

# **Atlanta Urban Debate League**

Climate AFF

High School Novice

SY 2023 - 2024



**Find us online at:**

[youtube.com/atlantadebate](https://www.youtube.com/atlantadebate)  
[facebook.com/atlantadebate](https://www.facebook.com/atlantadebate)  
[instagram.com/atlantadebate](https://www.instagram.com/atlantadebate)  
[twitter.com/atlantadebate](https://www.twitter.com/atlantadebate)

# Table of Contents

## Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Climate 1AC (Argument Overview).....	4
Energy Disadvantage (Argument Overview).....	5
Soft Power Disadvantage (Argument Overview).....	6
Climate Affirmative (1AC Shell).....	7
Climate 1AC — 1/7.....	7
Climate 1AC — 2/7.....	8
Climate 1AC — 3/7.....	9
Climate 1AC — 4/7.....	10
Climate 1AC — 5/7.....	11
Climate 1AC — 6/7.....	12
Climate 1AC — 7/7.....	13
Climate Affirmative (2AC).....	14
2AC Case (Climate Change).....	14
2AC Case (Social Justice).....	15
2AC Block (Energy DA) – 1/3.....	16
2AC Block (Energy DA) – 2/3.....	17
2AC Block (Energy DA) – 3/3.....	18
2AC Block (Soft Power DA) – 1/4.....	19
2AC Block (Soft Power DA) – 2/4.....	20
2AC Block (Soft Power DA) – 3/4.....	21
2AC Block (Soft Power DA) – 4/4.....	22
Climate Negative (1NC).....	23
1NC Disadvantage (Energy) – 1/3.....	23
1NC Disadvantage (Energy) – 2/3.....	24
1NC Disadvantage (Energy) – 3/3.....	25
1NC Disadvantage (Soft Power) – 1/4.....	26
1NC Disadvantage (Soft Power) – 2/4.....	27
1NC Disadvantage (Soft Power) – 3/4.....	28
1NC Disadvantage (Soft Power) – 4/4.....	29
1NC Case (Climate) – 1/3.....	30
1NC Case (Climate) – 2/3.....	31
1NC Case (Climate) – 3/3.....	32
1NC Case (Social Justice).....	33
Climate Negative (2NC / 1NR).....	34
2NC Energy DA (Impact – Turns Case).....	34

**Climate AFF (HS Novice)**

SY 2023 - 2024 Atlanta Urban Debate League

2NC Energy DA (Link).....	35
2NC Soft Power DA (Turns Case & Uniqueness).....	36
1NR Case (Climate Change) – 1/2.....	37
1NR Case (Climate Change) – 2/2.....	38

## **Climate 1AC (Argument Overview)**

### **Summary**

The Climate Affirmative contains three parts: a plan, Inherency, Solvency, and a Climate Advantage. The purpose of the Affirmative is to reduce global temperatures by creating a new climate policy called the “Green New Deal.” Specifically, the plan calls for investment in clean, renewable energy to reduce the use of fossil fuels and restore U.S. climate leadership internationally.

**Inherency:** Inherency is the problem in the status quo (the current state of things) that the affirmative plan will help to alleviate/fix and proof that the plan is not already being done. In this 1AC, the Cohen evidence says that the U.S. is falling behind on climate and drastic action is needed to fix the problem. In particular, the evidence cites recent emission levels to prove that the U.S. is falling behind other countries and will not meet its goals under the Paris Climate Agreement.

**Solvency:** Solvency is proof of why the proposed plan will work and solve the harms/problems that would happen without the plan. In this 1AC, the D’Souza evidence says that the Green New Deal will do two critical things. First, the plan will invest in clean, renewable energy to reduce the use of fossil fuels. Second, that investment will create millions of high-paying green jobs.

**Advantage (Climate):** An advantage explains the benefits gained from doing the plan and is sometimes called “Harms” because the plan avoids something harmful that would happen in the status quo. Advantages end with an **Impact**.

In this 1AC, the Climate Advantage makes three claims. First, the Rice and Pulver evidence cites a recent report by the United Nations to prove that we’re running out of time to stop climate change and need to take immediate action. Second, the Brown and Ahmadi evidence proves that the plan creates a transition to renewable energy by increasing the cost of fossil fuels through taxes. Third, the Hultman and Gross evidence pre-empts Negative arguments by proving that the U.S. needs to take action because of its global influence and high carbon emissions.

**Advantage (Social Justice):** An advantage explains the benefits gained from doing the plan and is sometimes called “Harms” because the plan avoids something harmful that would happen in the status quo. Advantages end with an **Impact**.

In this 1AC, the Social Justice Advantage makes two claims. First, the Nakat evidence says that climate change will not only impact the environment, but also make existing inequalities worse. In short, climate change will affect marginalized individuals the most, including those from low-income countries, people of color, indigenous people, women, and people with disabilities. Second, the Carter evidence says that the Green New Deal is not just a climate policy, but a way for the U.S. to take responsibility for its past emissions and help those who will be most affected by the climate emergency. As a result, the advantage argues that the judge has a moral obligation to vote for the Affirmative.

## **Energy Disadvantage (Argument Overview)**

### **Summary**

The Energy Disadvantage contains three parts: Uniqueness, Link, and Impact. A Disadvantage argues that the costs of the Affirmative plan are more important than (outweigh) the potential benefits (advantages). In particular, the Energy Disadvantage argues that by forcing the U.S. to move away from fossil fuels like natural gas, the plan will increase energy prices, leading to energy poverty.

**Uniqueness:** Uniqueness is the argument that the status quo (current state of things) is good now but could take a turn for the worse if the plan were to happen. In the Energy DA, the Newman evidence cites a recent report by Citi Bank to prove that energy prices (including gas and electricity) are decreasing now.

**Link:** A link is the negative change to the status quo made by the Affirmative plan. In the Energy DA, the Hollie evidence says that the Green New Deal will force the U.S. to transition from cheap fossil fuels to more expensive renewable energy. In particular, the evidence concludes that this will lead to energy poverty. As a result, low-income, minority, and rural Americans will not be able to meet basic needs.

**Impact:** An Impact is the ultimate negative consequence of the change to the status quo made by the plan. In the Energy DA, the Hollie evidence says that U.S. natural gas is a cheap, clean form of energy that will help reduce poverty and carbon emission internationally. As a result, the U.S. transition from fossil fuels will lead to energy poverty and climate change across the globe.

## **Soft Power Disadvantage (Argument Overview)**

### **Summary**

The Soft Power Disadvantage contains four parts: Uniqueness, Link, Internal Link, and Impact. A Disadvantage argues that the costs of the Affirmative plan are more important than (outweigh) the potential benefits (advantages). In particular, the Energy Disadvantage argues that the plan would increase U.S. climate leadership at the expense of the European Union, which will lead to a lack of international cooperation to solve global problems.

**Uniqueness:** Uniqueness is the argument that the status quo (current state of things) is good now but could take a turn for the worse if the plan were to happen. In the Soft Power DA, the Petriccione and van Kemseke evidence says that the E.U. is a leader on climate change, and cites a history of international agreements and summits to demonstrate its international influence.

**Link:** A link is the negative change to the status quo made by the Affirmative plan. In the Soft Power DA, the Langtree evidence looks at the history of U.S. and E.U. relations on climate change, concluding that the E.U. has taken a leadership role when the U.S. has not engaged in climate policy.

**Internal Link:** An internal link is the series of events that occur between the link and the impact. In the Soft Power Disadvantage, the Volintiru evidence argues that climate diplomacy is critical to the overall soft power of the European Union. In particular, the author cites the economic, diplomatic, and development agreements created through climate diplomacy as proof of the importance of climate leadership.

**Impact:** An Impact is the ultimate negative consequence of the change to the status quo made by the plan. In the Soft Power DA, the Schuette and Dijkstra evidence says that international institutions are in crisis due to China, Russia, and the U.S. abandoning them. As a result, the author concludes that a strong European Union can use its influence to restore those institutions, leading to international cooperation to solve global problems.

## Climate Affirmative (1AC Shell)

Climate 1AC — 1/7

Greetings! My partner and I propose the following plan:

**The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by adopting a federal jobs guarantee through the Green New Deal.**

Contention One is Inherency:

**The U.S. is falling behind. Drastic action is needed to lower carbon emissions and prevent a climate crisis**

### Cohen 2023 – Journalist for CBS News

(Li, Journalist For CBS News. U.S. Still Off-Track For Climate Goals As Greenhouse Gas Emissions Rise For Second Straight Year, New Report Says. CBS News. January 10, 2023.

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/u-s-still-off-track-for-climate-goals-as-greenhouse-gas-emissions-rise-for-second-straight-year-new-report-says/>)

Last year began with a warning that **the world needs to get on track in tackling the climate crisis as average global temperatures hit a new record.** It ended with yet another increase in emissions that trap that heat and add to the dramatic conditions already being felt worldwide. **U.S. greenhouse gas emissions increased for the second consecutive year in 2022,** by 1.3% compared to the previous year, [preliminary data](#) published by nonpartisan research organization the Rhodium Group on Tuesday revealed. That increase isn't nearly as dramatic as the one seen in 2021, which saw a rise of 6.5% after the onset of the pandemic a year prior caused a major emissions decline, but it is still higher than 2019 pre-pandemic levels. **Of the major emitting sectors, only one saw a decline** in emissions. Electric power, the nation's sector responsible for the second-most emissions, made up 28% of all U.S. emissions last year. However, its emissions were slightly lower compared to the year prior as researchers estimate coal usage declined by 8%, making up a total of only 20% of the power sector. Meanwhile, natural gas usage increased by 2% as [renewable energy](#) usage seemed to become more popular. Solar, wind and hydropower made up an increase of 12% compared to 2021, the report found, was used to generate 22% of total electric power. That preliminary data marks "the first time in over 60 years" that renewable energy surpassed coal in the country, the report said, noting that prior to the 1960s, hydropower surpassed the generation of coal. Nuclear energy, on the other hand, continues to constitute a smaller share of power generation in the country, going from 20% yearly from 2019 to 2021, to 19% in 2022. That slight improvement in the power sector, however, is at least somewhat overshadowed by what's happening elsewhere. Buildings, which encompass businesses and homes that mostly emit greenhouse gases through heating, saw the largest increase – 6% – as the Rhodium Group said 2022 saw below-average winter temperatures that forced people to [consume more energy](#). It's also the only sector to rebound to levels seen before the pandemic, the research says. **Transportation and industry, the sectors that make up two-thirds of total U.S. emissions, saw an increase in emissions** by 1.3% and 1.5%, respectively. This preliminary report shows that while the year saw some improvement when it comes to its energy sourcing, an overall increase in emissions indicates that **the U.S. "continues to fall behind" in its climate targets,** the report says. The lagging is specifically **in** regards to **the country's Paris Climate Agreement goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 50 to 52% below 2005 levels by the year 2030, an amount that would seemingly help the need to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius** compared to pre-industrial levels. As part of that plan, the U.S. planned to hit between 26 and 28% below 2005 levels within the next two years. But according to the Rhodium Group's data, **the U.S. is far from making that happen.** It only hit 15.5% below 2005 levels in 2022, and in fact, has yet to meet its 2020 goal of being 17% below 2005 levels. **In order to meet the 2025 target ... the US needs to significantly increase its efforts.**" the report says. Researchers noted that **the Inflation Reduction Act passed last year** – which invests billions into energy security and proposals that would help cut carbon emissions by 40% by 2030 – is a "significant turning point." **But it might not be enough. "More aggressive policies are needed.**" the report says, suggesting that there need to be "aggressive regulations" and changes among private sectors.

## Contention Two is Solvency:

### The Green New Deal will reduce U.S. emissions to net-zero by 2030 by investing in renewable energy and creating millions of jobs

#### D'Souza 2022 – News Editor at Investopedia

(Deborah, News Editor At Investopedia. Understanding The Green New Deal & What's In The Climate Proposal. Investopedia. May 28, 2022. <https://www.investopedia.com/the-green-new-deal-explained-4588463>)

According to the resolution, **the U.S. must lead the way to reduce emissions.** That's **because of its technological advancement and its historical contribution to** the disproportionate amount of greenhouse gas **emissions.**<sup>13</sup> The chart below, from the [World Bank](#), illustrates how **U.S. consumers account for an oversized share of global carbon emissions.** What's in the Green New Deal? **The main goal of the plan is to bring U.S. greenhouse gas emissions down to net zero and meet 100% of power demand in the country through clean, renewable, and zero-emission energy sources by 2030.**<sup>13</sup> **The Green New Deal also calls for the creation of millions of jobs to provide a job guarantee to all Americans,** along with access to nature, clean air and water, healthy food, a sustainable environment, and community resiliency. **These goals are to be accomplished through the following actions** on the part of the federal government:

- Providing investments and leveraging **funding to help communities affected by climate change**
- **Repairing and upgrading existing infrastructure** to withstand extreme weather and ensuring all bills related to infrastructure in Congress address climate change
- **Investing in renewable power sources**
- **Investing in** manufacturing and **industry to spur growth in the use of clean energy**
- Building or **upgrading to energy-efficient**, distributed, and **smart power grids** that provide affordable electricity
- Upgrading all existing buildings and building new ones so that they achieve maximum energy efficiency, water efficiency, safety, affordability, comfort, and durability.
- Supporting family farming, **investing in sustainable farming**, and building a more sustainable and equitable food system
- **Investing in** transportation systems, namely **zero-emission vehicle infrastructure** and manufacturing, public transit, and high-speed rail
- **Restoring ecosystems** through land preservation, afforestation, and science-based projects
- Cleaning up existing hazardous waste and abandoned sites
- Identifying unknown sources of pollution and emissions
- **Working with the international community** on solutions and helping them achieve Green New Deals<sup>13</sup>

## Advantage One is Climate:

**First, we're running out of time to stop climate change. Only an immediate transition to renewable energy can save the planet for future generations**

### **Rice and Pulver 2023 – Journalists for USA Today**

(Doyle & Dinah Voyles, Journalists For USA Today. 'Humanity Is On Thin Ice': Major UN Report Says 'Urgent Action Is Needed To Combat Climate Change. USA Today. March 20, 2023.

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2023/03/20/un-climate-change-report-ipcc-says-urgent-action-needed/11478166002/>)

**"Urgent" actions are needed to counter human-caused climate change, says** a report released Monday by **the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change**. "Without urgent, effective, and equitable mitigation and adaptation actions, **climate change increasingly threatens ecosystems**, biodiversity, **and the livelihoods, health and wellbeing of current and future generations**," according to the report, released Monday in Interlaken, Switzerland. **Reports by the IPCC are considered the planet's most authoritative assessments of the state of global warming**, its consequences and the measures being taken to tackle it. **"Humanity is on thin ice – and that ice is melting fast,"** U.N. Secretary-General Antonio Guterres said. **"Our world needs climate action on all fronts – everything, everywhere, all at once."** The report isn't all doom and gloom: It also said **there are many feasible and effective options to reduce greenhouse gas emissions** and adapt to human-caused climate change, and they are available now. IPCC Chair Hoesung Lee said that **"if we act now, we can still secure a livable sustainable future for all."** **'Hurtling** down the road to ruin' Environmental groups were quick to praise the report's findings: **"This is the stone-cold truth laid out in unassailable science by the world's top climate experts,"** said Manish Bapna, president and CEO of the Natural Resources Defense Council. **"We're hurtling down the road to ruin and running out of time to change course,"** Bapna said. "We're leaving the most vulnerable among us to pay a price they can't afford for a crisis they didn't cause. We're condemning our children to a world of cascading disasters." Kelly Trout, co-director of the environmental group Oil Change International, said, **"The science is crystal-clear: We must take immediate action to phase out fossil fuels** if we're to keep the 1.5 degree (Celsius) limit alive and stave off devastation to people and ecosystems worldwide. "The IPCC has shown **the fossil fuel phase-out must start now, and wind, solar, and energy efficiency are the keys** this decade, not fossil-fuel-industry-favored techno-fixes like carbon capture and storage." The report "underlines how important it is to not only accelerate climate action but to do it in a way that helps everyone in the world, not just those in the wealthiest countries and regions," said Christopher Trisos, a co-author and director of the Climate Risk Lab at the African Climate and Development Initiative. What is **the IPCC?** The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change **is the U.N. body for assessing** the science related to **climate change**, its consequences and adaptation and mitigation strategies. It provides periodic assessments to the leaders of its 195 member states. **This report is the culmination of an eight-year-long series of climate science papers**, the sixth assessment since the IPCC was established in 1988. **Over the past six years, hundreds of authors in three working groups reviewed thousands of academic papers with the latest science.**

**Second, the plan solves. By taxing emissions, the Green New Deal would increase the cost of fossil fuels, creating an incentive to transition to renewable energy**

**Brown and Ahmadi 2019 – Professor of Sustainable Systems At Georgia Tech**

(Marilyn A., Professor of Sustainable Systems At The Georgia Institute of Technology. Majid, PhD Student In Public Policy At The Georgia Institute of Technology. Would A Green New Deal Add Or Kill Jobs? Scientific American. December 17, 2019.

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/would-a-green-new-deal-add-or-kill-jobs1/>. Note: This evidence has been modified for clarity.)

**The [Green New Deal] GND offers citizens a vision of how their economy could advance from traditional fossil-fuel dependence to a future powered largely by low-carbon alternatives. Our analysis indicates that a cleaner-energy approach motivated by carbon taxes would promote innovation, open up new markets and produce an economy with more jobs—a greener economy worth investing in. Today clean-energy technologies in the U.S. struggle to compete because fossil energy is so “inexpensive.” Low prices make it difficult for such alternatives to flourish. Our analysis shows that raising energy prices would empower the transition to efficiency, renewables and other low-carbon resources. Indeed, a carbon tax of either \$25 or \$60 would cut carbon emissions significantly, but the higher tax would produce quicker and deeper reductions. On the other hand, while both tax levels would grow jobs, the \$25 tax would provide more employment growth than the \$60 one. Thus, as with most policies, the optimum is a trade-off between competing priorities. By using the clean technologies that carbon taxes would promote, Americans would not have to travel less, freeze in the winter, take cold showers or cut the output of their manufacturing plants to reduce the U.S.’s carbon emissions. Our independent analysis, along with a growing body of research, suggests that a low-carbon economy is likely to be a stronger and more secure economy that also provides climate solutions.**

**Third, the U.S. is key to global action on climate change. The Green New Deal will restore U.S. climate leadership and pressure other countries to reduce emissions**

### **Hultman and Gross 2021 – Researchers at the Brookings Institution**

(Nathan, Nonresident Senior Fellow At The Brookings Institution. Samantha, Director of Energy Security And Climate Initiative At The Brookings Institution. How The United States Can Return To Credible Climate Leadership. The Brookings Institution. March 1, 2021.

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/us-action-is-the-lynchpin-for-successful-international-climate-policy-in-2021/>)

2021 has the potential to be a year of rapid advancement on climate change. **The European Union, China, Japan, and South Korea have all announced new and ambitious near- and long-term climate targets**, and every member of the Paris Agreement is obliged to update their pledges prior to the November Conference of the Parties (COP) meeting. Non-government actors and sub-national governments around the world are also committing to ambitious long-term goals. Most of these goals focus on reaching net-zero emissions by 2050. As the international community gears up for the COP event, political attention to climate is the highest it has been since the runup to the Paris COP in 2015. **Expectations are high for commitments that honor the Paris Agreement** goal of limiting warming to “well below” 2°C above pre-industrial levels. **Four years of U.S. absence from the global climate community — including global climate negotiations and international efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions — have left a big gap in international leadership and credibility**. In this context, the reaction in the global climate community to Joe Biden’s election as U.S. president has been overwhelmingly positive. The world sees the importance of U.S. action to limit overall global temperature rise, and President Biden’s campaign, appointments — including former secretary of state John Kerry as special presidential envoy for climate — and early actions in office indicate his interest in a new approach to climate change. However, the Biden administration immediately faces a difficult challenge. How does the new administration meet the moment? **How does the United States regain its credibility on the world stage?** Since greenhouse gas emissions mix throughout the global atmosphere and oceans, emissions in one part of the world impact the climate everywhere. **The Paris Agreement calls for all countries to reduce emissions** in line with their own development goals and political realities. **But science suggests that a goal of net-zero emissions from the largest emitting countries by mid-century is necessary. In this context, credible U.S. action is critical. As the world’s largest economy, second-largest greenhouse gas emitter, and superpower re-engaging on climate diplomacy, U.S. actions can either dampen or accelerate global action. If the United States fails to make commitments that the rest of the world views as serious, it will be harder to pressure other countries to take more serious action. Credible U.S. action could form the basis for genuine leadership**, as the United States displayed preceding the Paris COP through its bilateral commitments with China. The global and national context for accelerating U.S. climate action The United States sat on the sidelines for four years of global climate action, and the world changed while we were away. The science about climate change became clearer and our allies and partners abroad are stepping up their national climate strategies in response. **Now that the United States is back in the game, they expect ambitious action, including a new U.S. climate target or nationally determined contribution (NDC)**. In this context, after whipsawing political positions on climate change, **the United States must advance a credible strategy for robust and continued climate action at home that is seen as reliable and not subject to reversals over time.**

Climate 1AC — 6/7

**Advantage Two is Social Justice:**

**Climate Change will uniquely impact marginalized cultures across the globe. Changing our economic system is necessary to solve the ongoing crisis and achieve social justice**

**Nakat 2023 – Executive Director of Greenpeace Middle East North Africa**

(Ghiwa, Executive Director of Greenpeace Middle East North Africa. Climate Justice And Social Justice: Two Sides Of The Same Coin. Greenpeace. February 21, 2023. <https://www.greenpeace.org/international/story/58334/climate-justice-and-social-justice-two-sides-of-the-same-coin/>)

**Climate justice and social justice are two sides of the same coin. Addressing both is vital** to creating a more equitable and sustainable future for all. Climate justice is rooted in recognising that **climate change is causing a multitude of** detrimental social, economic, health, and other **impacts on vulnerable communities who have contributed the least to the climate crisis.** In short, **the climate crisis is making existing inequalities and injustices a whole lot worse.** **Low-income countries, people of colour, Indigenous People, women, and people with disabilities are more exposed to the devastating impacts of climate disasters** such as floods, wildfires, severe drought and soaring temperatures, as well as rising sea levels and limited access to food and water. **This global majority** – marginalised and made more vulnerable by powerful systems of oppression – **don't have access to the financial resources and institutional capacity to adapt to climate change** nor to recover from the losses and damage that it causes. **The** cost of loss and **damage is estimated to be between 290 to 580 billion USD per year by 2030 and** unfortunately, **much of this will be shouldered by developing and least developed countries.** Why climate justice matters Why does **climate justice** matter? It **matters because it forces the global community and those who bear most responsibility for the climate crisis to work with and support those bearing its brunt.** It matters because it addresses a more systemic problem that is the fundamental cause of this crisis and many others. **The problem is an economic model based on** extractivism and **greed that's causing a planetary crisis and aggravating social injustices** around the world. While the whole world, and more specifically the Middle East North Africa region where I live, struggles with compounding crises — triggered by conflicts, pandemic, social and economic problems, deteriorating living conditions and devastating disasters — big western oil firms, by far some of the largest contributors to the global climate crisis, more than doubled their profits to 219 billion USD in 2022. MENA is the most water scarce region in the world, and is already warming at twice the global average. Vulnerable communities are now suffering the impact of climate change disproportionately to other parts of the world, whether they are living in deserts or beside the sea, on mountains or in green valleys. This region is facing scorching temperatures that pose a direct risk to human health, as well as longer and more severe droughts with serious implications for agriculture and food security. **More frequent climate related disasters are considerably increasing social inequalities** and crippling social justice. **Lives are being lost, homes destroyed, crops are failing, livelihoods are jeopardised, and cultural heritage is being wiped out.** Bearing witness At Greenpeace MENA we have witnessed and documented how climate change is putting the region's entire ecosystem, civilization, people, and heritage at risk. In Morocco, the increasing drying and loss of the oasis ecosystem are threatening the traditional nomadic lifestyle of indigenous people who depend on it. Studies show that olive trees and olive oil production from Egypt to Lebanon is being significantly impacted by rising temperatures. Threats of flooding along the Mediterranean coast are becoming ever more pressing. Ahwari women in Southern Iraq marshlands are the first to suffer from **climate change that caused crops to fail, and limited access to water which made it difficult for them to raise and earn a livelihood and support their families, perpetuating the cycle of poverty and inequality.** Again and again, we are seeing that **the communities most vulnerable to these impacts are also those with the lowest resilience in socioeconomic terms.** Climate justice is vital to addressing social justice.

## The Green New Deal is key to fight climate injustice. You have a moral obligation to vote for the Affirmative

### Carter 2021 – Journalist for The Heights

(Sophie, Journalist For The Heights. A Green New Deal Makes Economic And Environmental Sense. April 25, 2021. <https://www.bcheights.com/2021/04/25/a-green-new-deal-makes-economic-and-environmental-sense/>)

Last Tuesday, U.S. Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez of New York and Massachusetts' own U.S. Senator Ed Markey took the ambitious steps to formally reintroduce their signature bill, **the Green New Deal**. With new Democratic control of both houses of Congress and the White House, it appears as though the most sweeping piece of climate legislation in history may have another chance at being passed. If so, it **will transform the national economic and environmental landscape**. It is well past time for the Democratic Party to uniformly rally around the Green New Deal and work **to change the course of climate injustice in America**. As it stands today, climate change is undoubtedly one of the most pressing issues facing the world. There are concerning signs surrounding the prospects for maintaining an inhabitable world—storms and major weather events are worsening, the sea level is rising, and humans have already warmed the globe by about one degree Celsius. It is also important to note that **the effects of the climate and environmental crises are not uniformly felt across all social groups. Declining air and water quality is far more likely to impact racial minorities**, especially those who live in urban areas. In **the United States, one out of every six Black children suffer from asthma due to poor air quality, and they are five times more likely than white children to contract lead poisoning** because they live in close proximity to toxic waste. **On a more global scale, the majority of those who will be displaced by rising sea levels, unstable weather events, and plummeting food supplies will be those who live in developing nations, mostly in the global south**. It is evident that **this situation is fundamentally unfair** and unsustainable. The question is, **what can we do about this moral and environmental crisis? The Green New Deal** is a piece of public policy that **is carefully crafted to address the interrelated crises of environmental degradation and social inequality**. Scientists agree that in order to achieve a best-case scenario surrounding the changing climate, the world needs to achieve carbon neutrality by the year 2050. **The Green New Deal aims to push the U.S. to take on a leading role** in working toward this goal **by implementing a 10-year plan that includes investing in the move to 100 percent renewable energy and sustainable infrastructure**. All of these goals would be achieved **through creating high-paying, green jobs in order to reduce economic inequality** and retrain those who work in the dying fossil fuel industry. Although the bill would function as a non-binding resolution, **its passage would signal national cohesion on climate-friendly initiatives** that are already being implemented at state and local levels.

## **Climate Affirmative (2AC)**

### **2AC Case (Climate Change)**

#### **U.S. emissions are key. The best research proves the plan solves**

##### **Milman 2022 – Journalist for The Guardian**

(Oliver, Journalist For The Guardian. Nearly \$2tn Of Damage Inflicted On Other Countries By US Emissions. The Guardian. July 12, 2022. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/jul/12/us-carbon-emissions-greenhouse-gases-climate-crisis>)

**The US has inflicted more than \$1.9tn in damage to other countries from** the effects of **its greenhouse gas emissions**, according to a new analysis that has provided the first measurement of nations' liability in stoking the climate crisis. **The huge volume of** planet-heating **gases pumped out by the US, the largest historical emitter, has caused** such **harm to other**, mostly poor, **countries** through heatwaves, crop failures and other consequences that the US is responsible for \$1.91tn in lost global income since 1990, the study found. **This puts the US ahead of China**, currently the world's leading emitter, Russian, India and Brazil as the next largest contributors to global economic damage through their emissions. Combined, these five leading culprits have caused a total of \$6tn in losses worldwide, or about 11% of annual global GDP, since 1990 by fueling climate breakdown. **"It's a huge number,"** said Chris Callahan, a researcher at Dartmouth College, and lead author of the study, of the overall economic loss. "It's not surprising that the US and China are at the top of that list but the numbers really are very stark. For the first time, we can show that a country's emissions can be traced to specific harm." The **Dartmouth researchers combined** a number of **different models**, showing factors such as emissions, local climate conditions and economic changes, **to ascertain the precise impact of an individual country's contribution to the climate crisis**. They looked for these links over a period spanning 1990 to 2014, with the research published in the journal Climatic Change. **What they found was a** perniciously **uneven picture – rich nations in** northerly latitudes, such as those in **north America** and Europe, **have done the most to fuel climate change** but have not yet been severely harmed by it economically. Countries such as Canada and Russia have even benefitted from longer agricultural growing seasons and reduced deaths from the cold as winters have warmed. Conversely, poorer countries, such as those found in the tropics or low-lying Pacific islands, have done the least to harm other nations and yet are suffering the brunt of the economic damage from climate change. The research didn't factor things not included in GDP, such as biodiversity loss, cultural harm and deaths from disasters, meaning the damage is in reality far greater. "In places that are already hot you are seeing it becoming harder to work outside, mortality from the heat is on the rise, it's harder to grow crops," said Justin Mankin, a geographer at Dartmouth and co-author of the paper. "If you layer that on top of which countries have emitted the most you get an almost perfect storm. **There is this huge inequity. Countries like the US have disproportionately damaged low-income countries** in the global south and disproportionately benefited cooler, higher income countries in the global north."

## Recent agreements are not enough. Phasing out fossil fuels is key to climate justice

### Liguori 2022 – Climate Justice Advisor at Amnesty International

(Chiara, Climate Justice Advisor At Amnesty International. COP27: Loss And Damage Fund Is Welcome But Failure To Deliver On Phasing Out Fossil Fuels Is A Huge Setback. Amnesty International. November 21, 2022.

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2022/11/cop27-loss-and-damage-fund-is-welcome-but-failure-to-deliver-on-phasing-out-fossil-fuels-is-a-huge-setback/>)

This was a tale of two COPs: joy at the adoption of a Loss and Damage fund but anguish that, **despite overwhelming scientific evidence** and escalating human rights impacts, the **negotiations failed to secure vital commitments on the phasing out of all fossil fuels,** which are the number one driver of the climate crisis. **The establishment of the Loss and Damage fund** was the result of a united position presented by global south countries and persistent campaigning by a wide range of groups. It **sends a ray of hope to people whose human rights have been harmed by climate change. It will still be a long road before those most impacted can access real financial support** but the decision sets in motion a process to redress historical injustices. **Now it is up to wealthy countries to step up** and ensure the fund is adequately resourced. “However, demands from a growing number of civil society groups and others including many states to secure agreement on the phasing out of all fossil fuels did not prevail in the face of a powerful fossil fuel lobby, the blatant opposition of fossil-fuel producing countries, and the ambiguous position of some wealthy countries. “Governments failed to commit to phase out all fossil fuels, including oil and fossil gas (so-called ‘natural gas’), restating instead the pledge from last year’s COP that they would be ‘accelerating efforts towards the phasedown of unabated coal power and phase-out of inefficient fossil fuel subsidies’. **In light of the extreme climate-driven disasters that we have witnessed in the last year, and the growing catalogue of reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and others documenting both the impacts and the causes of climate change, this failure to progress on fossil fuels represents an enormous abdication of human rights obligations and disregards the rights of all those being affected, and future generations.”**

## First, climate change outweighs energy poverty

### A. Magnitude. The climate emergency risks a global catastrophe

#### **Roberts 2019 – Editor-in-chief of Horizon**

(Joanna, Editor-in-Chief Of Horizon. 'I Would Like People To Panic' – Top Scientist Unveils Equation Showing World In Climate Emergency. Horizon – EU Research & Innovation Magazine Published By The European Commission. September 24, 2019.

<https://ec.europa.eu/research-and-innovation/en/horizon-magazine/i-would-people-panic-top-scientist-unveils-equation-showing-world-climate-emergency>)

**'Based on sober scientific analysis, we are deeply within a climate emergency** state but people are not aware of it," he told Horizon on the sidelines of the European Research and Innovation Days event in Brussels, Belgium. "We don't want to see the truth. As Greta Thunberg would say, I would like people to panic and take action according to the state of emergency we are in." **To make his assessment, Prof. Schellnhuber, founder of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research**, Germany, **has devised a formula that defines the level of emergency as risk multiplied by urgency**. To calculate risk, he used the insurance industry's approach of multiplying the amount of damage done by the probability of the event. For urgency, he followed the model used by air traffic controllers, which divides the time needed to react by time left for intervention. **'If we go into a runaway climate effect, the damage may be between €100 trillion and the loss of civilisation,'** he said. **'The probability** I would say, **is about 10%** that this is going to happen. **And when it comes to the urgency of decarbonising society** and keeping the forests alive, **we need at least 20 years. We have only 30 years left** to do this. 'It simply means that **we are in a deep state of climate emergency**. If you trust the numbers from science.' Healthy Prof. Schellnhuber's declaration came as part of a discussion on how to make our planet healthy again, one of the first sessions of the inaugural European Research and Innovation Days event, which is taking place from 24 to 26 September. The idea of the conference is to provide a forum for policymakers, researchers, academics, non-governmental organisations and other interested parties to get together for three days of intensive talks to finalise priorities for European research over the next four years. When it comes to climate change, Prof. Schellnhuber recommended two priorities for Europe. The first is to decarbonise, reducing emissions to zero. The second is to take care of the natural carbon sinks to try and avert runaway climate effects. He proposed three 'outrageous suggestions' for achieving these goals: build wooden skyscrapers rather than using concrete and steel for construction; create so-called 'transition super-labs' by decarbonising three or four entire regions; and paying to lease forests elsewhere in the world so they are not burnt down for economic purposes. The need for climate change action is not lost on Europe's political leaders. In her [agenda for Europe](#), the next European Commission president, Ursula von der Leyen, has called for Europe to become the first climate-neutral continent. Her European Green Deal, which she has committed to proposing during her first 100 days in office, promises to enshrine the 2050 climate neutrality target into law. 'President-elect von der Leyen was very clear on that, the number one priority will be the green deal,' said European Commission vice-president Maroš Šefčovič, who was speaking at the same session. He says the EU needs to lead by example. 'We also proved that if you do it right, it works,' he said. 'We are the only major economy that has managed to split the economic growth and decouple it from the CO2 emissions.' Prof. Schellnhuber believes that as the industrial revolution started in Europe, the bloc should show further leadership by bringing the decarbonisation target forward to 2040. Echoed The importance of Europe taking the lead on climate change and science in general was a theme echoed throughout the first day of the conference, notably by Carlos Moedas, European Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation, at the conference opening. '(A [recent Eurobarometer survey](#) says) that 93% of Europeans really consider the problem of climate change is very serious and they believe we have to do something. Can you believe that it is a 16-year-old European girl that is leading the way on climate change? This gives me a huge hope for the future.' The next funding programme for European research and innovation, [Horizon Europe](#), is anticipated to be worth €100 billion between 2021 and 2027. As well as setting aside funding for basic research and promoting innovation, it will be designed around clusters of challenges where research and innovation could help find solutions. Some of the other challenges under discussion on day one of the conference included [undocumented migrants](#), emerging technologies, mobility and clean energy. Work also began to define concrete goals for Horizon Europe's 'missions', which will shape research and innovation to achieve targets in five areas: adaptation to climate change including societal transformation; cancer; healthy oceans, seas, coastal and inland waters; climate-neutral and smart cities; and soil health and food. In the end, according to Prof. Schellnhuber, climate change cuts across all of Europe's future challenges. 'It is always a question – why do you always talk about climate and not about anything else?' he said. **'If we don't solve the climate crisis, we can forget about the rest.'**

## 2AC Block (Energy DA) – 2/3

**Second, no link. The Green New Deal will create millions of jobs and jump-start the economy****Carter 2021 – Journalist for The Heights**

(Sophie, Journalist For The Heights. A Green New Deal Makes Economic And Environmental Sense. April 25, 2021.

<https://www.bcheights.com/2021/04/25/a-green-new-deal-makes-economic-and-environmental-sense/>)

In addition to being a comprehensive and innovative piece of public policy, **the Green New Deal makes economic sense. Climate change is both a threat to our existence and a fantastic opportunity to rebuild our economy** in an equitable and sustainable manner. **It is helpful to view the Green New Deal as more of an investment** than anything else—if Congress is bold in its **climate action**, **it could create an estimated 10.6 million new green jobs, expand job training for skilled laborers, and revitalize the role of unions** in protecting American workers. **By investing in sustainable infrastructure and labor, sweeping legislation could put millions of people to work with fair wages and jumpstart a post-pandemic economy, functioning to lift people out of poverty and rebuild the middle class. By shrinking income inequality and the influence of environmental racism, we could make our new green economy open to everyone.**

**Specifically, the plan is a bargain. Climate change will devastate the economy****Glasser 2020 – Student Fellow at the Kleinman Center for Energy Policy**

(Emma, Student Fellow At The Kleinman Center For Energy Policy. The Green New Deal Is The Solution To The Jobs Issue. Kleinman Center for Energy Policy. June 16, 2020. <https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/news-insights/the-green-new-deal-is-the-solution-to-the-jobs-issue/>)

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

**Third, no impact and turn: Natural gas is not climate friendly. It's a key source of methane, which is a huge cause of climate change**

### **Radka 2023 – Head of the U.N. Environment Program's Climate Branch**

(Mark, Head of The United Nations Environment Program's Energy & Climate Branch. Is Natural Gas Really The Bridge Fuel The World Needs? U.N. Environment Program. January 12, 2023. <https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/natural-gas-really-bridge-fuel-world-needs>)

**Natural gas has long been billed as a good stepping stone for a world looking to replace coal with renewable energy. As solar arrays and wind farms are being built, the theory goes, natural gas can be a stand-in for "dirtier" fuels, like coal and, in some cases, oil. But research indicates that emissions of methane – the main constituent of natural gas – that occur during its extraction and transport mean natural gas isn't as climate-friendly as once thought. By 2030, the world will need to cut its greenhouse gas emissions by more than 40 percent if it's to meet the most ambitious goals of the Paris Agreement, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a United Nations body. We spoke to Mark Radka, Head of the United Nations Environment Program's (UNEP) Energy and Climate Branch, about the role natural gas should play in reducing emissions and the transition to a renewable energy future. Is natural gas a cleaner alternative to coal or oil in terms of emissions? Mark Radka (MR): Natural gas is a cleaner fuel in the sense that burning it produces fewer conventional air pollutants, like sulfur dioxide and particulates, than does burning coal or oil. How much more depends on the characteristics of the fuel, the combustion technology, how well equipment is maintained and operated, and other factors. In general, burning natural gas also produces less carbon dioxide per unit of energy – about half compared to the best coal technology – and by this measure it's better from a climate perspective. Researchers have discovered massive amounts of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, leaking from natural gas facilities around the world. Does that call into question the notion that natural gas is cleaner than other fossil fuels? MR: Recent scientific measurement campaigns, some of them supported by UNEP, have shown that methane emissions from oil and gas operations are much higher than was estimated earlier. Methane is a powerful greenhouse gas, about 84 times more potent than carbon dioxide measured over a 20-year period, so any emissions undermine its credentials as a better fossil fuel. So, "cleaner" is probably not the best word to describe natural gas. But provided that methane emissions are well managed, it's not as problematic in terms of planetary warming as coal or oil.**

## **First, non-unique: E.U. climate leadership is fractured**

### **Petrequin 5/27 – Journalist for the Associated Press**

(Samuel, Journalist For The Associated Press. Cracks Emerging In Europe's United Front To Battle Climate Change. Associated Press. May 27, 2023. <https://apnews.com/article/eu-climate-green-deal-nature-restoration-rift-25a7427e7c275448c510ad8affff1cfc>)

**The European Union has been at the forefront of the fight against climate change** and the protection of nature for years. **But it now finds itself under pressure** from within to pause new environmental efforts amid fears they will hurt the economy. With the next European Parliament elections set for 2024, some **leaders and lawmakers** are concerned about antagonizing workers and voters with new binding legislation and restrictive measures and **are urging the 27-nation bloc to hit the brakes.** Since Ursula von der Leyen took the helm of the powerful European Commission back in 2019, environmental policies have topped the EU agenda. EU nations have endorsed plans to become climate neutral by 2050 and adopted a wide **range** of measures, from reducing energy consumption to sharply cutting transport emissions and reforming the EU's trading system for greenhouse gases. But **cracks in the European united front against climate change have emerged in recent months.** **The first sign was** earlier this year **when Germany, the bloc's economic giant, delayed a deal to ban** new internal **combustion engines** in the EU by 2035 **amid ideological divisions** inside the German government. An agreement was finally reached in March, but just **weeks later, the bloc's other powerhouse, France, called for a pause on EU environmental regulation,** causing controversy. As he presented a bill on green industry earlier this month, French President Emmanuel Macron said it was time for the EU to implement existing rules before adopting new ones. "We have already passed a lot of regulations at European level, more than our neighbors," he said. "Now we have to execute, not make new rules, because otherwise we will lose all players." Macron has been particularly concerned by a U.S. clean energy law that benefits electric vehicles and other products made in North America, fearing it will expose European companies to unfair competition. Although Europeans and their American partners **keep working** to resolve the challenges posed by the U.S. law, Macron's logic basically holds that a pause on environmental constraints would help EU businesses keep producing on home soil, despite competition from countries such as China that have lower environmental standards. **Belgian Prime minister Alexander De Croo quickly followed suit,** calling this week for a moratorium on the introduction of EU legislation aimed at nature preservation, creating a rift within the governing coalition including green politicians. The law proposed by the EU's executive arm aims, by 2030, to cover at least 20% of the EU's land and sea areas with nature restoration measures, "and eventually extend these to all ecosystems in need of restoration by 2050," the commission said. De Croo said that climate legislation should not be overloaded with restoration measures or limits on agricultural nitrogen pollution, warning that businesses would no longer be able to keep up. "That's why I'm asking that we press the pause button," he told VRT network. "Let's not go too far with things that, strictly speaking, have nothing to do with global warming. These other issues are important too, but measures to address them must be taken in phases." **Macron and De Croo have found allies at the European Parliament,** where members of the biggest group, the Christian Democrat EPP, have asked the European Commission to withdraw the nature restoration law proposal on grounds that it will threaten agriculture and undermine food security in Europe. The move came after two parliamentary committees, the Fisheries Committee and the Agriculture Committee, rejected the planned legislation. EPP lawmakers claim that abandoning farmland will lead to an increase in food prices, more imports and drive farmers out of businesses. **This is an exceptional step and shows that the Parliament is not ready** to accept a proposal that only increases costs and insecurity for farmers, fishers and consumers," said Siegfried Mureşan, the vice-chairman of the EPP Group responsible for budget and structural policies. The **growing opposition** to the nature restoration law **has caused great concern** among environmental NGOs, and Frans Timmermans, the EU Commission's top climate official in charge of its Green Deal, warned he would not put forward an alternative proposal because there isn't time. "You can't say I support the Green Deal, but not the ambition to restore nature. It's not 'à la carte menu,'" Timmermans said. The EU commission has also proposed setting legally binding targets to reduce the use of pesticides by 50% by 2030 and a ban on all pesticide use in public parks, playgrounds and schools. To ease the transition to alternative pest control methods, farmers would be able to use EU funds to cover the cost of the new requirements for five years. "If one piece falls, the other pieces fall. I don't see how we can maintain the Green Deal without the nature pillar, because without the nature pillar, the climate pillar is also not viable," Timmermans told EU lawmakers. "So we need to get these two together."

## Specifically, internal politics critically undermines E.U. climate leadership

### Fisher 2022 – Professor of Political Sociology at Oxford

(Stephen, Professor of Political Sociology At Oxford. Expert Comment: European Public Opinion On Climate Change Has Become Politicised. University of Oxford. November 3, 2022. <https://www.ox.ac.uk/news/2022-11-03-expert-comment-european-public-opinion-climate-change-has-become-politicised>)

**The European Union will present a united front in favour of ambitious climate action** at the forthcoming United Nations climate change [conference](#) in Cairo. Across Europe, more broadly, governments [support](#) the Paris Agreement, which aims to keep global temperature increase below 1.5 degrees Celsius. **But such consensus belies political divisions within European nations.** Disagreement is very intense over climate change between Republicans and Democrats in the United States. But mainstream political parties are not as polarised in Europe. Certainly, there are 'populist-right' parties which take a very different stance on climate change from Green parties. But the larger traditional parties are all in broad agreement that climate change is a problem caused by carbon emissions generated from human activity. With such consensus among the political elites of mainstream parties, there is perhaps relatively little reason for voters with strong feelings about climate change to pick one mainstream party over another. Instead, voters may continue to choose who to vote for based on other issues, such as taxation and public services. But **recent research shows voters** in Europe do, in fact, **divide themselves** between mainstream parties partly **based on climate change attitudes**. Using high-quality [European Social Survey](#) data from 21 countries, the study looks at how voters for different kinds of parties differ in their climate attitudes. It confirms some obvious differences: voters for Green parties are the most worried about climate change, while populist-right voters are among the least worried. But **the study also found systematic differences between voters for mainstream left and mainstream right parties.** Some 38% of voters for social democrat parties (including the British Labour Party) report being "very" or "extremely" worried about climate change, compared with just 26% of voters for conservative parties. **Voters for the mainstream left are also more likely to believe climate change is mainly or entirely caused by human activity (49%) than voters for mainstream right parties (39%).** Of course, divisions such as these could be a statistical by-product of other, more fundamental, processes. For instance, if left-wing people vote for left-wing parties based on welfare policies, but also hold more climate-conscious views than average, then voters for left-wing parties will be more climate-conscious - even if their climate attitudes had nothing to do with their vote choice. However, the study found party differences in climate change attitudes cannot be so easily explained away. They exist even after accounting for attitudes to income redistribution, gender equality, gay rights, and immigration. Climate change attitudes are linked to vote choice in their own right, not just as a statistical by-product. That does not mean voters are necessarily choosing parties based on their climate attitudes. It could be that left-wing parties, and more broadly left-wing activists and newspapers on the left, have persuaded left-wing voters to care more about climate change. It could be both, and both are processes that produce politicisation of climate change in domestic electoral politics. **Politicisation, though, is a problem for climate policymakers. If carbon reduction becomes predominantly a left-wing cause, this may alienate voters on the right, making it harder to reach consensus. If mainstream right parties voters care less about the climate, it is harder for leaders of right-wing parties to advocate for effective carbon reduction policies.** Over the last two decades, patterns of change in greenhouse gas emissions have [depend](#)ed on which kinds of parties are in government. Although the EU managed to maintain a united front for this year's UN conference, it was, in fact, the product of tense negotiations and [compromise](#), especially over the use of coal. **If politicisation of climate change at the level of electoral politics gets worse, consensus and action at the intergovernmental level could get harder still**

## **Second, no link: Recent summits prove the U.S. and E.U. can work together on climate policy**

### **Worland 2023 – Journalist For TIME Magazine**

(Justin, Journalist For TIME Magazine. How Climate Change Became Central To U.S.-Europe Relations. TIME Magazine. March 8, 2023. <https://time.com/6261102/ursula-von-der-leyen-us-europe-climate-change/>)

So it may come as a surprise that as a war rages in Europe and tensions between China and the West simmer, **the most highly anticipated item of discussion when European Union Commission President Ursula von der Leyen meets with U.S. President Joe Biden** in Washington this Friday **will be climate change. Both the U.S. and the E.U. have placed emissions reduction programs at the center of their economic growth plans**—and put hundreds of billions of dollars behind those plans, to boot. That investment has led to far-reaching and, to some degree, unanticipated consequences as leaders on both sides of the Atlantic grapple with the new shape of the global economy. **Officials say the meeting between Biden and von der Leyen will help pave the way forward for constructive trans-Atlantic climate cooperation.** But it just scratches the surface of what's to come. As the transition to a clean economy accelerates, climate change is increasingly poised to occupy center stage in international relations. The seeping in of climate change into geopolitical discussions came slowly and then all at once. For decades, countries have gathered in international meetings to talk about climate change, but the discussions were mostly left to environment-focused officials. When heads of government showed up, they either made speeches and then went home, or, worse, got in the way of negotiations. But, in the years since the onset of COVID-19, the world's biggest economies have increasingly intertwined climate policy with economic policy. China has continued its long-standing pursuit of serving as the world's clean energy manufacturer, supporting the production of solar panels and other technology. The E.U. has created new policies to direct financing to clean energy technologies. And the U.S. passed the enormous Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), which includes \$369 billion to help accelerate the transition. These economic measures were all intended to help local economies, but it didn't take long for countries to start taking note of their geopolitical ramifications. [The E.U.—and others—complained](#) that the U.S. was unfairly favoring its own industries with the IRA. Meanwhile, the U.S. called on the E.U. to enact new climate spending rules—and sought to shift criticism to China for the country's long-time state sponsorship of industry. And while these complaints may once have been delivered in backroom conversations between diplomats, they are now being leveled at the highest levels of government. French President Emmanuel Macron, for example, told Biden in December that the IRA was "[super aggressive](#)" toward French companies; Biden promised to help soften the blow. Temperatures have come down since then as **leaders in the U.S. and Europe have promised to work together.** Now, the question is how. The U.S. and the E.U. are currently working on a deal to make European minerals eligible for U.S. tax incentives. A bigger move would allow the two jurisdictions to enjoy free-trade status. **"We have a real common interest in secure, reliable, friendly, supply chains,"** says John Podesta, the Biden adviser charged with overseeing implementation of the IRA. **"We need to find a way of decarbonizing the path forward." The summit this week is just the beginning.**

## **Third, no impact: Multilateralism is dead in the water**

### **Pinto 2022 – African Affairs Expert**

(Teresa Nogueira, African Affairs Expert At GIS. The Failures Of Multilateralism. G.I.S. March 30, 2022. <https://www.gisreportsonline.com/r/multilateralism-crisis/>)

**Multilateralism is in crisis.** Power competition is increasing, globalization is slowing, and the West finds itself with no choice but to return to realism and realpolitik. **The United Nations has repeatedly failed to maintain peace and security. The United Kingdom has left the European Union. Trade is becoming increasingly regional.** Such issues were predictable to a certain extent. More realistic and efficient multilateral frameworks would have contributed to mitigating the negative effects of disintegration and conflict. From hyper-globalization to regionalization Since 2008, and after decades of accelerated expansion, the global integration of trade, markets and finance has slowed down, with some suggesting that we are in a period of “slowbalization” or even “deglobalization.” Trade conflicts between China and the United States, Brexit and the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic on global value chains have exposed and accelerated these shifts. **Multilateral mechanisms, like the Doha Development Agenda of the World Trade Organization (WTO), have largely failed.** Such letdowns reveal not only the WTO’s structural inefficiencies but also the unrealistic nature of its goals, which aim to control trade on a global scale and reach consensus among more than 160 states with different and sometimes irreconcilable interests. These trends do not mean, however, that we are entering a period of isolationism or protectionism. Instead, recent events suggest that regionalization is increasing. In 2021, the African Continental Free Trade Area came into force, becoming the largest trade area in the world. One year later the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership, a free trade agreement between 15 Asian-Pacific countries, came into force. The bloc accounts for around 30 percent of the world’s economic output and 28 percent of trade. Negotiations were started by Beijing to counter U.S. influence in the region. Washington had sought to reinforce its power there through the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which excluded China but ended up also withdrawing from the TPP in 2017. Inefficiencies and contradictions If any doubts remained, **recent events have demonstrated that the idea of a single world, progressively united by common values, norms and purposes, was but a dream.** **The U.S. is no longer the only superpower shaping global norms. China and Russia have expanded their influence while openly defying the principles of the international liberal order,** employing both soft and hard power mechanisms to promote their alternative political and economic models. **With few exceptions,** albeit important ones such as NATO, **multilateral frameworks have not achieved their overambitious goals** despite the continuous expansion of their bureaucratic structures. On the African continent, there are multiple actors involved in security, political and economic policymaking, from peacekeeping forces to regional and subregional bodies and multilateral financial institutions. But this has not empowered Africans. These failures do not mean that cooperation is not beneficial. However, they do show that multilateralism cannot replace sovereign states. **The UN is the most obvious example of the limitations and failures of multilateralism** and the erosion of the post-World War II liberal international order. **Despite its massive size** (or because of it), **the organization has been unable to deliver results in crucial matters and has become hostage to geopolitical competition and ideological struggles.**

## **Climate Negative (1NC)**

1NC Disadvantage (Energy) – 1/3

**First is Uniqueness: Energy prices are declining now. U.S. natural gas production is at a record high**

### **Newman 6/14 — Senior Columnist for Yahoo Finance**

(Rick, Senior Columnist For Yahoo Finance. It's Not Just Gasoline: Other Energy Prices Are Finally Falling, Too. Yahoo! Finance. June 14, 2023. <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/its-not-just-gasoline-other-energy-prices-are-finally-falling-too-200442028.html>)

**The fever is now breaking. High natural gas prices** and the need for new sources of gas in Europe, which has stopped most Russian supplies, **have pushed US natural gas production to new record highs. A glut now seems to be forming, with prices falling.** Citi **analysts predict natural gas prices could fall** to the range of \$1 per million BTU later this year, and maybe **even lower.** The lowest monthly average for gas prices was \$1.63 in June 2020, right after the COVID outbreak. So if Citi's right, **gas prices are headed toward new record lows. Household energy costs**, including electricity, **are finally in retreat.** The Consumer Price Index for household energy jumped 37% from the low in 2020 to the peak in January of this year. Household energy costs have fallen 7% since then. Electricity is following a similar trend, with costs up 27% from 2020 to the beginning of 2023. **Electricity prices** are down just 2% since then, but **should fall further as basic energy prices decline.** **Other types of energy are getting cheaper as well,** including coal, diesel fuel (which is similar to heating oil), propane, and renewables. **All fossil fuels shot up in 2022,** for similar reasons, as Russia's war in Ukraine and a recovering global economy scrambled markets. **Prices are falling now for** similar reasons: **strong supply and tepid demand. So most consumers are likely to benefit,** however they heat and power their homes. Cool.

**Second is the Link: The plan's shift to renewable energy will cost trillions of dollars and lead to energy poverty. Low-income, minority, and rural Americans won't be able to keep the lights on**

### **Hollie 2019 — Director of the Small And Disadvantaged Business Office**

(Derrick, Founder of Reaching America And Former Director Of The Office Of Small And Disadvantaged Business Utilization Within The Department of Transportation. No Need For Energy Poverty. Real Clear Energy. September 11, 2019.

[https://www.realclearenergy.org/articles/2019/09/11/no\\_need\\_for\\_energy\\_poverty\\_110474.html](https://www.realclearenergy.org/articles/2019/09/11/no_need_for_energy_poverty_110474.html))

One of those candidates, **Sen. Bernie Sanders** of Vermont, **unveiled his** answer to the looming disaster last month. His **version of the Green New Deal will cost 16.3 trillion dollars. Under his plan, the government would control energy production and distribution, relying solely on wind, solar and other 'renewable' energy sources.** (Imagine having to call the federal government because your power is out, only to hear a message that your expected hold time is over an hour long). It calls for subsidizing consumers' switch to electric vehicles, and it even calls for replacing every diesel school bus in America with an electric bus. **Sanders' deal is enormous in scope, but like all others, it fails to address a very real and urgent problem—energy poverty. Energy poverty occurs when low-income families and individuals can't afford basic heating and electric needs due to high energy prices.** And while **energy poverty** has no color, it **disproportionately impacts minority, low-income and rural communities the most.** In **a report** done by the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy and the Energy Efficiency for All coalition **found that low-income households devote up to three times as much income to energy costs as do other, higher income households. Expensive energy costs are a burden to people who already struggle to make ends meet each month.**

**Third is the Impact: Global energy poverty. U.S. natural gas exports reduce emissions and help grow the economy. The plan's shift away from fossil fuels will trap billions in poverty**

### **Hollie 2019 — Director of the Small And Disadvantaged Business Office**

(Derrick, Founder of Reaching America And Former Director Of The Office Of Small And Disadvantaged Business Utilization Within The Department of Transportation. No Need For Energy Poverty. Real Clear Energy. September 11, 2019.

[https://www.realclearenergy.org/articles/2019/09/11/no\\_need\\_for\\_energy\\_poverty\\_110474.html](https://www.realclearenergy.org/articles/2019/09/11/no_need_for_energy_poverty_110474.html))

We should all be good stewards of the environment and do our best to protect it. But we also need a sensible approach to our energy needs and that will come from fossil fuels, specifically **natural gas**, which **is the future in U.S. and global electricity production**. Regardless of what the supposed climate change experts claim, the reality is that **since 1970 America has reduced the six key harmful pollutants by 73% while still growing our GDP by 262%**, population by 59%, **miles traveled by 189%** and **energy use by 44%**. Those are great numbers by any standard, and in 2017, Americans spent \$300 billion less on energy than ten years before, meaning they have more to invest in their families, kids' education, communities and favorite charities. But **for America to continue this economic growth, we must continue to pursue energy independence**, allowing us more stability and power in trade negotiations as we rely less on hostile and unstable nations. **Through our leadership in energy production and environmental protection, the United States is in a position to help lift billions in developing nations out of poverty and sickness by exporting our natural resources—along with pollution control technology. Right now, the United States produces more oil and natural gas** and holds more recoverable coal **than any other nation, and we are continually increasing our reserves** thanks to scientific advancements. **There is no reason anyone should be without affordable energy. We don't have to accept less. We've experienced economic freedom and a better quality of life because of our abundance of affordable, reliable energy resources. And with that abundance, we can promote human health, combat energy poverty and improve the quality of life for all people regardless of where they live.**

## First is Uniqueness: The European Union is a global leader on climate change

### Petriccione and van Kemseke 2022 — Policy Analysts at the European Commission For Climate Action

(Mauro, Director-General At The European Commission's Directorate-General For Climate Action. Peter, Diplomat And Senior Policy Assistant At The European Commission's Directorate-General For Climate Action. The Coming of Age of Europe's Climate Diplomacy. Friends of Europe. April 1, 2022. <https://www.friendsofeurope.org/insights/the-coming-of-age-of-europes-climate-diplomacy/>)

“We look forward to a long-term partnership that can serve as an appropriate model of support for climate action from developed to developing countries.” With these words, South Africa's President Cyril Ramaphosa launched, on 2 November 2021 in Glasgow, the Just Energy Transition Partnership, an initiative of his country, the European Union, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States to accelerate the decarbonisation of Africa's highest emitter. “A global first”, and a possible template on how to support just energy transitions around the world, added European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen. **In the broader context of** what – contrary to much commentary – was **a successful COP26, it is easy to overlook the** importance of this new initiative, first and foremost for South Africa itself. European foreign policy watchers, however, might very well look at it through a different lens. They might assess it as a concrete deliverable of the European Green Deal's vigorous call to develop a stronger ‘green deal diplomacy’ and to build green alliances. This is a good illustration of what we would label the **‘coming of age’ of Europe's climate diplomacy**. Another equally telling illustration is the rapidly blurring distinction between climate diplomacy and more traditional security diplomacy. In the words of Executive Vice-President of the European Commission Frans Timmermans, last November: “It's about time that the traditional security community understood that the climate crisis is the biggest security threat we have as humanity and as regions.” The walls between the two communities are indeed beginning to crumble fast. This was once again illustrated by the Council conclusions adopted by EU Foreign Ministers on 21 February 2022. **Traditionally, the diplomatic efforts of EU member states** and of the European institutions themselves **have followed two main axes. The first is the strong advocacy of the necessity and urgency of climate action worldwide**, grounded in decades of increasingly effective domestic policy, and in the moral argument that major emitters – namely industrialised nations, but increasingly emerging economies as well – are the principal cause of anthropogenic emissions and, therefore, have a duty to act and stop global warming. **The second axis is the pursuit of international rules that can frame objectives, targets and timetables for climate action**, based on ascertained facts and strong scientific advice, whose prime outcome so far is the Paris Agreement. Neither of these two axes has become obsolete or has been superseded, but a third dimension is developing, once again grounded in science and in the strength of Europe's domestic commitments and action. The notion of developing further Europe's climate diplomacy is of course not new. Precisely **a decade ago, the Council of Ministers decided that the time had come to step-up** the efforts on **climate diplomacy**. **Since then, the European institutions and member states have been working to turn these words into reality**. The idea, for instance, that climate change is a ‘threat multiplier’ and that **climate action must be mainstreamed in EU security policy** is now solidly embedded in the decision-making of the EU and its member states. Now, the time has come to take further steps and equip Europe's climate diplomacy with the instruments it needs to have meaningful impact in the critical decade of the 2020s. A decade that in terms of climate policies will be radically different from the previous one. **Barely more than three years ago, the international community was struggling with** the difficulty of translating the goals of **the Paris Agreement** into rules and processes to ensure transparency of domestic climate action, clarity of countries' commitments, and verification of their implementation and actual impact. **For the first time, the European Commission was also proposing that Europe's goal should be to reach net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050**. At the end of 2020, the United Nations Secretary-General could already publicly argue the emergence of a “net-zero coalition”. **Now, after COP26 in Glasgow, not only do mid-century net-zero commitments potentially cover over three-quarters of the world's GDP, but the international community also stepped up its 2030 commitments** to ensure that every country would be on a straight trajectory towards those mid-century goals. **Europe has already legislated both its 2050 and 2030 goals** and the need to sustain climate action over the next three decades. It is now tackling the legislative reforms that would embody its plan of necessary policies and measures. **This renewed and bold domestic plan is a solid basis for furthering Europe's international action and leadership in the climate field**. This leadership must now be based not only on a moral argument but also on demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of a climate-neutral economy, as a basis for a prosperous and fairer society; a more modern and more competitive economy, supported by technological leadership and a secure energy supply; a society that effects a just transition, where no one is left behind and where the depth of the transformation becomes a unique opportunity to address older inequalities.

## Second is the Link: U.S. climate policy trades off with E.U. leadership

### Langtree 2012 — Student Researcher

(Sam, Student Researcher Studying International Relations. The European Union: A Leader On Climate Change? E-International Relations. March 24, 2012. <https://www.e-ir.info/2012/03/24/the-european-union-a-leader-on-climate-change/>)

#### **The 2000 launch of the European Climate Change Program re-enhanced the EUs credentials as an international leader**

before the significant COP6. The Program identified, and attempted to develop, all necessary elements of an EU strategy to implement the Kyoto protocol. **However, the subsequent COP6, broke down**, and Ott (2001) notes that the EU was weak in its

instrumental leadership in this period, once again domestic disputes dictated an inability to act cohesively on the international stage. Furthermore, as Dessai (2001) notes,

#### **the EU and US found themselves diametrically opposed on the issue of emission trading regulation,**

#### **and the focussed enmity of the United States had previously overwhelmed EU attempts at leadership.**

However, in the case of the COP6, despite the UK once again negotiating a compromise with the US, the EU as a group denied this compromise, because, as Grubb and Yamin (2001) state, the compromise was not ambitious enough. Dessai (2001) asserts that the EU had been adamant in its desire to cap emissions trading scheme, due to its attempts to ensure that domestic action remained the primary way to achieve reduction. Ott (2001) consequently believes that the EU's defiance of the US can, in fact, be

seen as an example of its growing structural leadership, as it was powerful enough to defy the United States. **Following the COP6 negotiations, the**

#### **United States withdrew from the Kyoto protocol, thus providing the EU with another opportunity**

#### **to demonstrate its capacity for leadership,**

as the only actor with enough political, economic, and diplomatic clout to enact change (Bang et al, 2005). Dessai (2001) asserts that the EU subsequently pursued a sequence of 'missions' to ensure ratification, as it was believed with an assertive leader the protocol would die. The key issues facing ratification were the concerns of the supposed Gang of Four: Russia, Japan, Canada and Australia. Having seen the United States withdrawal, these four were inclined to similarly withdraw, rather than face the economic tribulations of stringent green demands. The EU, then, at COP6Bis, performed impressive feats of diplomacy, reasserting its instrumental leadership (Brommann, 2009). The EU acknowledged the economic concerns of the four, and thus the protocol would sacrifice, to an extent, environmental effectiveness for economic flexibility. This strong instrumental leadership allowed for the COP7 implementation of the lighter version of the protocol, rather than its, arguably inevitable, death. Pursuant to the conclusion of negotiations, the EU sought swift ratification, which, according to Schreurs and Tiberghen (2007) was emblematic of a surge of directional power in the period, as the EU sought to lead by example. Furthermore, it was able to demonstrate its structural power by hastening, and ensuring, Russian ratification. Vogler and Bretherton (2000) note that the EUs trade power enabled it to persuade the Russians to ratify protocol in exchange for supporting Russian accession to the World Trade Organisation. Ott et al (2005) summarise the final ratification of the Kyoto protocol as a major soft power and leadership achievement for the EU. Finally, then, the domestic EU policies following the Kyoto ratification provide a further basis assessing the directional leadership of the EU. It was enhanced by the European Council in 2007 committing unilaterally to a 20% reduction target by 2020, and 30% if other developed countries would commit to comparable reduction targets (European Council, 2007). As Schreurs et al (2009) note, at the COP13 and subsequent sessions, the EU pushed for more ambitious reduction targets. The launch of the European emissions trading system in 2005, alongside the Second European Climate Change Programme considerably strengthened the directional leadership of the EU (Brommann, 2009). The measures that followed the programme provide a firm basis for the strengthening of EU climate and energy policy,

and thus further enhance its claims for leadership. To conclude, then, by providing a chronological framework the capacity of **the EU** to undertake a **role of**

#### **international leadership can be seen to have fluctuated**

during the mentioned period. **At times, it has had**

#### **strong structural, directional and instrumental leadership, and at others it has been overwhelmed by**

either domestic disagreement or **the power of the United States. In the current context, the EU has arguably made**

#### **strides towards being considered the pre-eminent green leader in the international**

**environment, due to** a combination of member states combined enthusiasm and agreement, and **the apathy of the United States.**

**The EU,** it can be concluded, **is the world's leading actor to a strong extent, due to the reluctance of**

**others to assume the mantle,** and its power as a homogenous actor.

## **Third is the Internal Link: E.U. climate leadership is key to its overall soft power and international influence**

### **Volintiru 2020 — Associate Professor of International Relations and Economics**

(Clara, Associate Professor of International Business And Economics At The Bucharest University of Economic Studies. EU's Soft Power In Green Diplomacy: Scaling-Up Consensus From Subnational And National Initiatives. Institute of European Democrats. December 2020.

<https://www.iedonline.eu/publications/2020/geopolitics-values/eus-soft-power-in-green-diplomacy-scaling-up-consensus-from-subnational-and-national-initiatives-volintiru>)

EU's Green Deal is a revolutionary policy package that can create both a new economic model in Europe (and possibly beyond) and further the political integration of member states through new conditionalities and legal constraints. **A more integrated Europe is a stronger actor on the world stage. By mediating the challenges of climate action within its borders, the EU gains the legitimacy of becoming a global leader** in this regard **and possibly jumpstarting multilateral action once again. Green diplomacy will constitute the foundation on which EU's economic partnerships will align in the future,** as it links climate action to a new economic growth model (changing both consumption and production patterns) and the way we ensure energy security in the region. This paper is structured as follows: the first section presents the Green Deal and its implications in global affairs, the second—its challenges, and the final section analyses subnational initiatives. EU GREEN DEAL AND MULTILATERALISM IN CLIMATE ACTION? **Europe's role and position as a global actor are explicitly linked to sustainable development and multilateralism,** as mentioned in the New Strategic Agenda 2019-2024. **For decades now, the EU has positioned itself as a global leader in green diplomacy** (Oberthür and Roche Kelly 2008, Bäckstrand and Elgström 2013, Parker et al. 2017, IPOL 2018). This falls in line with increasingly concrete (and sometimes contentious) actions in climate policy, especially within its borders. Multilateralism is still needed to consolidate the Green Deal's impact at the global level (Braunstein and Renedo 2020). **Building on the regulatory growing power of the EU** (i.e. Brussels effect) (Bradford 2020), **goals related to climate action will inform new international agreements conducted by the EU with strategic partners in the Transatlantic space and beyond,** across various sectors (e.g. energy, trade) **beyond the primary area of environmental policy. Effectively the EU is trying to leverage its leadership in climate diplomacy to create a new paradigm in economic exchanges that can consolidate its global power and internal resilience.**

**Fourth is the Impact: Multilateralism is in crisis. Only a strong European Union can preserve international norms and leverage institutions to solve global crises**

### **Schuette and Dijkstra 2023 — Political Science Researchers**

(Leonard, Senior Researcher At The Munich Security Conference. Hylke, Assistant Professor of Political Science At Maastricht University. The Show Must Go On: The EU's Quest To Sustain Multilateral Institutions Since 2016. Journal of Common Market Studies. March 1, 2023. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jcms.13466>)

**Multilateralism is in crisis** (Lake et al. 2021). **Russia's attack on Ukraine reflects not only a flagrant disregard for multilateral norms, such as the peaceful settlement of disputes, but it has also intensified great power competition and undermined multilateral cooperation.** Meanwhile, **China continues to pursue mercantilist trade policies, while eroding human rights law** and building alternative institutions such as the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. But threats to the multilateralism also emanate from the West. Donald **Trump's America First exemplified unilateralism with severe consequences for specific multilateral institutions, including NATO, the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the Paris Climate Agreement.** The United Kingdom left the European Union (EU) and Japan the International Whaling Commission. Almost inevitably, **multilateral institutions are increasingly 'gridlocked'** (Hale et al. 2013), **thus unable to produce adequate solutions to pressing global problems.** Multilateralism means that three or more states cooperate based on 'generalised principles' that should apply to all states regardless of their particularistic interests (Ruggie 1992, p. 571). In the long term, successful multilateralism should generate 'diffuse reciprocity' (Keohane 1986), whereby states mutually benefit and more than had they engaged in ad hoc bilateralism or hierarchical forms of coordination. The contemporary crisis of multilateralism pertains both to its substantive and procedural nature (Eilstrup-Sangiovanni and Hofmann 2020). For one, states no longer agree on the generalised principles that should undergird cooperation. **Liberal principles, such as open trade, cooperative security and universal human rights, are heavily contested** as a result of greater ideological diversity and power shifts away from the West (Ikenberry 2020, 33ff; Voeten 2020). For another, amid growing nationalist tendencies in many established democracies and great power competition, rules-based cooperation across regions as such is in jeopardy. **The crisis of multilateralism is critical for the EU.** As the most advanced multilateral institution itself, the EU is the main beneficiary of the limited multilateral post-1945 order and particularly the more extensive post-1989 multilateral order. Protected by the US security umbrella, the military feeble but economically liberal EU profited from the growing interconnectedness and legalisation of international relations based on the generalised principles of open trade and cooperative security (Ikenberry 2020). The crisis of multilateralism is therefore of critical consequence for the EU as **its very existence is bound up with the multilateral order.** The EU has long recognised this in its various strategies including the 2016 Global Strategy, the 2021 Joint Communication on multilateralism and the 2022 Strategic Compass (e.g., Barbé and Morillas 2019; Biscop 2005; Dijkstra 2016; Sus 2021; Tocci 2016). As the 2019 final review of the EU Global Strategy aptly notes **'[f]or the EU the stakes are sky high [...] our Union has a vital interest in being the centre of gravity of the work to promote and protect multilateralism globally'** (2019, p. 15). **Preserving multilateralism therefore represents a key strategy for the EU to prosper and survive,** yet scholarly analyses of the EU and the crisis of multilateralism remain surprisingly limited. Scholars have studied extensively how **the EU** routinely participates and performs in multilateral institutions (Da Conceição-Heldt and Meunier 2014; Jørgensen et al. 2011; Laatikainen and Smith 2006; Marx and Westerwinter 2022; Wessel and Odermatt 2019) and how it **projects its internal standards to the rest of the world** (Bradford 2020). Research has therefore focused on how the EU has carved out a multilateral role for itself, but **the present crisis requires the EU to change strategy and sustain multilateralism and its institutions.**

**First, the status quo solves. The U.S. is already taking action on climate**

### **Colon et al. 2022 — Researchers at the Center for American Progress**

(Frances, Senior Director of International Climate Policy. Anne Christianson, Director of International Climate Policy. Cassidy Childs, Research Associate On International Climate Policy. How The Inflation Reduction Act Will Drive Global Climate Action. Center For American Progress. August 17, 2022. <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/how-the-inflation-reduction-act-will-drive-global-climate-action/>)

**When President Joe Biden rejoined the Paris Agreement on his inauguration day, the United States indicated its intent to lead the world in tackling climate change. Yet until the Inflation Reduction Act was signed into law on August 16, 2022, the United States had not taken the meaningful domestic action needed to reduce its emissions, which grew by 6.2 percent in 2021 relative to 2020 and overall remain second only to China. The Inflation Reduction Act may change this reality. Although it is domestically focused—and includes several harmful provisions on drilling that demonstrate the ongoing power of the oil and gas industry—this law represents the single-largest investment in climate action in U.S. history and will profoundly alter the international landscape. Indeed, this historic legislation will help the United States reach its emission reduction commitments, increase U.S. competitiveness and spur a “race to the top” in the clean energy economy, reshape the security landscape, and, crucially, restore trust and legitimacy for the United States within the global climate community.**

## 1NC Case (Climate) – 2/3

**Second, the plan can't solve. The U.S. isn't key. The emissions of other countries outweigh****International Energy Agency 2022**

(Global CO2 Emissions Rebounded to Their Highest Level In History In 2021. Press Release By The International Energy Agency. March 8, 2022. <https://www.iea.org/news/global-co2-emissions-rebounded-to-their-highest-level-in-history-in-2021>)

**Global** energy-related carbon dioxide **emissions rose by 6% in 2021 to 36.3 billion tonnes, their highest ever level**, as the world economy rebounded strongly from the Covid-19 crisis and relied heavily on coal to power that growth, according to new [IEA analysis](#) released today. **The increase** in global CO2 emissions of over 2 billion tonnes **was the largest in history** in absolute terms, more than offsetting the previous year's pandemic-induced decline, the IEA analysis shows. The recovery of energy demand in 2021 was compounded by adverse weather and energy market conditions – notably the spikes in natural gas prices – which led to more coal being burned despite renewable power generation registering its largest ever growth. The global CO2 emissions and energy demand numbers are based on the IEA's detailed region-by-region and fuel-by-fuel analysis, drawing on the latest official national data and publicly available energy, economic and weather data. Combined with the methane emissions estimates that the IEA [published last month](#) and estimates of nitrous oxide and flaring-related CO2 emissions, the new analysis shows that overall greenhouse gas emissions from energy rose to their highest ever level in 2021. The numbers make clear that the global economic recovery from the Covid-19 crisis has not been [the sustainable recovery](#) that IEA Executive Director Fatih Birol [called for](#) during the early stages of the pandemic in 2020. The world must now ensure that the global rebound in emissions in 2021 was a one-off – and that an accelerated energy transition contributes to global energy security and lower energy prices for consumers. Coal accounted for over 40% of the overall growth in global CO2 emissions in 2021, reaching an all-time high of 15.3 billion tonnes. CO2 emissions from natural gas rebounded well above their 2019 levels to 7.5 billion tonnes. At 10.7 billion tonnes, CO2 emissions from oil remained significantly below pre-pandemic levels because of the limited recovery in global transport activity in 2021, mainly in the aviation sector. Despite the rebound in coal use, renewable energy sources and nuclear power provided a higher share of global electricity generation than coal in 2021. Renewables-based generation reached an all-time high, exceeding 8 000 terawatt-hours (TWh) in 2021, a record 500 TWh above its 2020 level. Output from wind and solar PV increased by 270 TWh and 170 TWh, respectively, while hydro generation declined due to the impacts of drought, notably in the United States and Brazil. The use of coal for electricity generation in 2021 was intensified by record high natural gas prices. The costs of operating existing coal power plants across the United States and many European power systems were considerably lower than those of gas power plants for the majority of 2021. Gas-to-coal switching pushed up global CO2 emissions from electricity generation by well over 100 million tonnes, notably in the United States and Europe where competition between gas and coal power plants is tightest. **The rebound of global CO2 emissions above pre-pandemic levels has largely been driven by China, where they increased by 750 million tonnes between 2019 and 2021.** China was the only major economy to experience economic growth in both 2020 and 2021. **The emissions increases in those two years in China more than offset the aggregate decline in the rest of the world over the same period. In 2021, China's CO2 emissions rose above 11.9 billion tonnes, accounting for 33% of the global total.** China's rise in emissions resulted largely from a sharp increase in electricity demand that leaned heavily on coal power. With rapid GDP growth and additional electrification of energy services, electricity demand in China grew by 10% in 2021, faster than economic growth at 8.4%. This increase in demand of almost 700 TWh was the largest ever experienced in China. With demand growth outstripping the increase in supply from low emissions sources, coal was used to meet more than half of the rise in electricity demand. This was despite the country also seeing its largest ever increase in renewable power output in 2021. **CO2 emissions in India rebounded strongly in 2021 to rise above 2019 levels, driven by growth in coal use for electricity generation. Coal-fired generation reached an all-time high in India, jumping 13% above its 2020 level.** This was partly because the growth of renewables slowed to one-third of the average rate seen over the previous five years.

1NC Case (Climate) – 3/3

**Third, there's no impact. Climate change is not an existential threat. We can adapt**

**Lomborg 2022 — Visiting Fellow at the Hoover Institution**

(Bjorn, Visiting Fellow At The Hoover Institution. Turning Down The Climate-Change Heat. National Review. March 3, 2022. <https://www.nationalreview.com/magazine/2022/03/21/turning-down-the-climate-change-heat/>)

As a species, **we are not on the brink of imminent extinction.** In fact, quite the opposite. **The rhetoric of impending doom belies an absolutely essential point: In almost every way we can measure, life on earth is better now than it was at any time in history. Since 1900, we have more than doubled our life expectancy.** In 1900, the average life span was just 33 years — today it is more than 71. The increase has had the most dramatic impact on the world's worst-off. Health inequality has diminished significantly. The world is more literate; child labor has been dropping; we are living in one of the most peaceful times in history. Between 1990 and 2015, the percentage of people in the world practicing open defecation dropped from 30 to 15 percent. **The planet is getting healthier,** too. In the past half century, **we have made substantial cuts in indoor air pollution,** previously the biggest environmental killer. In 1990, pollution caused more than 8 percent of deaths; this has almost halved, to 4.7 percent, meaning that 1.2 million people survive each year who would have died. Higher agricultural yields and changing attitudes to the environment have meant that rich countries are increasingly preserving forests and reforestation. And since 1990, 2.6 billion more people have gained access to improved water sources, bringing the global total of people with access to improved water to 91 percent. Many of these improvements have come about because we have gotten richer, both as individuals and as nations. Over the past 30 years, **the average global income per person has almost doubled.** That has driven massive cuts in poverty. In 1990, nearly four in ten people on the planet were poor, meaning they made less than \$1.90 per day. Today, it is less than one in ten. **When we are richer, we live longer and have better lives.** We live with less indoor air pollution. **Governments provide more health care, build better safety nets, and enact stronger laws and regulations to battle pollution and protect the environment.** Significantly, progress has not ended. The world has been radically transformed for the better in the last century, and it will continue to improve in the century to come. **Analysis by experts shows that we are likely to become much, much better off in the future.** Researchers working for the United Nations suggest that **by 2100, average incomes will greatly increase, perhaps to 450 percent of today's incomes.** Life expectancy will continue to increase, to 82 years or possibly beyond 100. As countries and individuals get richer, air pollution will reduce even further. **Climate change will have a negative impact on the world, but it will pale in comparison with all the positive gains** that we have seen so far and that we will continue to see **in the century ahead.** These gains that we both have seen and will see come **from** the general **economic development** described above. The best current research shows that **the cost of climate change by the end of the century, if we do nothing, will be less than 4 percent of global GDP.** This includes all the negative impacts — not just the increased costs from stronger storms but also the costs of increased deaths from heat waves and the lost wetlands from rising sea levels. This means that instead of seeing incomes rise by 450 percent by 2100, they might increase by “only” 434 percent. That's clearly a problem. But it's also clearly not a catastrophe. As the members of the U.N. Climate Panel put it themselves: **For most economic sectors, the impact of climate change will be small** relative to the impacts of other drivers [such as] changes in population, age, income, technology, relative prices, lifestyle, regulation, governance, and many other aspects of socioeconomic development” (italics added).

## 1NC Case (Social Justice)

### The status quo solves. Recent international agreements solve climate injustice

#### Harvey et al. 2022

(Fiona Harvey, Nina Lakhani, Oliver Milman, Adam Morton – Journalists For The Guardian. COP27 Agrees Historic 'Loss And Damage' Fund For Climate Impact In Developing Countries. The Guardian. November 20, 2022.

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2022/nov/20/cop27-agrees-to-historic-loss-and-damage-fund-to-compensate-developing-countries-for-climate-impacts>)

**Developing countries celebrated** on Sunday morning **as crucial climate talks ended with a “historic” deal on their most cherished climate goal: a global fund** for “loss and damage”, **providing financial assistance to poor nations stricken by climate disaster**. However, the deal was far from perfect, with several key elements flawed or lacking. Some countries said the commitments on limiting temperatures to 1.5C represented no progress on the Cop26 conference in Glasgow last year, and the language on phasing out fossil fuels was weak. Sameh Shoukry, the Egyptian foreign minister and president of the Cop27 UN climate summit in Egypt, said: “We rose to the occasion. We worked around the clock, day and night, but united in working for one gain, one higher purpose, one common goal. In the end we delivered. We listened to the calls of anguish and despair.” Sherry Rehman – climate change minister of Pakistan where suffering in record floods in September became emblematic of the devastation developing countries are facing – hailed the “historic” loss and damage deal to applause in the conference hall. “This is not about accepting charity,” she said. **“This is a down payment on investment in our futures, and in climate justice.”** Simon Stiell, the UN climate chief, told exhausted delegates as the gavel was brought down on the final deal at 7am, after an all-night negotiating session: “It wasn’t easy at all. But **this outcome will benefit the most vulnerable around the world**.” But he warned that time was short to take action on the targets agreed, and there was “no room for backsliding”. He said the national plans that countries had submitted on cutting greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 were not enough to meet the vital goal of limiting global temperature rises to 1.5C above pre-industrial levels, in line with scientific advice. “The [national plans] just don’t add up,” he said. “Keep your eye on 2030. That is our horizon.” **Poor countries and climate campaigners rejoiced**. Sir Molwyn Joseph, minister of health, wellbeing and the environment of Antigua and Barbuda, and chair of the Alliance of Small Island States, said: **“Today, the international community has restored global faith in this critical process that is dedicated to ensuring no one is left behind. The agreements made at Cop27 are a win for our entire world.** We have shown those who have felt neglected that we hear you, we see you, and we are giving you the respect and care you deserve. We must work even harder to hold firm to the 1.5C warming limit, to operationalise the loss and damage fund, and continue to create a world that is safe, fair, and equitable for all.”

## **Climate Negative (2NC / 1NR)**

### **2NC Energy DA (Impact – Turns Case)**

**Disadvantage turns the case: Natural gas is a key “bridge fuel” that reduces emissions while we develop effective renewable energy**

#### **Rapier 2018 — Senior Contributor at Forbes**

(Robert, Senior Contributor At Forbes. Natural Gas Is Already A Bridge Fuel. Forbes. September 2, 2018.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/rrapier/2018/09/02/natural-gas-is-already-a-bridge-fuel/?sh=5249ae21975f>)

By the Numbers According to [data](#) from the Energy Information Administration (EIA), **in the year 2000, 71% of U.S. electricity generation was derived from fossil fuels. By 2017 the fossil fuel share had fallen to 63%.** But **the overall decline in fossil fuels is entirely because of a move away from coal** for power generation. Coal's share of U.S. electricity generation between 2000 and 2017 fell from 51% to 30%. Renewables get a lot of credit for this decline, but the truth is that **natural gas took most of coal's market share.** Over the past 17 years, the natural gas share of power production doubled from 16% to 32%. **Natural gas is now the largest source of power in the U.S.** Renewables have grown as well. The total renewable share rose from 9.5% to 17%, but hydropower has always been responsible for the largest renewable contribution. In 2000 hydropower accounted for 275 billion kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity. By 2017, that was just a bit higher at 300 billion kWh. But modern renewables like wind and solar power soared from nearly nothing in 2000 to 300 billion kWh in 2017. Still, that is less than half the gains made by natural gas. From 2000 to 2017, power generated by coal fell by 700 billion kWh. Meanwhile, at the same time natural gas generation increased by 700 billion kWh. Falling Carbon Dioxide Emissions **The impact of the huge drop in coal can be clearly seen in the emissions data.** First, let me explain why coal has higher associated carbon dioxide emissions. Fossil fuels contain two different elements that produce energy: carbon and hydrogen. When carbon burns, it forms carbon dioxide. When hydrogen burns, it forms water vapor. Coal has a much higher concentration of carbon, whereas natural gas has much more hydrogen. Thus, **when natural gas is burned, it produces relatively fewer carbon dioxide emissions.** According to the [BP Statistical Review of World Energy](#), **the U.S. has reduced carbon dioxide emissions by 639 million metric tons per year since 2000. This leads all countries by far in reducing carbon dioxide emissions.** Far behind in second place was the U.K., where emissions dropped by 165 million metric tons per year. At the same time China, by contrast, increased its carbon dioxide emissions by a whopping 6.8 billion metric tons per year, primarily a result of ~170% increases in both oil and coal consumption. Thus, those who wish to debate whether **natural gas should be a bridge between a coal-fired past and a renewable future** are missing the point. **It is already serving as that bridge.**

## 2NC Energy DA (Link)

### Status quo energy leads to low prices and declining emissions. The plan trades off with natural gas and risks trapping millions in energy poverty

#### Hollie 2019 — Director of the Small And Disadvantaged Business Office

(Derrick, Founder of Reaching America And Former Director Of The Office Of Small And Disadvantaged Business Utilization Within The Department of Transportation. AOC's Green New Deal Would Cost \$600,000 Per U.S. Household. The National Interest. July 16, 2019. <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/aocs-green-new-deal-would-cost%C2%A0600000-us-household%C2%A0-67262>)

The "Green New Deal" will fail for many reasons. One is that the people pushing it seem oblivious to the needs of poor and minorities families, who would be directly hurt by the plan. By one estimate, **that Green New Deal would cost \$600,000 per household and eliminate the use of all fossil fuels** in just 10 years. **It would result in higher energy prices for all Americans, but would disproportionately hurt people of color and other minorities who are the most susceptible to energy poverty. Energy poverty occurs when households are unable to afford their basic electric and heating needs due to high energy prices.** Yes, we need to protect the environment. But **unrealistic proposals** like the Green New Deal **only contribute to energy poverty and won't work for low-income families.** We need an energy approach that makes better use of what we have, especially if it can keep costs low and create jobs. One of the answers is natural gas. **Natural gas is abundant and affordable compared to most forms of energy, and it burns cleaner than other fossil fuels.** In fact, **shifting to gas-fired plant generators was the single greatest factor in the United States achieving a 28 percent reduction in CO2 emissions** since 2005, according to the Energy Information Administration. Right now, America needs better access to natural gas. This winter's polar vortex exposed natural gas supply problems in the Northeast. We've certainly made progress—**America is producing more natural gas than ever**—but there isn't enough pipeline infrastructure to move enough natural gas into the communities that need it most. When temperatures dropped to the teens and single-digits, demand exceeded supply and forced prices to skyrocket. **There's simply no excuse for forcing low-income African-Americans and other minorities to choose between heating a home and putting food on the table.** These pipeline shortages are bad enough, but they are made worse by the same activists who claim social justice in supporting the Green New Deal. Where's the social justice and compassion in blatantly opposing affordable, traditional energy resources that are becoming cleaner and more efficient every year? Recently, I saw some of these "keep it in the ground" people in economically depressed Buckingham County, Virginia, protesting the construction of the Atlantic Coast Pipeline, where a pipeline compressor would create jobs and up to \$1 million in tax revenues. That's a desperately needed economic jolt to a county where every third person is African-American. But the activists, with their bullhorns, T-shirts, and protest signs, ignored the potential benefits of this project and claimed to be fighting "environmental racism" by opposing the pipeline compressor. All of the protestors were white. The Atlantic Coast Pipeline could save consumers in Virginia and North Carolina more than \$377 million in electricity bills annually—states with disproportionately high black populations. How a pipeline that would make life more affordable and create more prosperity is racist is beyond my comprehension. Sadly, the only environmental racism I see is actually "green energy discrimination" foisted upon minority households, who can least afford higher energy costs. I'm all for renewable energy where it makes sense and where it doesn't needlessly drive up our cost of living. If electric cars are attractive to consumers, let them compete in a free market without the help of government subsidies—our tax dollars. The working poor and middle class need to rely on affordable energy, and no one should be vilified for using a fuel-efficient gasoline engine to get to work. That's ridiculous. More pipeline infrastructure projects are needed to transport oil and natural gas from where it's refined to cities and towns where it's needed. Lower fuel costs also keep prices for commodities—food, construction materials, and industrial goods—in check. **There is a practical, realistic path forward when it comes to modernizing our national infrastructure and pipeline grid. We can do it while improving energy efficiency and lowering greenhouse gas emissions. But the Green New Deal, with its \$93 trillion price tag, isn't any viable plan at all. It's a pipe dream—a bad deal for America.**

## 2NC Soft Power DA (Turns Case & Uniqueness)

### Disadvantage turns the case: E.U. climate leadership is key to international action on climate change

#### Schape and Konneke 2023 — Policy Advisors at E3G

(Belinda, Policy Advisor At E3G's Climate Diplomacy And Geopolitics Team. Jule, Policy Advisor In E3G's Geopolitics, Diplomacy, And Security Team. EU's Climate Leadership Is Now On Foreign Ministers. Euractiv. February 17, 2023.

<https://www.euractiv.com/section/energy-environment/opinion/eus-climate-leadership-is-now-on-foreign-ministers/>)

**2023 needs to see effective cooperation on cutting emissions**, managing debt, tackling rising trade tensions, and responding to climate impacts. **This year will pave the way for the next big climate moment in 2025 when global emissions will have to peak. But geopolitical fracturing is feeding a competitive approach from major emitters** like China and has disbanded traditional high-ambition coalitions that have shaped global political will in the past. **The EU has a major role to play** this year and the upcoming gathering of foreign ministers will set the tone for this. **The EU was crucial in brokering a historic outcome** on loss and damage **at COP27**, supporting calls by vulnerable countries whose rising power was on display. However, a lack of coordination prevented the EU to secure a package of action through COP27 or Germany's G7 presidency. On 20 February, **EU Foreign Affairs Ministers will meet** in Brussels to agree on the agenda for climate diplomacy in 2023. The conclusions of the gathering are an opportunity to set out a strong mandate for ambitious climate diplomacy and a vision for EU climate foreign policy that effectively rallies partners around a faster transition. **The starting position is promising: the EU and its member states will hold significant sway in international fora over the next two years. Italy as G7 presidency in 2024, Germany supporting the incumbent Japanese G7, the Netherlands co-leading the Coalition of Finance Ministers for Climate Action, and France co-hosting a summit on a "New Financial Pact" with the Global South** together with Barbados. **The EU should harness these moments to inject momentum into delivering climate outcomes and raise the bar for climate ambition in international venues** such as the G7, G20, the UNFCCC and UNGA.

### Yes climate leadership. Recent policies are a game changer

#### Lory 2023 — Journalist for EuroNews

(Gregoire, Journalist For EuroNews. European Parliament Approves Mega Package Of EU Climate Measures. EuroNews. 4/18/2023.

<https://www.euronews.com/my-europe/2023/04/18/european-parliament-approves-mega-package-of-eu-climate-measures>)

**The European Parliament took a big step forward in the fight against climate change** on Tuesday, **after it approved as many as three pieces of legislation** from its landmark Fit for 55 package, **which aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 55% by 2030. Among them was the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM), which is designed to create a more level playing field between EU and non-EU producers by attributing a carbon price to certain imported products.** According to the lead MEP on the file, Mohammed Chahim, the CBAM will have a major impact. **"It is an absolute game changer and it's really historic because for the first time we will start asking producers to pay for also the imported CO2 emissions."** he told Euronews. "And it's for the first time that the EU or any other region in the world applies a carbon tariff or a carbon price on producers outside of the EU, which that's in itself historic. **"We hope that this will incentivise other regions in the world to join us in the EU to show the same ambition and decarbonise the economy as soon as possible and to keep the one so that we keep the 1.5 degrees within reach."**

## **Specifically, India's emissions critically undermine global climate targets**

### **Schonhardt 2023 — Journalist for E&E News**

(Sara, Journalist For E&E News. Why The Climate Fight Will Fail Without India. Scientific American. February 10, 2023. <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/why-the-climate-fight-will-fail-without-india/>)

**India** is in the midst of the biggest climate experiment the world has ever known. It's a test that aims to transform a nation marked by deep economic inequality and heavily polluting coal power to one where families drive electric scooters and cool their homes with the sun's energy. And it **could determine whether global temperatures exceed limits beyond which climate impacts become increasingly disastrous**. It's a challenge no other country has faced in quite the same way, say experts. **The nation of 1.4 billion people could undermine global climate targets** if it continues to rely on fossil fuels — with India facing some of the greatest dangers. Those same targets, set largely by industrialized nations that benefitted from unfettered energy development, could also limit the growth India desires to increase its economic prosperity. **“[India] is important because of its place in the development journey,”** said Ulka Kelkar, director of the climate program at the World Resources Institute India (WRI). **“It still remains a lower-middle-income country, so the bulk of its economic development,** and meeting various needs — of housing, water, energy, mobility, nutrition — all of these **challenges still remain ahead,”** she added. **“And so far no country has met these goals without also causing greenhouse gas emissions, without using fossil fuels.”** **The South Asian nation is currently the world's third-largest emitter** of planet-warming pollution after China and the United States, **and its demand for energy is expected to grow faster than any other country over the next two decades. By 2040, it will need to add a power system that's equivalent to the European Union's,** according to the International Energy Agency. **And because of its size, “if that new energy comes from fossil fuels, then it will have a serious impact on the climate,”** said Sandeep Pai, a senior associate at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).

## **Specifically, China's emissions outweigh the U.S. and undermine solvency**

### **Davidson 2022 — Journalist for The Guardian**

(Helen, Journalist For The Guardian. Is China Doing Enough To Combat The Climate Crisis? The Guardian. November 11, 2022.

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/nov/11/china-climate-crisis-renewable-energy-goals>)

### **After decades of fossil fuel-driven economic growth and industrialisation, China is now the world's biggest carbon emitter, contributing almost a third of the world's greenhouse gases in 2020**

It is also the most exposed to the impact of the climate crisis, in terms of its population size and number of environmental disasters, according to UN figures. Average temperatures and sea levels have risen faster than global averages, and in just one year since Cop26, China has experienced record-breaking floods and heatwaves, bringing with them severe energy crises. China's government has signed up to global climate pledges and is a big driver of renewable energy, but like with many countries, experts have raised concerns over the scale of the cuts. "It is complicated," said the Trivium analyst Cory Combs.

"The general summary is: they are genuinely ambitious but also probably not enough." **Of key concern as countries come together at Cop27 is China's**

**recent suspension of a climate agreement with the world's other big global emitter, the US**

At Cop26, the US and China made a declaration of cooperation but when the US House speaker, Nancy Pelosi, angered Beijing by visiting Taiwan this year, bilateral climate talks were suspended amid a suite of retaliatory acts. Targets set for the 2015 Paris agreement, China pledged to peak its emissions by 2030. At a UN meeting in 2020, the president, [Xi Jinping](#), announced a target of carbon neutrality by 2060. The following year, at another UN meeting, he pledged China would stop building coal-fired power plants. The targets went beyond China's national determined Paris agreement contributions, and signalled a significant domestic upshift towards a more sustainable economic strategy and focus on the environment. China had been the biggest producer of coal and accounted for about half of global coal consumption in 2021, and was the world's largest foreign financier of fossil fuel infrastructure, according to the Council for Foreign Relations. Domestically, China's crucial "five-year plans", which set out national policies for each political term, codified some of the new ambitions. In its 12th plan (covering 2011-15), Beijing had outlined a 16% reduction in energy intensity and a 17% reduction in the amount of carbon emissions per unit of GDP. In its 14th (2021-25), it committed to reducing the latter by 65%, and raised the share of non-fossil (renewable) fuels in primary energy consumption from 20% to 25%. What's been achieved After the ban on new coal-fired power projects, Chinese banks committed to not investing in new overseas coal projects. "We haven't seen any new coal projects after September 2021, so the data also supports the progress we've seen on overseas coal investment," Shuang Liu, a senior associate at the World Resources Institute recently told the Asia Society. China has also launched major efforts on improving its climate adaption and resilience, including a national strategy increasing protections of wetlands and animal species, and growing the proportion of grasslands and forested areas. The government has invested heavily in electric vehicles. By June, China had nearly 10m new-energy vehicles, including battery electric, plug-in hybrid, and fuel cell vehicles – more than half the world's estimated total, according to the London School of Economics. Combs says China is "remarkably ambitious" on its renewable energy goals, and is on track to hit 1200GW in renewables by the end of the decade. There has been a huge buildup in onshore wind and solar, more recently in offshore wind. In 2021, new projects in China contributed 80% of global additions to wind power. Timelines are "uncertain" but China is also advancing in research and development of nuclear energy. But there's a problem. Essentially, China's renewables are advancing faster than the electricity grids, markets, and transmission technology can keep up, creating a "huge roadblock".

**In the last year we've seen at least five provinces have to scale back approvals of distributed renewable energy resources**

because they were building up too much capacity," Combs said. Electricity production and markets are tied to provinces, and the regions with some of the best potential for renewable energy generation, such as the Gobi desert, have a fraction of the demand than less capable markets, such as Guangdong, have. And transmission-line projects are not yet advanced enough to transfer it. The climate emergency is also complicating efforts to mitigate its impact. This summer, China experienced a [record-breaking drought and heatwave](#), which dried up parts of the economically, industrially and environmentally crucial Yangtze River. For Sichuan, which has been so successful building hydropower that it now draws 80% of its power needs from it, that led to massive energy shortages. In 2021, China faced an even bigger power crunch, exacerbated by the division of political power and responsibility between the central and provincial governments. In 2022, further pressure came from the war in Ukraine and soaring demand with [undulating Covid restrictions](#). The Climate

Tracker estimated **China's emissions rose 3.4% in 2021**. In response to these successive energy and economic crises, China – like some European countries – has returned to what observers hope is a temporary increased reliance on coal. "With the 14th [five-year plan] targets to be met by 2025, and 2022 in effect a lost year for energy decarbonisation efforts,

**China has just lost one-third of its remaining time to meet its goals,"** said the Asia Society in a recent issues paper. Combs

added: "It's doing what it believes it can do, what it can achieve without completely destroying its economy." The future **While China has launched some big**

**initiatives** and appears committed to mitigating the effects of the climate crisis and increasing its use of green energy, **its international**

**commitments fall short of what experts say is needed**. The net zero target is widely regarded as too late to ensure the world limits global heating to 1.5C above pre-industrial levels, and emissions must peak by 2025 to be in line with Paris goals. "What separates China from the rest of the world is the power of its leader, Xi Jinping, to make

climate a politically non-negotiable pillar of long-term policymaking," said the Asia Society paper. **But realistically, for now, officials will not**

**sacrifice short-term economic demands for the 2030 target – and certainly not for 2060 –**

**raising the prospect of serious challenges near the end of the decade."**