

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

**BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS (PRO) ..... 2**

**INTRODUCTION (PRO) ..... 2**

*[OPTIONAL] Manufacturers Motivated to Adapt ..... 2*  
According to... National Geographic, July 7, 2022 ..... 2

**PRO-01: REDUCING SEVERE HEALTH RISKS ..... 3**

*First... Plastics' Chemicals are Hazardous to Human Health ..... 3*  
According to... PBS.org, November 1, 2023 ..... 3

*Also... Reducing Plastic Production by 40%..... 3*  
According to... TIME Magazine, November 28, 2023..... 3

**PRO-02: PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT ..... 4**

*First... Significant Harm to Marine Animals..... 4*  
According to... the Harvard Environmental Law Review, April 2023..... 4

*Also... Reduced Production is Key to Results ..... 4*  
According to... National Geographic, July 7, 2022 ..... 4

**PRO-03: REDUCING EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE..... 5**

*First... Tremendous Emissions from the Plastics Industry ..... 5*  
According to... PBS.org, November 1, 2023..... 5

*Also... Driving Force Behind Climate Change..... 5*  
According to... the Environmental Center, University of Colorado Boulder, February 25, 2021 ..... 5

**BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS (CON) ..... 6**

**SIMPLE INTRODUCTION (CON)..... 6**

*[OPTIONAL] Ineffective Due to Lack of Infrastructure..... 6*  
According to... TIME Magazine, November 28, 2023..... 6

**CON-01: HARMING THE ECONOMY..... 7**

*First... Causing Severe Harm to Industries ..... 7*  
According to... the Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, Last Accessed: January 2024..... 7

*Also... Increasing Costs for Businesses & Consumers ..... 7*  
According to... the Competitive Enterprise Institute, July 13, 2018..... 7

**CON-02: RISK TO HEALTH AND SAFETY ..... 8**

*First... Risking Public Health & Safety ..... 8*  
According to... the Reason Foundation, October 24, 2022 ..... 8

*Also... Alternatives Pose Serious Health Risks ..... 8*  
According to... the Competitive Enterprise Institute, July 13, 2018..... 8

**CON-03: INCREASED RISKS FROM CLIMATE CHANGE ..... 9**

*First... Climate Change Poses Greater Threat Than Nuclear War..... 9*  
According to... Bloomberg News, September 10, 2023 ..... 9

*Also... Alternatives Create Significantly Higher Greenhouse Gasses..... 9*  
According to... A white paper from Veolia UK, July 7, 2020..... 9

## **BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS (PRO)**

### **INTRODUCTION (PRO)**

*Hello. My name is... \_\_\_\_\_ .*

*Today, we will discuss: Banning single-use plastics.*

*My partner and I believe that a ban would be desirable.*

*To begin, let's discuss the framework...*

*Each of our key terms come from the Oxford English Dictionary...*

To “ban” is to prohibit something, in this case, “single-use plastics,” which means something made of plastic that is designed to be used once and then disposed of.

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

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

*So... “**On balance**” the side providing the most “**Quality of Life**” should win the debate.*

*Now, let's discuss our first argument... **Reducing Health Risks.***

### **[ALTERNATE] INTRODUCTION (PRO)**

#### **[OPTIONAL] *Manufacturers Motivated to Adapt***

*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...*** The new law is expected to prompt change in the plastics industry far beyond California's borders. As the most populous state and the world's fifth largest economy, California influences markets in ways that other states can't. Auto manufacturers, for example, agreed to follow California's fuel emissions standards, which are stricter than federal standards. In plastics, experts predict that product packaging lines, for example, will be adapted to California's standards no matter where the products are sold.

***This means...*** If we ban single-use plastics in the U.S., then manufacturers around the world will be motivated to adapt their practices to prevent being excluded from the world's largest economy.

*This is why, my partner and I believe that “Banning Single-Use Plastics” is... Desirable.*

*To begin, let's discuss... “The Framework”.*

*Each of our key terms come from the Oxford English Dictionary...*

To “ban” is to prohibit something, in this case, “single-use plastics,” which means something made of plastic that is designed to be used once and then disposed of.

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

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

*So... “**On balance**” the side providing the most “**Quality of Life**” should win the debate.*

*Now, let's discuss our first argument... **Reducing Health Risks.***

## NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

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

### PRO-01: REDUCING SEVERE HEALTH RISKS

*Banning Single-Use Plastics will...* reduce severe health risks.

*Because...* chemicals from producing and disposing of plastics exposes populations to potentially severe health risks from the chemicals used to make plastic products. By reducing production, we reduce the amount of toxins.

*For example...*

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

*According to...* [PBS.org](https://www.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."

**This means...** the plastic industry is putting thousands of chemicals into the plastics, many of which are hazardous to our health. These chemicals and microplastics end up in our water, our food, and even the air we breathe. By banning single-use plastics, we protect the health of millions of people by reducing the amount of air pollution and plastic waste.

#### **Also... Reducing Plastic Production by 40%**

*According to...* [TIME Magazine](https://time.com/6339914/plastic-alternatives-pollute/), November 28, 2023

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

**It states...** Like most single-use packaging, the stickers are not easily recycled. Those that don't end up in landfill collect in the environment, and then often end up clogging up our rivers and oceans. According to the United Nations Environment Program, nearly a garbage truck and a half's worth of plastic ends up in rivers, lakes, and oceans every minute. Eventually those plastics break down into micro and nano plastic particles that poison our air, the water we drink, and our bloodstream. Approximately 40% of all plastic produced is designed for single-use purposes, and little of it is easily recycled. Like the PLU sticker, it is used just once and then thrown away. Yet the long-term consequences are enormous: The production of plastic, 98% of which is sourced from fossil fuels, is the cause of some 10% of all global greenhouse-gas emissions.

**This means...** by banning single-use plastics, we reduce plastic production by up to 40%, which reduces plastic production and waste. So, millions of people will be healthier because fewer toxins and microplastics are produced.

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

*"Our next argument is..."* Protecting the Environment.

[or]

*"Our next argument is..."* Reducing the Risk of Climate Change.

## NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

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

### PRO-02: PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

*Banning Single-Use Plastics will... protect the environment.*

*Because... when we reduce the production of plastics, we also reduce its waste, and this protects marine habitats.*

*For example...*

#### ***First... Significant Harm to Marine Animals***

*According to... the Harvard Environmental Law Review, April 2023*

<https://journals.law.harvard.edu/elr/wp-content/uploads/sites/79/2023/04/HELRL-Vol.-47.1-AdlerWells.pdf>

***It states...*** Plastic harms fish and wildlife through physical effects (entanglement, ingestion causing digestive blockages) and toxicological impacts from microplastics. The media has documented heart-wrenching pictures and videos of whales, birds, and seals entangled in plastic or killed by ingesting plastic.<sup>103</sup> A total of 557 different species of wildlife are known to have been affected by either entanglement or ingestion of plastic debris.<sup>104</sup>

***This means...*** banning single-use plastics will protect millions of marine wildlife by forcing a shift to more sustainable alternatives, many of which will be biodegradable.

#### ***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."

***This means...*** policies requiring a reduction in plastic production are necessary to address the heart of the problem. Banning single-use plastics addresses the root causes of the plastic waste problem. This will protect marine habitats.

*Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will reduce harm to the environment.*

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

*"Thank you."*

## **NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)**

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

### **PRO-03: REDUCING EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE**

*Banning Single-Use Plastics will...* reduce the effects of climate change.

*Because...* by reducing plastic production, we also reduce its waste, which in turn reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

*For example...*

#### ***First... Tremendous Emissions from the 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.

***This means...*** banning single-use plastics could reduce the production and disposal of plastic, which would reduce significant amounts of greenhouse gas – this could reduce a growing threat our very existence.

#### ***Also... Driving Force Behind Climate Change***

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

<https://www.colorado.edu/ecenter/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 eyesores and pose a threat to the natural ecosystems they make their way into. However, these plastics are also a driving force behind climate change.

***This means...*** banning single-use plastics, will protect billions of lives, because it reduces the production of plastics and reduces the burning of plastic waste, which can reduce the risks of global warming.

*Therefore...* Banning Single-Use Plastics will reduce the serious threat of global warming.

*“So, for all these reasons, please vote for the PRO.”*

*“Thank you.”*

## **BANNING SINGLE-USE PLASTICS (CON)**

### **SIMPLE INTRODUCTION (CON)**

Hello. My name is... \_\_\_\_\_ .

Today, we will discuss: *Banning single-use plastics.*

My partner and I believe that a ban would be undesirable.

To begin, let's discuss the framework...

Each of our key terms come from the Oxford English Dictionary...

To "ban" is to prohibit something, in this case, "single-use plastics," which means something made of plastic that is designed to be used once and then disposed of.

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

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

So... "**On balance**" the side providing the most "**Quality of Life**" should win the debate.

Now, let's discuss our first argument... **Harming the Economy.**

### **ALTERNATE INTRODUCTION (CON)**

#### **[OPTIONAL] Ineffective Due to Lack of Infrastructure**

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...** The alternatives to single-use plastics would make things even worse.

*This is why, my partner and I believe that "Banning Single-Use Plastics" is... undesirable.*

To begin, let's discuss... "The Framework".

Each of our key terms come from the Oxford English Dictionary...

To "**ban**" is to prohibit something, in this case, "**single-use plastics**," which means something made of plastic that is designed to be used once and then disposed of.

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

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

So... "**On balance**" the side providing the most "**Quality of Life**" should win the debate.

Now, let's discuss our first argument... **Harming the Economy.**

## NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

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

### CON-01: HARMING THE ECONOMY

*Banning Single-Use Plastics will... cause serious harm to the economy.*

*Because... when we produce less plastic, businesses make less profit, leading to higher unemployment and higher prices (or inflation) for consumers.*

*For example...*

#### ***First... Causing Severe Harm to Industries***

*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...*** 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.

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

#### ***Also... Increasing Costs for Businesses & Consumers***

*According to... the 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.

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

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

*Our next argument is... Causing Significant Health Risks.*

[or]

*Our next argument is... Increasing the Risks of Climate Change.*

## NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

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

### CON-02: RISK TO HEALTH AND SAFETY

*Banning Single-Use Plastics will... increase risks to health and safety.*

*Because... it will ban necessary medical and safety products as well as increase the transmission of diseases.*

*For example...*

#### **First... Risking Public Health & 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.

**This means...** without medical exceptions, a national ban on single-use plastics would make it illegal to produce or use single-use medical protections for people with disabilities, and protective gear such as gloves, masks, and face shields. This would pose serious health risks to medical professionals and the public at large due to unintended consequences.

#### **Also... Alternatives Pose Serious Health Risks**

*According to... the 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.

**This means...** banning single-use plastics would cause increased health risks from disease-causing bacteria inside reusable bags. The ban would put tens of millions of families at greater risk of getting sick from bacteria and disease.

*Therefore... Banning Single-Use Plastics will increase risks to health and safety.*

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

*"Thank you."*

## NSDA Public Forum Debate (Jan-Feb 2024)

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

### CON-03: INCREASED RISKS FROM CLIMATE CHANGE

*Banning Single-Use Plastics will...* increase the risks of climate change.

*Because...* there is no greater threat to humanity's existence and the alternatives will require more energy, generate more greenhouse gas emissions compared to their plastic counterparts.

*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."

**This means...** no other threat, not even nuclear war, poses a more serious threat to our existence. By not banning plastics, we prevent the production of harmful alternatives, which in turn protects billions of lives.

#### **Also... Alternatives Create Significantly Higher Greenhouse Gasses**

*According to...* A white paper from Veolia UK, July 7, 2020

<https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/faculty-of-natural-sciences/centre-for-environmental-policy/public/Veolia-Plastic-Whitepaper.pdf>

[N. Voulvoulis, et al, Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, Examining Material Evidence - The Carbon Fingerprint, Veolia UK, July 7, 2020.]

**It states...** A total of 73 LCAs (see Annex 1) were identified, and information on LCA procedures including scope and boundary, functional units and analyzed life cycle impacts were reviewed and summarized. Most LCA undertaken for various plastic uses show plastic performing better than the alternatives from a carbon perspective. Even if, ounce for ounce, some kinds of plastic have a higher carbon footprint than other kinds of packaging, less quantity is used reducing overall impact, as plastic is light. Plastic performs better most of the time (for example heavier-duty plastics, such as low density polyethylene or woven polypropylene bags, do have a bigger climate and energy impact than paper, but they're more durable and you get more use out of them). Several studies have shown many materials used as alternatives to plastic in packaging, such as cotton, glass, metal or bioplastics, to have significantly higher CO2 impact or water usage compared to plastic packaging. On average over current food packaging, replacing plastic packaging with alternatives, would increase the weight of the packaging by 3.6 times, the energy use by 2.2 times, and the carbon dioxide emissions by 2.7% but these can vary significantly for different cases<sup>24</sup>. Some examples are 23 highlighted in Figure 3.

**This means...** banning single-use plastics would lead to greater greenhouse gas emissions and would pose an even greater risk to both nature and humans.

*Therefore...* Banning Single-Use Plastics will increase the risks of climate change.

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

*"Thank you."*