

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)
 Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

REJOINDERS (PRO): BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS	2
INTRODUCTION (PRO)	2
PRO-01: Reducing Health Risks	3
First... Bans Effective in Reducing Waste	3
According to... Frontiers in Marine Science, December 11, 2023	3
Also... Alternatives Biodegrade into Nontoxic Components	3
According to... TIME Magazine, November 28, 2023	3
PRO-02: Protecting the Environment	4
First... Plastic Pollution “Lasts Forever”	4
According to... National Resource Natural Resources Defense Council, January 9, 2020	4
Also... Biodiversity Loss Threatens Habitats and Human Survival	4
According to... the New York Times, May 6, 2019	4
PRO-03: Reducing the Risks of Climate Change	5
First... Reducing Contribution to Climate Change	5
According to... National Resource Natural Resources Defense Council, January 9, 2020	5
Also... Global Warming Poses Cataclysmic Impact	5
According to... the MIT Climate Portal, Last Updated: November 7, 2023	5
REJOINDERS (CON): BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS	6
INTRODUCTION (CON)	6
CON-01: Harming the Economy	7
First... Causing Major Economic Ramifications	7
According to... the Reason Foundation, October 24, 2022	7
Also... Non-Plastic Alternatives are “Far More Expensive”	7
According to... TIME Magazine, November 28, 2023	7
CON-02: Risks to Health & Safety	8
First... Bans Spread Deadly Bacteria & Disease	8
According to... Waste Management Resources, March 2022	8
Also... Alternatives Increase Health Risks	8
According to... the Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, Last Accessed: January 2024	8
CON-03: Increasing the Risks of Climate Change	9
First... Alternatives Causing Global Warming	9
According to... TIME Magazine, November 28, 2023	9
Also... Alternatives Create Substantially Higher Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions	9
According to... McKinsey & Company, July 6, 2022	9

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

REJOINDERS (PRO): BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS

INTRODUCTION (PRO)

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

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

We think you should prefer our interpretation because... Ours is more clear, accurate, precise and it is fair-minded.

*So... "**On balance**" we think our side is providing the most improvement to "**Quality of Life**".*

*Now, I will defend our first argument... **Reducing Health Risks.***

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

PRO-01: REDUCING HEALTH RISKS

They said... we were wrong about health risks.

We were not wrong because...

First... Bans Effective in Reducing Waste

According to... Frontiers in Marine Science, December 11, 2023

<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2023.1305091/full>

[Ren-Shou Yu, Department of Tourism Management, Jimei University, et al, Global analysis of marine plastics and implications of control measure strategies, Frontiers in Marine Science, December 11, 2023.]

It states... Bans on single-use plastics have been implemented in many countries and cities worldwide, and they have shown to be effective in reducing plastic waste. A study conducted in San Francisco found that the ban on plastic bags reduced the usage of plastic bags by 72% (Hoorweg et al., 2013). Product redesign is another strategy that can reduce plastic waste. For example, Coca-Cola has introduced a plant-based bottle made from sugarcane that can reduce the company's reliance on fossil fuel-based plastics (Coca-Cola, 2019). Recycling programs are also effective in reducing plastic waste. In Australia, the National Recycling Scheme has led to the collection and recycling of 2.7 million tonnes of plastic waste (National Plastics Plan, 2021).

This means... By banning single-use plastics, we create a shift in the marketplace where innovation and better alternatives will be used instead of plastic. It is in the self-interest of the companies and industry to adapt to the ban.

Also... Alternatives Biodegrade into Nontoxic Components

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

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

It states... One of the most promising plastic replacements is polyhydroxyalkanoate, or PHA, which is made by fermenting plant sugars that come from beets, corn, and other vegetable waste, or even biogas from landfill, in a process similar to brewing beer. As with other naturally-occurring polymers like silk or cellulose, PHA products degrade into nontoxic components within months. They can also be shredded, melted, and reformed into new products. Different kinds of bacteria, some naturally occurring, others specifically engineered, are used instead of chemical additives to create properties such as flexibility and transparency.

This means... banning single-use plastics will not cause health problems as the alternatives will be biodegradable without relying on any harmful additives or chemicals.

Finally... _____

According to... _____

It states... _____

This means... _____

So... our evidence completely disproves each of our opponent's rebuttals, because bans are effective and the alternatives will not use harmful chemicals!

Therefore... We were not wrong – a ban on single-use plastics will reduce health risks.

*"The next argument I will defend is... **Protecting the Environment.**"*

[or]

*"The next argument I will defend is... **Reducing Climate Risks.**"*

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

PRO-02: PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

They said... we were wrong about the environment.

We were not wrong because...

First... Plastic Pollution “Lasts Forever”

According to... National Resource Natural Resources Defense Council, January 9, 2020

<https://www.nrdc.org/stories/single-use-plastics-101>

It states... What do the bans accomplish? They prevent millions of tons of plastic from entering the waste stream each year. And when it comes to waste that lasts forever, every ton counts. In New York, 23 billion plastic bags are used by residents each year. Not only does banning single-use plastic reduce pollution, but it also reduces demand for plastic production that’s contributing to global climate change. But beyond these impacts, the bans have cultural effects. Companies are forced to innovate, rethinking their designs and sourcing sustainable materials. And they help shift consumer mind-sets, as people begin to recognize that exorbitant and avoidable waste is not sustainable.

This means... banning single-use plastics reduces waste, reduces demand, & forces a shift to sustainable alternatives.

Also... Biodiversity Loss Threatens Habitats and Human Survival

According to... the New York Times, May 6, 2019

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/06/climate/humans-are-speeding-extinction-and-altering-the-natural-world-at-an-unprecedented-pace.html>

It states... Humans are transforming Earth’s natural landscapes so dramatically that as many as one million plant and animal species are now at risk of extinction, posing a dire threat to ecosystems that people all over the world depend on for their survival, a sweeping new United Nations assessment has concluded. The 1,500-page report, compiled by hundreds of international experts and based on thousands of scientific studies, is the most exhaustive look yet at the decline in biodiversity across the globe and the dangers that creates for human civilization. A summary of its findings, which was approved by representatives from the United States and 131 other countries, was released Monday in Paris. The full report is set to be published this year.

This means... Hundreds of experts from the United Nations have determined that our unsustainable activities risk the extinction of not just ecosystems and animals, but our own survival as well. Banning single-use plastics significantly reduces risks that are irreversible and are infinite in magnitude. *No other risks can outweigh this!*

Finally... _____

According to... _____

It states... _____

This means... _____

So... our evidence completely disproves each of our opponent’s rebuttals, because banning plastics will be effective and the alternatives will not cause more harm – the opposite is true!

Therefore... We were not wrong – banning single-use plastics will protect the environment.

*“The next argument I will defend is... **Reducing Climate Risks.**”*

[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 (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

PRO-03: REDUCING THE RISKS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

They said... we were wrong about climate change.

We were not wrong because...

First... Reducing Contribution to Climate Change

According to... National Resource Natural Resources Defense Council, January 9, 2020

<https://www.nrdc.org/stories/single-use-plastics-101>

It states... What do the bans accomplish? They prevent millions of tons of plastic from entering the waste stream each year. And when it comes to waste that lasts forever, every ton counts. In New York, 23 billion plastic bags are used by residents each year. Not only does banning single-use plastic reduce pollution, but it also reduces demand for plastic production that's contributing to global climate change. But beyond these impacts, the bans have cultural effects. Companies are forced to innovate, rethinking their designs and sourcing sustainable materials. And they help shift consumer mind-sets, as people begin to recognize that exorbitant and avoidable waste is not sustainable.

This means... banning single-use plastics will reduce the demand for 'forever' waste and force a shift to more sustainable alternatives. Innovations move us away from climate disasters.

Also... Global Warming Poses Cataclysmic Impact

According to... the MIT Climate Portal, Last Updated: November 7, 2023

<https://climate.mit.edu/ask-mit/why-do-some-people-call-climate-change-existential-threat>

It states... Kieran Setiya, an MIT professor of philosophy who co-teaches a course on the ethics of climate change, offers a basic and a more nuanced definition. First: In the worst-case scenarios in scientists' climate models, human-caused climate change is a threat to the continued existence of many species and to human society as we know it. If humans do nothing to slow climate change, then global temperatures may increase by 4.5 degrees Celsius or more by the year 2100.¹ This may not sound like much, Setiya says, but "it is quite cataclysmic." Earth has not been that warm in millions of years, and such temperature spikes in our planet's history are connected to mass extinction events that killed off a large percentage of species that existed at the time.²

This means... banning single-use plastics will reduce a tremendous amount of plastic production, which moves us further away from mass extinction.

Finally... _____

According to... _____

It states... _____

This means... _____

So... this evidence completely goes against each of the rebuttals, because plastics are a much larger threat than the alternatives – and this outweighs all other arguments.

Therefore... We were not wrong about how banning single-use plastics would move us away from climate threats.

"So, for all these reasons, please vote for the PRO."

"Thank you"

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

REJOINDERS (CON): BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS

INTRODUCTION (CON)

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

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

We think you should prefer our interpretation because... Ours is more clear, accurate, precise and it is fair-minded.

*So... "**On balance**" we think our side is providing the most improvement to "**Quality of Life**".*

*Now, I will defend our first argument... **Harming the Economy.***

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

CON-01: HARMING THE ECONOMY

They said... we were wrong about harming the economy.

We were not wrong because...

First... Causing Major Economic Ramifications

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.

This means... banning single-use plastics will cause major problems for the entire economy. A nationwide ban for all companies, not just government agencies, would be even larger and more damaging to millions of out of work families.

Also... Non-Plastic Alternatives are "Far More Expensive"

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

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

It states... The only problem is that while TIPA's films are compostable, they, like many other compostable products, are still made partially from fossil fuels. The technology exists to make a fully compostable, fully plant-based plastic product, but it is far more expensive than conventional plastics, and does not always work as well, especially if it is used to package food items that are acidic, or liquid, or require long-term storage. Blending plant-based and fossil-fuel sourced plastics to create a compostable product lowers the cost and improves performance.

This means... banning single-use plastics makes products too expensive; beyond what many businesses can afford.

Finally... _____

According to... _____

It states... _____

This means... _____

So... our evidence completely disproves each of our opponent's rebuttals, because the ban is harmful to businesses and their workers - plus the alternatives will not be affordable for many businesses.

Therefore... We were not wrong – a ban on single-use plastics will harm the economy.

*"The next argument I will defend is... **Causing Health & Safety Risks.**"*

[or]

*"The next argument I will defend is... **Causing Climate Risks.**"*

NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

Topic: Banning Single-Use Plastics (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

CON-02: RISKS TO HEALTH & SAFETY

They said... we were wrong about health risks.

We were not wrong because...

First... Bans Spread Deadly Bacteria & Disease

According to... Waste Management Resources, March 2022

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8847762/>

[Muposhi, et al, Midlands State University, Zimbabwe, Considerations, benefits and unintended consequences of banning plastic shopping bags for environmental sustainability: A systematic literature review, Waste Management Resources, March 2022.]

It states... The review showed that an outright ban on plastic bags triggered a host of challenges that were unforeseen during the policy's promulgation. Examples of such unintended consequences included job losses resulting from disinvestments in the plastic industry, health and hygiene problems resulting from the increased use of unwashed reusable shopping bags. 12 people were reported dead in San Francisco from E. coli, a foodborne bacteria related to the use of unwashed reusable shopping bags (Klick and Wright, 2012).

This means... banning single-use plastics will in fact transmit diseases, which could be deadly for hundreds perhaps thousands of people each year when the policy covers the entire country instead of just one city.

Also... Alternatives Increase Health Risks

According to... the Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, Last Accessed: January 2024

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

It states... Environmental Effects: While the economic and employment effects of plastic bag bans are substantial, there are no environmental benefits to banning plastic bags. Plastic bags require less energy to produce and recycle, and they create less municipal waste than cloth bags. Cloth bags need to be used 104 times before they have an environmental advantage over plastic bags, and most cloth bags are used half that amount. Reusing cloth bags also has potential negative health effects as this practice can lead to cross-contamination and disease. As studies have shown, there is much evidence in favor of using plastic bags over cloth bags. Banning plastic bags will likely have a negative impact on jobs, the economy, and the environment.

This means... banning single-use plastics would put tens of millions of families at greater risk of getting sick from bacteria and disease.

Finally... _____

According to... _____

It states... _____

This means... _____

So... our evidence completely disproves each of our opponent's rebuttals, because banning plastics will not be effective, and the alternatives will definitely cause more harm to people's health.

Therefore... We were not wrong about how a ban of single-use plastics would threaten both health and safety.

*"The next argument I will defend is... **Causing Increased Climate Risks.**"*

[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 (Rejoinders, ver. 1.17)

CON-03: INCREASING THE RISKS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

They said... we were wrong about climate change.

We were not wrong because...

First... Alternatives Causing Global Warming

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

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

It states... Perhaps the biggest problem is that the infrastructure to ensure these bioplastics actually biodegrade or compost is very limited. That means that despite the best intentions of manufacturers and consumers, supposedly compostable plastic bags and supposedly biodegradable single-use cutlery may be causing just as much climate damage as conventional plastics.

This means... banning single-use plastics forces us to rely on alternatives that do just as much & possibly more harm.

Also... Alternatives Create Substantially Higher Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions

According to... McKinsey & Company, July 6, 2022

<https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/chemicals/our-insights/climate-impact-of-plastics>

It states... Among applications for which nonplastic alternatives are used at scale, the plastics examined in this paper offer lower total GHG contribution compared with alternatives in 13 of 14 cases (exhibit). GHG savings range from 10 to 90 percent, considering both product life cycle and impact of use. In addition, in many applications, particularly those concentrated in food packaging, there are few alternatives to plastics today. In fact, plastics adoption in the near term can help decarbonization efforts in these areas, particularly in terms of food spoilage and energy efficiency, given their lower GHG footprint.

This means... banning single-use plastics will create far more greenhouse moving us closer to mass extinction events.

Finally... _____

According to... _____

It states... _____

This means... _____

So... this evidence completely goes against each of their rebuttals, because the alternatives will be a much larger threat than conventional plastics – and this '*existential threat*' outweighs all other arguments.

Therefore... We were not wrong about how banning single-use plastics would create even greater climate threats.

"So, for all these reasons, please vote for the CON."

"Thank you"