982-4>

It states... Plastics have become an integral component in agricultural production as mulch films, nets, storage bins and in many other applications, but their widespread use has led to the accumulation of large quantities in soils. Rational use and reduction, collection, reuse, and innovative recycling are key measures to curb plastic pollution from agriculture. Plastics that cannot be collected after use must be biodegradable in an environmentally benign manner. Harmful plastic additives must be replaced with safer alternatives to reduce toxicity burdens and included in the ongoing negotiations surrounding the United Nations Plastics Treaty. Although full substitution of plastics is currently not possible without increasing the overall environmental footprint and jeopardizing food security, alternatives with smaller environmental impacts should be used and endorsed within a clear socio-economic framework. Better monitoring and reporting, technical innovation, education and training, and social and economic incentives are imperative to promote more sustainable use of plastics in agriculture.

In other words... plastics are very important to food production and substitution is not possible without increasing risks to the environment and would also jeopardize our food security.

This means... banning single-use plastics will pose a significant risk to millions of low-income families in the U.S. and other parts of the world, who are already struggling with food insecurity.

Finally... Trade-offs to Public Health and Safety

According to... the Reason Foundation, October 24, 2022

<https://reason.org/commentary/the-governments-bad-idea-to-stop-using-single-use-plastics/>

It states... The Center for Biological Diversity argues that banning single-use plastics aligns with President Joe Biden's Executive Order 14008, "Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad," which calls for federal agencies to align their activities with the president's climate change agenda. The crux of CBD's petition is on page 9: [---skip 4 paragraphs---] We further request that the rulemaking contains exemptions for disability accommodations, disaster recovery, medical use, and personal protective equipment. GSA regulations must clarify that "single-use product" does not include medical products necessary for the protection of public health, or personal protective equipment, including masks, gloves, or face shields.

In other words... without medical exceptions, the ban on single-use plastics would make it illegal to produce single-use medical protections such as gloves, masks, and face shields.

This means... banning single-use plastics will pose significant health risks to medical professionals and the public at large due to unintended consequences. Reuse would ultimately lead to increased contamination & preventable deaths.

Imagine... the potential economic harm from banning single-use plastics...

- Less food produced coupled with greater food waste means overall less food security.
- Millions of families will struggle from increased medical costs and less overall health.
- Reusing single-use medical devices and protective gear will spread disease (or alt = increased health costs).

Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will significantly increase risks to health & safety.

"Our next argument is..." [or] "So, for all these reasons, please vote for the CON. Thank you."