(best) Climate 1AC v1

Resolution

I affirm Resolved: The People's Republic of China ought to prioritize environmental protection over economic growth.

Definitions

First on definitions:

“China” is a country in East Asia

Diffen No Date. Diffen is the world's largest collection of unbiased comparisons that help people make decisions. Compare anything on Diffen -- products, services, organizations, religions, athletes, celebrities, programming languages. “People's Republic of China vs Republic of China.” *Diffen*, https://www.diffen.com/difference/People%27s_Republic_Of_China_vs_Republic_Of_China. BZ

The People's Republic of China is commonly **known as China** and the Republic of China is commonly known as Taiwan. These are separate states with a shared history; China claims sovereignty over Taiwan. After the Kuomintang reunified China in 1928, most of mainland China was governed by the Republic of China (ROC). The island of Taiwan was under Japanese rule at the time. At the end of World War II in 1945, Japan surrenedered Taiwan to the Republic of China. In 1949, there was a civil war in China and the government (ROC) lost control of mainland China to the Communist Party, which established the People's Republic of China (**PRC**) and took **control[s]** of all of **mainland China**. Only the island of Taiwan remained under the control of the ROC.

“Environmental protection”

OECD 1. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an international organization that works together with governments, policy makers and citizens to establish evidence-based international standards and finding solutions to a range of social, economic and environmental challenges. OECD provides a unique forum and knowledge hub for data and analysis, exchange of experiences, best-practice sharing, and advice on public policies and international standard-setting. OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms - Environmental Protection Definition, OECD, 25 Sept. 2001, https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=836#:~:text=Definition%3A,polluting%20substances%20in%20environmental%20media. BZ

Environmental protection refers to any activity **to maintain or restore the quality of environment**al media **through preventing** the emission of pollutants **or reducing** the presence of **polluting substances** in environmental media. It may consist of: (a) changes in characteristics of goods and services, (b) changes in consumption patterns, (c) changes in production techniques, (d) treatment or disposal of residuals in separate environmental protection facilities, (e) recycling, and (f) **prevention** of **degradation of** the landscape and **ecosystems**.

“Economic Growth”

Investopedia 21, Investopedia was founded in 1999 with the mission of simplifying financial decisions and information to give readers the confidence to manage every aspect of their financial life. Team, Investopedia. “Economic Growth Definition.” Investopedia, Investopedia, 1 Jan. 2021, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/e/economicgrowth.asp. BZ

Economic growth is an increase in the production of economic **goods and services**, compared from one period of time to another. It can be measured in nominal or real (adjusted for inflation) terms. Traditionally, aggregate economic growth is measured in terms of gross national product (GNP) or gross domestic product (GDP), although alternative metrics are sometimes used.

“Prioritize”

Collins ND, https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/prioritize BZ

If you prioritize something, you treat it as more important than other things. *Prioritize your own wants rather than constantly thinking about others.*

Framework

"Prioritize" is from a perspective of maximizing human well-being

Rasul 20, Dr Golam Rasul, **former Chief Economist**, at International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD). Prior to his appointment as a Chief Economist, he served as a Theme Leader livelihoods, Head of the Economic Analysis Division and Policy Development Specialist at ICIMOD for about nine years. Dr Rasul holds a PhD in regional and rural development planning from the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), Thailand. Rasul, Golam. "A Framework for Improving Policy Priorities in Managing COVID-19 Challenges in Developing Countries." National Library of Medicine, Frontiers Media S.A., 14 Oct. 2020, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7591500/#:~:text=Priority%20setting%20is%20a%20complex,explicitly%20chosen%20and%20agreed%20criteria. BZ

Priority setting is a complex process involving **[involves] making decisions on** the allocation **[allocating]** of **resources to improve policy** goals. The interests, motivations, and preferences of the diverse array of stakeholders will differ, thus prioritization needs to be based on explicitly chosen and agreed criteria. Dimension of Priorities Prioritization is a multidimensional concept and can be seen from different perspectives, all of which need to be understood and taken into account. **From a moral** and ethical **perspective, managing** existing, and emerging **threats to human lives is** a societal obligation and **the primary responsibility of states** (24, 25). Thus, **the highest priority should be given to policy choices that save human lives** by reducing health risks, improving health care, reducing communicable diseases, and ensuring provision of basic health services, together with those aimed at meeting basic human needs such as access to food, water, and shelter. From a utilitarian perspective, policy choices should be guided by the utility generated and cost-effectiveness, since resources are finite (26, 27). Thus, the highest priority should be given to the policy choices that are most cost-effective **and generate the maximum net social benefits**. From an egalitarian perspective, equity, and fairness are equally important in policy choices (28, 29). Cost-effectiveness is important but should not be the sole criterion; an equally high priority is given to protecting those who are most at risk and serving the most deprived even if this is less cost-effective. From a resilience perspective, present actions should prepare for transition to a more resilient and better society (12, 30). Thus, a high priority should be given to policy options that enhance long-term social, economic, and environmental benefits that lay the basis for long term resilience and build the capacity to deal with future challenges.

Thus, the value of morality is achieved by maximizing human well-being

Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, **Research Fellow in Philosophy** at University of Oslo "An Argument for Hedonism" Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have.** "Pleasure" and "pain" are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, **I might ask: "What for?" This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so**, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but **for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable.** You might answer, for example: "To

buy soda." This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: "What is buying the soda good for?" This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: "Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it." **If I then proceed by asking "But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?" the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.**3 As Aristotle observes**: "We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**"4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says "This is painful!" we never respond by asking: "And why is that a problem?" We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

AND preventing extinction comes first due to moral uncertainty – save humanity now so we can deliberate more in the future

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior **Research Fellow in Philosophy** at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. "Moral Agreement on Saving the World" Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] brett

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are **deep and irresolvable**, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – **whether we're consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists** – should all agree that **we should try to save the world**. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions [of] upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even ifthe well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there's nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there's a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations(the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But **that is a huge mistake**. Non-consequentialism is the view that there's more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don't matter. Even John Rawls wrote, "All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy." Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They'd thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn't significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one's character. What's even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial "point of view of the universe," indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one's own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don't care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler's recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I'd have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I've just argued that there's agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It's possible they'll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, **all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world**. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won't get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: "We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly." (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

Contentions

Contention 1: Climate Change

China's growing economy is killing its citizens and contributing massively to global warming

Igini 22. Martina is an **environmental journalist** based in Hong Kong. She holds two Bachelor's degrees in Journalism and Translation/Interpreting Studies and a Master's degree in International Development. Igini, Martina. "Top 5 Environmental Issues in China in 2022." Earth.Org, 4 Aug. 2022, https://earth.org/environmental-issues-in-china/. BZ

According to the 2021 World Air Quality Report, out of 1,374 cities located in East Asia, 143 (or about 11%) recorded annual average PM2.5 concentrations that are seven times greater than World Health Organization (WHO) standards. All of them were located in China, with the town of Hotan in southwestern Xinjiang experiencing the highest level of **pollution** in the country at about 101 µg/m³, over 20 times the WHO guideline value. Estimated to **cause[s]** an average of **1.2 million** premature **deaths every year**, China's poor air quality is primarily attributed to the rapid economic expansion the country experienced since 1979, which resulted in a drastic increase in coal-powered industrial production and electricity demand, as well as an exponential rise in private vehicles. It is estimated that roughly 48% of Chinese CO2 emissions come from the industrial sector, with 40% from the power – mainly coal – and 8% from the transport industry. With an ever-increasing population, the demand for electricity has grown with no respite, leading to even more coal-burning and worsened air standards. Furthermore, despite pledging to reach net zero emissions before 2060, the country remains by far the world's largest producer and consumer of coal, which alone covers 60% of its electricity demand. In an effort to restore the economy to pre-pandemic levels and curb the energy crisis sparked by the exponential rise in industrial activities the country experienced in 2021, the Chinese government ordered factories to increase their production capacity and built more than triple the amount of new coal power capacity as the rest of the world combined. Unsurprisingly, CO2 emissions in the same year almost reached **12 billion tonnes**, accounting for **33% of the global total.**

To truly understand the urgency of this situation, according to The Guardian,

Ad Fontes Media rates The Guardian as Reliable, Analysis/Fact Reporting in terms of reliability. The Guardian is a British news website begun as a print newspaper in 1821. "Air Pollution in China Is Killing 4,000 People Every Day, a New Study Finds." The Guardian, Guardian News and Media, 14 Aug. 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/14/air-pollution-in-china-is-killing-4000-people-every-day-a-new-study-finds. BZ

Air pollution is killing about **4,000 people in China a day**, accounting for one in six premature deaths in the world's most populous country, a new study finds. Physicists at the University of California, Berkeley, calculated about 1.6 million people in China die each year from heart, lung and stroke problems because of incredibly polluted air, especially small particles of haze. Earlier studies put the annual Chinese air pollution death toll at one to two million but this is the first to use newly released air monitoring figures. The study, to be published in the journal PLOS One, blames emissions from the burning of coal, both for electricity and heating homes. It uses real air measurements and then computer model calculations that estimate heart, lung and stroke deaths for different types of pollutants. Study lead author Robert Rohde said 38% of the Chinese population lived in an area with a long-term air quality average the US Environmental Protection Agency called "unhealthy."

Think of the hundreds that have died a slow, painful death since the start of this tournament at the hands of pollution.

The Aff's SOLUTION: A carbon tax will be passed – deter emissions and generate revenue to spend on healthcare for the people impacted by pollution

Parry & Wingender 16, Ian Parry is an **environmental fiscal policy expert** for the International Monetary Fund. Philippe Wingender is a senior economist of The World Economic Studies Division of the IMF's Research Department. Parry, Ian, and Philippe Wingender. "The Overwhelming Case for a Carbon Tax in China." IMF, IMF Blog, 27 July 2016, https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2016/07/27/the-overwhelming-case-for-a-carbon-tax-in-china. BZ

A single policy could do it all for China. A carbon tax—an upstream tax on the carbon content of fossil fuel supply—could dramatically cut greenhouse gases, save millions of lives, soothe the government's fiscal anxieties, and boost green growth. According to IMF estimates, a tax on carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions, rising by **$5 per year** between 2017 and 2030, could reduce CO_2 emissions by **30 percent** in **2030**, well in excess of what is needed to fulfill China's pledge for the 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change. The carbon tax [It] could also save close to **4 million** lives during this **14-year[s]** period (Figure 1), principally by deterring use of coal, the main source of the fine particulates that elevate the risk of strokes, heart, and lung diseases. And the tax would raise well over **2 percent of GDP** in new revenue by **2030**, a huge bonus which represents **more than enough to double government spending on healthcare.** In fact, this is good news for the planet given that China is by far the world's leading producer of CO_2 emissions, contributing 25 percent to the global total in 2013, compared with 16 and 6 percent from the United States and India, respectively, the world's second and third largest emitters. Predicting the effects of a carbon tax These findings are based on a new spreadsheet tool developed at the IMF, for projecting future fuel use by economic sector. Using assumptions about how fuel demand would respond to price changes, and previous IMF estimates of local air pollution deaths from fuel combustion for China, we are able to assess the carbon, public health, and fiscal impacts of carbon taxation. The future is of course inherently uncertain so the numbers should not be taken too literally, but they do at least provide a broad indication of the likely impacts of carbon taxes. Moving it forward Administering a carbon tax is straightforward. It involves a **tax** on fossil fuel **products at their point of entry** in the economy with rates levied on coal, petroleum products, and natural gas **based on the tons of CO_2 produced** per unit of fuel. The government could collect the tax at the mine mouth for coal (where royalties are already collected) or at coal processing plants, at the refinery for petroleum products, at the border for imported fuel products, and so on. Yes, downsides exist, but they are manageable. The most difficult challenge is dealing with the burden of higher energy prices on vulnerable groups, though impacts should not be overstated—in 2020, for example, the carbon tax raises electricity prices by around 5 percent.

AND if we don't prevent climate change, we face extreme warming and global extinction within a decade

Krosofsky 21, Andrew Krosofsky is a writer and **environmental journalist** for Green Matters, a media company covering awareness and solutions around the climate crisis. Krosofsky, Andrew. "How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction." Green Matters, Green Matters, 11 Mar. 2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction. BZ

Life on this planet has gone through many extinction-level events over time. Most of these phenomena were caused by natural, cataclysmic forces beyond the control of any of the lifeforms existing at that time. The current cataclysmic forces are anything but natural and they are well within our control. The question is not, "will global warming cause extinction?"— it's, "how can we prevent that inevitability from happening?" Will global warming cause extinction? Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species, humankind included.** In fact, the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet. Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won't be able to handle long-term. **Extreme weather patterns are** shifting climates across the globe, **eliminating habitats and altering the** landscape. As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced. Then, of course, there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions. What species will go extinct if global warming continues? The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming. Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean

acidification. This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia's Great Barrier Reef, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that **more than 30 percent of Earth's plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050.** By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. Will global warming cause humanity's extinction? We won't try and sugarcoat things, humanity's own prospects aren't looking that great either. According to The Conversation, our species has just under a decade left to get our CO_2 emissions under control. **If we don't cut** those **emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to** potentially **catastrophic levels.** It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense. The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, but **it will mean less food, [and]** less **water,** and increased hardship across the world — **especially in low-income areas** and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires. It's difficult to calculate the numbers in these cases or to assess precisely what risks we will all be facing, but this is because we have never experienced anything like it before.

Contention 2: Contaminated Water

Many Chinese rely on polluted water to survive and die as a result

The Aff's SOLUTION to this is to improve sewage laws, and prevent careless waste dumping

Igini 22. Martina is an **environmental journalist** based in Hong Kong. She holds two Bachelor's degrees in Journalism and Translation/Interpreting Studies and a Master's degree in International Development. Igini, Martina. "Top 5 Environmental Issues in China in 2022." Earth.Org, 4 Aug. 2022, https://earth.org/environmental-issues-in-china/. BZ

2. Water Pollution High on the list of environmental issues in China is water pollution. As much as **90% of** the country's **groundwater is contaminated by toxic** human and industrial **waste** dumping, as well as farm fertilisers, causing about 70% of rivers and lakes to be unsafe for human use. Nearly **half of the population does not have access to** water that is **safe** for human consumption, while two-thirds of the rural population has to rely on tainted **water** due to a lack of adequate systems to treat wastewater. Based on this, it is clear that **in China, the water you drink is as dangerous as the air you breathe.** While air pollution can be observed by the naked eye, underground water pollution in cities is not as visible, causing it to be virtually forgotten and continue unabated. **For decades, factories were able to discharge their wastewater into lakes and rivers across the country due to poor environmental regulations, weak enforcement, and the government's failure to crack down on polluting industries.** However, significant progress has been made in recent years. The Thirteenth Five Year Plan (13FYP) in 2016 set specific goals for water consumption and water quality, aiming at reducing water consumption by 23% from 2015 levels by 2020. This includes upgrading [upgraded] urban sewage facilities, increasing rates of wastewater treatment, and forcing farmers to reduce the use of chemical fertilisers and insecticides in a bid to reduce contamination from agricultural pollutants. According to the 2020 State of Ecology & Environment Report, most of the key targets set in 13FYP have been met and exceeded, owing to the fact that within a very short period of time, the country managed to build [built] more than 39,000 new sewage treatment facilities in **95%** of municipalities and 30% **of** rural **areas.** To further improve water quality, the Chinese government funded the construction or renovation of nearly 80,000 kilometres of sewage collection pipeline network between 2021 and 2025. Despite surface water continuing to improve, groundwater quality still has a long way to go, with just 13.6% considered fit for human consumption, according to the report. **Water pollution still causes more than 100,000 deaths and economic losses of USD$1.5 trillion each year**; this environmental issue is therefore something that China can no longer afford to ignore.

Contention 3: Flooding

Climate change causes flooding and extreme rain RIGHT NOW, leading to billions of dollars in economic damage

Ye 22. Yuan is a **Shanghai-based journalist** who writes for Sixth Tone. Ye, Yuan. "Global Warming of 2C Could 'Double' Flooding Costs in China Compared to 1.5C." Carbon Brief, 1 Aug. 2022, https://www.carbonbrief.org/global-warming-of-2c-could-double-flooding-costs-in-china-compared-to-1-5c/. BZ

Economic losses from flooding in China at 2C of global warming could be double those at 1.5C, research suggests. The study, published in the journal Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, estimates future flood risk across China under 1.5C and 2C of warming and its impact on people and wider society. Compared with 1.5C of global warming, "the probability of the severe flood would be significantly higher for global warming of 2C", the study finds, adding that "in some areas, the probability would double". The direct economic losses at 1.5C would total around $33bn per year (£27bn) for "severe" floods, rising to $70bn (£57bn) for "mild" floods that would affect more of the country. At 2C, these projected costs approximately double, the authors say. Flooding would have the largest impact for the "social economy in the regions with lower altitudes and smaller slopes in eastern China", the study says. However, the range of medium-high flood risk will "gradually expand westward and northward". The study presents a "clear message that **the warmer we let the climate get[s], the greater the losses of dollars** will be from flooding", a scientist not involved in the research tells Carbon Brief. They add that the findings are "important" because they allow policymakers to "see the economic cost of not responding". Rising flood risk **In** late July **2021**, a record-breaking deluge dumped close to a year's worth of rain in just three days on the central Chinese city Zhengzhou, home to 12 million people. The resulting flooding became the deadliest natural disaster for the city in decades, with close to 400 people killed. BREAKING – Heavy rain pounded the central Chinese province of Henan, bursting the banks of major rivers, flooding the streets of a dozen cities including Zhengzhou and trapping subway passengers waist-high in floodwaters pic.twitter.com/JSxYhz1k5a— Insider Paper (@TheInsiderPaper) July 20, 2021 Unprecedented **rainfall** also hit the nearby cities in Henan province, triggering **[triggered] flash flooding and landslides. Crops were submerged, more than 50 thousand houses were destroyed and more than 1.4 million people were evacuated from their homes.** Overall, the rain caused direct economic losses of 120bn yuan (£15bn), including 41bn yuan (£5bn) in Zhengzhou alone. In the wake of the floods, mentions of climate change increased, though modestly, in news reports on extreme weather in Chinese media. Wang Zhihua, head of disaster relief at the China Meteorological Administration, blamed climate change for the natural disaster in a press briefing after the flood. He said: "The increased likelihood of extreme weather has become one of the biggest risks facing the world, which requires our great attention. For the response, the focus is to step up monitoring and early warning capacity." Flooding drives the largest economic losses among all other natural disasters in China in recent years, but flood insurance is not yet widely taken up. In 2021, China's economic losses from flood-related events stood at $25bn, behind Europe's losses of $41.8bn, according to Zurich-based reinsurer Swiss Re. This year, extreme weather hit the southern parts of China again with torrential rains, disrupting the lives of half a million people, with flash floods that turned roads into swollen rivers and submerged houses and cars. Economic exposure The new study, conducted by researchers from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, compares the flood exposure and social economic impact from rainfall-driven flooding across China, under different future scenarios. The researchers use the global warming levels of 1.5C and 2C, in keeping with the limits set out in the Paris Agreement. They use two different scenarios for these levels – the intermediate emissions of RCP4.5 and the very high emissions of RCP8.5. Glossary RCP8.5: The RCPs (Representative Concentration Pathways) are scenarios of future concentrations of greenhouse gases and other forcings. RCP8.5 is a "very high baseline" emission scenario brought about by rapid population growth, high energy… Read More The study notes that global warming is "projected to reach 1.5C by around 2030 for both RCPs, whereas the 2C is reached by 2040 under RCP8.5 and by 2050 under RCP4.5".

Homelessness increases due to flood destruction – prioritizing the environment through methods such as tree planting can solve, by soaking up large amounts of rain

Kusmer 20. Anna Kusmer is a **reporter and producer** at The World focusing on the environment. Kusmer, Anna. "How China's Nature-Based Solutions Help with Extreme Flooding." The World from PRX, 31 July 2020, https://theworld.org/stories/2020-07-31/how-china-s-nature-based-solutions-help-extreme-flooding. BZ

Southern China's rainy season lasted nearly twice as long this year. Record rainfall caused the country's longest river, the Yangtze, to overflow along the river's middle and lower regions. "A normal rainy season is about 24 days," said Xiquan Dong, an extreme weather expert at the University of Arizona. "This year we got 43." But so far, this year's flooding has not been as catastrophic as the fatal floods of 1998, leading some environmental experts to evaluate how nature-based mitigation strategies like tree planting and floodplain restoration have helped to ease the fallout. "[This year's] precipitation is much higher than the year of 1998, but the flooding has been less serious and damaging." Junguo Liu, chair professor, School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, China "[This year's] precipitation is much higher than the year of 1998, but the flooding has been less serious and damaging," said Junguo, chair professor in the School of Environmental Science and Engineering at Southern University of Science and Technology in Shenzhen, China. This year, about 158 people have been reported dead or missing so far, and more than 400,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, according to China's Ministry of Emergency Management. In contrast, the 1998 flood killed more than 3,000 people and left 15 million people homeless. The Chinese government attributed the 1998 floods to uncharacteristically heavy rains, as well as rampant deforestation and high population density along the Yangtze and its tributaries. Liu said the 1998 disaster caused the Chinese government to completely rethink flooding management. The new approach — rolled out in the 10 years after the 1998 flood as part of the National Climate Change Program — shifted the focus toward nature-based solutions for flood risk management. "Definitely this is a very important turning point for the Chinese government to think about the relation between human and nature," said Liu. Tree-planting and 'sponge cities' For centuries, China's flood control strategy relied on levees built at the riverbank's edge to keep the water in narrow river channels, with people living and farming on the other side. With over 20,000 miles of levees, China has had one of the most extensive levee systems in the world. To reverse some of the damage done by an overburdened levee system, China launched some of the largest **ecological restoration projects** in the world, planting billions of trees to prevent runoff into rivers and absorb more water upstream. "The Chinese government initiated a lot of programs for the forestry restoration," said Liu. "So, when we plant more trees … upstream, this can reduce the runoff. And this is very helpful for the mitigation of flood[s] events." While the tree-planting schemes have received some criticism for how they were executed, Liu says his studies show that depending on the context, upland **tree planting can help reduce flooding by up to 30%.** Additionally, the government's "sponge cities" project aims to increase green spaces and permeable pavement to absorb more rainwater in urban spaces prone to flooding.

THUS, IN SUMMARY

Contention 1] Because air pollution is happening RIGHT NOW, killing thousands every day and hour, we need to solve climate change. The solution is to tax emissions.

Contention 2] Because people are dying from contaminated water RIGHT NOW, we need to solve this by upgrading sewage regulations.

Contention 3] YOU CAN'T HAVE A HEALTHY ECONOMY IF FLOODS ARE CAUSING $70 BILLION IN DAMAGES. Economic benefits can result from preventing climate change and extreme floods, by planting more trees to absorb heavy rainfall. This ensures a prosperous and sustainable society for all of us.

And because we must protect the world we live in, I proudly affirm. I stand open to CX.

V1 Extensions

Definitions

Diffen ND | PRC = China = country in East Asia. Controls mainland China.

OECD 1 | Environmental protection = maintain quality of environment thru reducing pollution and preventing degradation of ecosystems

Investopedia 21| Econ growth = increase in production of economic goods & services

Collins ND | Prioritize = treat as more important than other things

Util Framework

Prefer the framework of maximizing human well-being:

1] Rasul 20 | Specifically the word "prioritize" in the resolution is from a perspective of maximizing human well-being, due to having to decide what our highest priority should be for policy choices. Hence, we need to choose the better policy – the one that does the most good for society, a.k.a. saving human lives.

2] Moen 16 | Pain and pleasure are all we value, based on everyday experiences and reasoning. When we ask "why buy soda?", it's to drink. "Why drink soda?" -> "because it's sweet". "Why pursue sweet snacks?" -> "because it makes one happy". Everything comes down to seeking pleasure and avoiding pain, so this is what we ought to use as our framework.

3] Pummer 15 | Disagreements in philosophy have happened for centuries, yet we still can't settle on it. To keep discussing, we need to preserve the human species, but if we all go extinct (along with trillions of future possible people), we will never find the true meaning of morality. Hence, preventing extinction comes first.

C1 – Carbon Tax / Climate

Parry & Wingender 16 | A carbon tax rising by $5 per year could reduce emissions 30%, by 2030. It's easy to implement: tax polluting products at their point of entry, like at a border or coal mine. This gradually seeks to achieve zero emissions by discouraging pollution, yet allows some economic activity to happen.

Igini 22 + Guardian | The immediate impact is a slow mass-death. That's 4000 Chinese people dying PER DAY, and 1.2 million EVERY YEAR. And because China contributes to one third of all pollution on Earth, a carbon tax in China will be significant to help stop warming.

Krosofsky 21 | The long-term impact is climate change extinction. Rising global temperatures will cook us all alive by 2030 - this is urgent because of its high probability and the short amount of time we have to address it.

C2 – Contaminated Water

Igini 22 | 90% of China's water is toxic, because of poor environmental regulations and unrestricted waste-dumping near rivers and lakes. Half the population doesn't have clean drinking water, causing hundreds of thousands of deaths EVERY YEAR.

The solution is to upgrade sewage and further enforce regulations on waste disposal – no more careless littering by factories.

C3 – Flooding (definitely extend in 1AR)

Ye 22 | 70 billion dollars in damage result from flooding and heavy rain, caused by climate change – crops are destroyed, homes demolished, and millions must evacuate. This is because of changing wind currents and warming that messes with weather patterns. You can't build up any economic growth if everything is being destroyed. Hence, the urgency of this issue calls for immediate prioritization of the environment.

Kusmer 20 | In addition, 15 million people have become homeless from recent floodings. The cause is deforestation, due to economic growth, cutting down forests vital to absorbing rainwater. Hence, the Aff proposes ecological restoration projects to plant more trees, reducing flooding by 30%.

Impact Weighing

Environment (timeframe): Climate change extinction will happen by 2030 [Krosofsky].

Environment (probability): It's happening right now, constantly as we speak, and has been happening for the past few centuries – 100% probability if we don't do anything.

Climate 1AC v2

Resolution

I affirm Resolved: The People's Republic of China ought to prioritize environmental protection over economic growth.

Definitions

First on definitions:

“China” is a country in East Asia

Diffen No Date. Diffen is the world's largest collection of unbiased comparisons that help people make decisions. Compare anything on Diffen -- products, services, organizations, religions, athletes, celebrities, programming languages. “People's Republic of China vs Republic of China.” *Diffen*, https://www.diffen.com/difference/People%27s_Republic_Of_China_vs_Republic_Of_China. BZ

The People's Republic of China is commonly **known as China** and the Republic of China is commonly known as Taiwan. These are separate states with a shared history; China claims sovereignty over Taiwan. After the Kuomintang reunified China in 1928, most of mainland China was governed by the Republic of China (ROC). The island of Taiwan was under Japanese rule at the time. At the end of World War II in 1945, Japan surrenedered Taiwan to the Republic of China. In 1949, there was a civil war in China and the government (ROC) lost control of mainland China to the Communist Party, which established the People's Republic of China (**PRC**) and took **control[s]** of all of **mainland China**. Only the island of Taiwan remained under the control of the ROC.

“Environmental protection”

OECD 1. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an international organization that works together with governments, policy makers and citizens to establish evidence-based international standards and finding solutions to a range of social, economic and environmental challenges. OECD provides a unique forum and knowledge hub for data and analysis, exchange of experiences, best-practice sharing, and advice on public policies and international standard-setting. OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms - Environmental Protection Definition, OECD, 25 Sept. 2001, https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=836#:~:text=Definition%3A,polluting%20substances%20in%20environmental%20media. BZ

Environmental protection refers to any activity **to maintain or restore the quality of environment**al media **through preventing** the emission of pollutants **or reducing** the presence of **polluting substances** in environmental media. It may consist of: (a) changes in characteristics of goods and services, (b) changes in consumption patterns, (c) changes in production techniques, (d) treatment or disposal of residuals in separate environmental protection facilities, (e) recycling, and (f) **prevention** of **degradation of** the landscape and **ecosystems**.

“Economic Growth”

Investopedia 21, Investopedia was founded in 1999 with the mission of simplifying financial decisions and information to give readers the confidence to manage every aspect of their financial life. Team, Investopedia. “Economic Growth Definition.” Investopedia, Investopedia, 1 Jan. 2021, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/e/economicgrowth.asp. BZ

Economic growth is an increase in the production of economic **goods and services**, compared from one period of time to another. It can be measured in nominal or real (adjusted for inflation) terms. Traditionally, aggregate economic growth is measured in terms of gross national product (GNP) or gross domestic product (GDP), although alternative metrics are sometimes used.

“Prioritize”

Collins ND, https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/prioritize BZ

If you prioritize something, you treat it as more important than other things. *Prioritize your own wants rather than constantly thinking about others.*

Framework

"Prioritize" is from a perspective of maximizing human well-being

Rasul 20, Dr Golam Rasul, former Chief Economist, at International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD). Prior to his appointment as a Chief Economist, he served as a Theme Leader livelihoods, Head of the Economic Analysis Division and Policy Development Specialist at ICIMOD for about nine years. Dr Rasul holds a PhD in regional and rural development planning from the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), Thailand. Rasul, Golam. "A Framework for Improving Policy Priorities in Managing COVID-19 Challenges in Developing Countries." National Library of Medicine, Frontiers Media S.A., 14 Oct. 2020, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7591500/#:~:text=Priority%20setting%20is%20a%20complex,explicitly%20chosen%20and%20agreed%20criteria. BZ

Priority setting is a complex process involving **[involves] making decisions on** the allocation **[allocating]** of **resources to improve policy** goals. The interests, motivations, and preferences of the diverse array of stakeholders will differ, thus prioritization needs to be based on explicitly chosen and agreed criteria. Dimension of Priorities Prioritization is a multidimensional concept and can be seen from different perspectives, all of which need to be understood and taken into account. **From a moral** and ethical **perspective, managing** existing, and emerging **threats to human lives is** a societal obligation and **the primary responsibility of states** (24, 25). Thus, **the highest priority should be given to policy choices that save human lives** by reducing health risks, improving health care, reducing communicable diseases, and ensuring provision of basic health services, together with those aimed at meeting basic human needs such as access to food, water, and shelter. From a utilitarian perspective, policy choices should be guided by the utility generated and cost-effectiveness, since resources are finite (26, 27). Thus, the highest priority should be given to the policy choices that are most cost-effective **and generate the maximum net social benefits**. From an egalitarian perspective, equity, and fairness are equally important in policy choices (28, 29). Cost-effectiveness is important but should not be the sole criterion; an equally high priority is given to protecting those who are most at risk and serving the most deprived even if this is less cost-effective. From a resilience perspective, present actions should prepare for transition to a more resilient and better society (12, 30). Thus, a high priority should be given to policy options that enhance long-term social, economic, and environmental benefits that lay the basis for long term resilience and build the capacity to deal with future challenges.

Thus, the value of morality is achieved by maximizing human well-being

Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo "An Argument for Hedonism" Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have.** "Pleasure" and "pain" are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, **I might ask: "What for?" This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so**, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but **for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable.** You might answer, for example: "To

buy soda." This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: "What is buying the soda good for?" This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: "Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it." **If I then proceed by asking "But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?" the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.**3 As Aristotle observes**: "We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**"4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says "This is painful!" we never respond by asking: "And why is that a problem?" We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

AND preventing extinction comes first due to moral uncertainty – save humanity now so we can deliberate more in the future

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. "Moral Agreement on Saving the World" Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] brett

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are **deep and irresolvable**, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – **whether we're consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists** – should all agree that **we should try to save the world**. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions [of] upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even ifthe well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there's nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there's a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations(the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But **that is a huge mistake**. Non-consequentialism is the view that there's more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don't matter. Even John Rawls wrote, "All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy." Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They'd thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn't significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one's character. What's even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial "point of view of the universe," indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one's own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don't care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler's recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I'd have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I've just argued that there's agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It's possible they'll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, **all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world**. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won't get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: "We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy.... Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly." (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

Contentions

Contention 1: Climate Change

China is a major contributor to global warming – protecting the environment is an obligation and within their power

BBC 21. The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) is the national broadcaster of the United Kingdom. Headquartered at Broadcasting House in London, it is the world's oldest national broadcaster, and the largest broadcaster in the world by number of employees. "Report: China Emissions Exceed All Developed Nations Combined." BBC News, BBC, 7 May 2021, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-57018837. BZ

China emits more greenhouse gas than the entire developed world combined, a new report has claimed. The research by Rhodium Group says China emitted 27% of the world's greenhouse gases in 2019. The US was the second-largest emitter at 11% while India was third with 6.6% of emissions, the think tank said. Scientists warn that without an agreement between the US and China it will be hard to avert dangerous climate change. China's emissions more than tripled over the previous three decades, the report from the US-based Rhodium Group added. The Asian giant has the world's largest population, so its per person emissions are still far behind the US, but the research said those emissions have increased too, tripling over the course of two decades. China has vowed to reach net-zero emissions by 2060 with a peak no later than 2030. President Xi Jinping reiterated his pledge at a climate summit organised by US President Joe Biden last month. "This major strategic decision is made based on our sense of responsibility to build a community with a shared future for mankind and our own need to secure sustainable development," President Xi said at the time. However, China is heavily reliant on coal power. The country is currently running 1,058 [1,000] coal plants - more than half the world's capacity. Under the Paris accord, agreed in 2015, 197 nations pledged to limit global warming to below 2C. However, the world is far from meeting that commitment. Central to the Paris Agreement are Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). These are targets intended to cut emissions. NDCs represent the commitments by each country - under the Paris pact - to reduce their own national emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change. According to the Climate Action Tracker, an independent scientific analysis that tracks government climate action, China's NDC rating is "highly insufficient" and "are not at all consistent with holding warming to below 2C". President Biden's climate envoy, John Kerry travelled to China last month to meet counterparts and discuss how to work together to combat climate change, despite diplomatic tensions between the two countries on a range of other issues. In a joint statement, the two sides committed to working together and with other countries on tackling climate change including specific action on emissions. Leaders will come together for COP26 - a crucial climate change summit - in November in Glasgow, UK to accelerate action towards the goals of the Paris Agreement.

There are two ways China solves:

1] A carbon tax will be passed – deter emissions and generate revenue to spend on healthcare for the people impacted by pollution

Parry & Wingender 16, Ian Parry is an environmental fiscal policy expert for the International Monetary Fund. Philippe Wingender is a senior economist of The World Economic Studies Division of the IMF's Research Department. Parry, Ian, and Philippe Wingender. "The Overwhelming Case for a Carbon Tax in China." IMF, IMF Blog, 27 July 2016, https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2016/07/27/the-overwhelming-case-for-a-carbon-tax-in-china. BZ

A single policy could do it all for China. A carbon tax—an upstream tax on the carbon content of fossil fuel supply—could dramatically cut greenhouse gases, save millions of lives, soothe the government's fiscal anxieties, and boost green growth. According to IMF estimates, a tax on carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions, rising by **$5 per year** between 2017 and 2030, could reduce CO_2 emissions by **30 percent** in **2030**, well in excess of what is needed to fulfill China's pledge for the 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change. The carbon tax [It] could also save close to **4 million** lives during this **14-year[s]** period (Figure 1), principally by deterring use of coal, the main source of the fine particulates that elevate the risk of strokes, heart, and lung diseases. And the tax would raise well over **2 percent of GDP** in new revenue by **2030**, a huge bonus which represents **more than enough to double government spending on healthcare.** In fact, this is good news for the planet given that China is by far the world's leading producer of CO_2 emissions, contributing 25 percent to the global total in

2013, compared with 16 and 6 percent from the United States and India, respectively, the world's second and third largest emitters. Predicting the effects of a carbon tax These findings are based on a new spreadsheet tool developed at the IMF, for projecting future fuel use by economic sector. Using assumptions about how fuel demand would respond to price changes, and previous IMF estimates of local air pollution deaths from fuel combustion for China, we are able to assess the carbon, public health, and fiscal impacts of carbon taxation. The future is of course inherently uncertain so the numbers should not be taken too literally, but they do at least provide a broad indication of the likely impacts of carbon taxes. Moving it forward Administering a carbon tax is straightforward. It involves a **tax** on fossil fuel **products at their point of entry** in the economy with rates levied on coal, petroleum products, and natural gas **based on the tons of CO2 produced** per unit of fuel. The government could collect the tax at the mine mouth for coal (where royalties are already collected) or at coal processing plants, at the refinery for petroleum products, at the border for imported fuel products, and so on. Yes, downsides exist, but they are manageable. The most difficult challenge is dealing with the burden of higher energy prices on vulnerable groups, though impacts should not be overstated—in 2020, for example, the carbon tax raises electricity prices by around 5 percent.

2] China *symbolically showing* that they value and prioritize environment leads to better cooperation with the U.S. in solving climate change, due to a renewed common goal

Shen et al. 22. Shiran Victoria Shen is the W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell national fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution, as well as an assistant professor of environmental politics at the University of Virginia. Jean C. Oi is the William Haas professor of Chinese politics, senior fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute of International Studies, as well as the director of Stanford University's China Program. She is also the Lee Shau Kee director of the Stanford Center at Peking University. Yi Cui is the director of Stanford University's Precourt Institute for Energy, as well as professor of materials science and engineering. He is a senior fellow at the Woods Institute for the Environment, and professor, by courtesy, of Chemistry, Stanford University. Liang Min is managing director of the Bits & Watts Initiative of the Precourt Institute for Energy at Stanford University. Oi, J. C., Shen, S. V., Cui, Y., & Min, L. (2022, April 26). Next steps in US-china climate cooperation. The Hill. Retrieved October 1, 2022, from https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/3464062-next-steps-in-us-china-climate-cooperation/ BZ

Second, we need to be explicitly cognizant of political and institutional constraints. This is necessary in order to translate promises into progress, while protecting social benefits and their equitable distribution amid the green energy transition. As noted in both the joint declaration and our report, bilateral dialogues so far remain very high-level. We need future discussions and workshops at the sectoral and local levels to develop concrete plans. In enacting and implementing concrete plans, political and institutional constraints can pose real obstacles, as demonstrated by China's past and ongoing efforts to control air pollution. Hence, strong support from both national and local governments will be critical. As a first step, we need to gain a good understanding of who the relevant actors are in both policy making and implementation and the incentives they face. In this period of transition when there are still regional mismatches between energy supply and demand, it is too easy to let short term needs push climate mitigation goals to the bottom of the barrel to address regional energy shortages. In both countries policymakers and those charged with implementation face multiple and sometimes conflicting goals. The prioritization of goals is shaped by incentive structures. Fostering incentive structures conducive to decarbonization is particularly important during the transitional period when consensus around goals and priorities is less clear. Furthermore, it is time to standardize standards. A recurring theme across our discussions is the need for shared, clearly **specified regulatory** frameworks and **standards across both nations**. **Harmoniz**ing standards will expedite trade, validation, accounting, **climate pledges** and environmental, social and corporate governance (ESG) evaluation. Only if there is standardization can organizations be required to follow unified disclosure practices for making available important information like the amount of carbon emitted. We need to make and implement more legislation to encourage a faster pace of decarbonization, and having unified terminology and standards is conducive to both effective carbon legislation and policy implementation. Common terminology and standards will provide a basis for carbon legislation. Having clearly stipulated standards and procedures can also make implementation easier and more straightforward. Last but not least, we are hopeful about the future of **U.S.-China cooperation** on climate change and believe that universities can play a significant role in the global energy transition. Universities are often the birthplaces of innovative technology, training grounds for talent from across the globe, as well as conveners of bilateral and multilateral dialogues. We hope the governments on both sides of the Pacific

will work together to hammer out the needed details to **build** the **momentum** and make a real impact **in the fight against** global **climate change**.

China-U.S. Cooperation is key to fight global warming

Mallapaty 22. As Editor in Chief, Magdalena leads Nature's magazine and research editorial teams. A geneticist by training, she has considerable editorial and publishing experience: having started in Nature Publishing Group in 2001, she was Chief Editor of Nature Reviews Genetics, Senior Editor for genetics and genomics at Nature, and Executive Editor for the Nature Partner Journals. Mallapaty, Smriti. "Will a Freeze in US–China Climate Talks Threaten Global Action?" Nature News, Nature Publishing Group, 11 Aug. 2022, https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-022-02169-x. BZ

Cooperation between the United States and China on global warming has been dealt a major blow after China's foreign ministry suspended climate talks with the United States. The decision came in response to last week's high-profile trip to Taiwan by Nancy Pelosi, US speaker of the US House of Representatives, which China says violated its sovereignty. Researchers say a temporary freeze in discussions will probably affect only high-level political engagements, but that a longer stand-off could have a chilling effect on academic collaborations. "Climate discussions have always been somewhat immune from the turbulent bilateral politics between the US and China," says Li Shuo, a policy adviser at Greenpeace China in Beijing. "But the announcement last Friday brought this relationship to a very new place." Talks between the world's two largest emitters of greenhouse gases are important for advancing global action on climate change, say researchers. Both countries have demonstrated their commitment to addressing the problem within their borders: over the weekend, the US Senate passed a massive spending bill to invest in clean-energy technologies, and China has promised to become carbon neutral before 2060. But cooperation between the two countries could accelerate action this decade, especially in areas such as the cutting of methane emissions. A protracted rift between the two could also threaten the success of discussions at the next round of global climate talks in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, in November. Meetings between the United States and China have been crucial in facilitating multilateral consensus at previous summits, says Fei Teng, a climate-policy researcher at Tsinghua University in Beijing. "I hope that China and the US can resolve this conflict soon and go back to the regular routine." If the freeze in communications continues until then, Li Shuo anticipates a more politically divisive climate summit in Egypt. But others think that such multilateral engagements will probably continue. Joint agreement Discussions on climate change between the two countries ramped up when US President Joe Biden took office in January 2021, after being on the back-burner for several years. In April, climate envoy John Kerry became the first senior member of Biden's administration to visit China, meeting Xie Zhenhua, China's representative on climate change. A second trip followed in September, and at the climate summit in Glasgow, UK, in November, the two countries signed a joint declaration to enhance climate action in the 2020s, including setting standards for emissions reduction, deploying carbon-capture and -storage technologies, and measuring and controlling methane emissions. Kerry and Xie met again at the World Economic Forum in Davos in May. Researchers say China's suspension is currently restricted to talks between Kerry's and Xie's teams.

THUS, the impact is the extinction of humanity via climate change – the timeframe is soon

Krosofsky 21, Andrew Krosofsky is a writer and environmental journalist for Green Matters, a media company covering awareness and solutions around the climate crisis. Krosofsky, Andrew. "How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction." Green Matters, Green Matters, 11 Mar. 2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction. BZ

Life on this planet has gone through many extinction-level events over time. Most of these phenomena were caused by natural, cataclysmic forces beyond the control of any of the lifeforms existing at that time. The current cataclysmic forces are anything but natural and they are well within our control. The question is not, "will global warming cause extinction?"— it's, "how can we prevent that inevitability from happening?" Will global warming cause extinction? Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species, humankind included.** In fact, the Center

for Biological Diversity says that **global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet.** Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won't be able to handle long-term. **Extreme weather patterns are** shifting climates across the globe, **eliminating habitats and altering the landscape**. As a result, **food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures** themselves, **which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions. What species will go extinct if global warming continues? The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming. Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have** already **led to ocean acidification**. This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia's Great Barrier Reef, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that **more than 30 percent of Earth's plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century,** that number could be as high as **70 percent**. Will global warming cause humanity's extinction? We won't try and sugarcoat things, **humanity**'s own prospects aren't looking that great either. According to The Conversation, our species **has just under a decade left** to get our CO_2 emissions under control. **If we don't cut** those **emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to** potentially **catastrophic levels.** It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense. The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, but **it will mean less food,** less **water,** and **increased hardship** across the world — **especially in low-income areas and developing countries**. This increase will also mean **more pandemics,** devastating **storms, and** uncontrollable **wildfires**. It's difficult to calculate the numbers in these cases or to assess precisely what risks we will all be facing, but this is because we have never experienced anything like it before.

Contention 2: Flooding

Climate change causes flooding and extreme rain RIGHT NOW, leading to billions of dollars in economic damage

Ye 22. Yuan is a Shanghai-based journalist who writes for Sixth Tone. Ye, Yuan. "Global Warming of 2C Could 'Double' Flooding Costs in China Compared to 1.5C." Carbon Brief, 1 Aug. 2022, https://www.carbonbrief.org/global-warming-of-2c-could-double-flooding-costs-in-china-compared-to-1-5c/. BZ

Economic losses from flooding in China at 2C of global warming could be double those at 1.5C, research suggests. The study, published in the journal Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, estimates future flood risk across China under 1.5C and 2C of warming and its impact on people and wider society. Compared with 1.5C of global warming, "the probability of the severe flood would be significantly higher for global warming of 2C", the study finds, adding that "in some areas, the probability would double". The direct economic losses at 1.5C would total around $33bn per year (£27bn) for "severe" floods, rising to $70bn (£57bn) for "mild" floods that would affect more of the country. At 2C, these projected costs approximately double, the authors say. Flooding would have the largest impact for the "social economy in the regions with lower altitudes and smaller slopes in eastern China", the study says. However, the range of medium-high flood risk will "gradually expand westward and northward". The study presents a "clear message that **the warmer we let the climate get[s], the greater the losses of dollars** will be from flooding", a scientist not involved in the research tells Carbon Brief. They add that the findings are "important" because they allow policymakers to "see the economic cost of not responding". Rising flood risk **In** late July **2021**, a record-breaking deluge dumped close to a year's worth of rain in just three days on the central Chinese city Zhengzhou, home to 12 million people. The resulting flooding became the deadliest natural disaster for the city in decades, with close to 400 people killed. BREAKING – Heavy rain pounded the central Chinese province of Henan, bursting the banks of major rivers, flooding the streets of a dozen cities including Zhengzhou and trapping subway passengers waist-high in floodwaters pic.twitter.com/JSxYhz1k5a— Insider Paper (@TheInsiderPaper) July 20, 2021 Unprecedented **rainfall** also hit the nearby cities in Henan province, triggering **[triggered] flash flooding and landslides. Crops were submerged, more than 50 thousand houses were destroyed and more than 1.4 million people were evacuated from their homes.** Overall, the rain caused direct economic losses of 120bn yuan (£15bn), including 41bn yuan (£5bn) in Zhengzhou alone. In the wake of the floods, mentions of climate change increased, though modestly, in news reports on extreme weather in Chinese media. Wang Zhihua, head of disaster relief at the China Meteorological Administration, blamed climate change for the natural disaster in a press briefing after the flood. He said: "The increased likelihood of extreme weather has become one of the biggest risks facing the world, which requires our great attention. For the response, the focus is to step up monitoring and early warning capacity." Flooding drives the largest economic losses among all other natural disasters in China in recent years, but flood insurance is not yet widely taken up. In 2021, China's economic losses from flood-related events stood at $25bn, behind Europe's losses of $41.8bn, according to Zurich-based reinsurer Swiss Re. This year, extreme weather hit the southern parts of China again with torrential rains, disrupting the lives of half a million people, with flash floods that turned roads into swollen rivers and submerged houses and cars. Economic exposure The new study, conducted by researchers from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, compares the flood exposure and social economic impact from rainfall-driven flooding across China, under different future scenarios. The researchers use the global warming levels of 1.5C and 2C, in keeping with the limits set out in the Paris Agreement. They use two different scenarios for these levels – the intermediate emissions of RCP4.5 and the very high emissions of RCP8.5. Glossary RCP8.5: The RCPs (Representative Concentration Pathways) are scenarios of future concentrations of greenhouse gases and other forcings. RCP8.5 is a "very high baseline" emission scenario brought about by rapid population growth, high energy… Read More The study notes that global warming is "projected to reach 1.5C by around 2030 for both RCPs, whereas the 2C is reached by 2040 under RCP8.5 and by 2050 under RCP4.5".

Homelessness increases due to flood destruction – prioritizing the environment through methods such as tree planting can solve, by soaking up large amounts of rain

Kusmer 20. Anna Kusmer is a reporter and producer at The World focusing on the environment. Kusmer, Anna. “How China's Nature-Based Solutions Help with Extreme Flooding.” The World from PRX, 31 July 2020, https://theworld.org/stories/2020-07-31/how-china-s-nature-based-solutions-help-extreme-flooding. BZ

Southern China’s rainy season lasted nearly twice as long this year. Record rainfall caused the country’s longest river, the Yangtze, to overflow along the river’s middle and lower regions. “A normal rainy season is about 24 days,” said Xiquan Dong, an extreme weather expert at the University of Arizona. “This year we got 43.” But so far, this year’s flooding has not been as catastrophic as the fatal floods of 1998, leading some environmental experts to evaluate how nature-based mitigation strategies like tree planting and floodplain restoration have helped to ease the fallout. “[This year’s] precipitation is much higher than the year of 1998, but the flooding has been less serious and damaging." Junguo Liu, chair professor, School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, China “[This year’s] precipitation is much higher than the year of 1998, but the flooding has been less serious and damaging,” said Junguo, chair professor in the School of Environmental Science and Engineering at Southern University of Science and Technology in Shenzhen, China. This year, about 158 people have been reported dead or missing so far, and more than 400,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, according to China’s Ministry of Emergency Management. In contrast, the 1998 flood killed more than 3,000 people and left 15 million people homeless. The Chinese government attributed the 1998 floods to uncharacteristically heavy rains, as well as rampant deforestation and high population density along the Yangtze and its tributaries. Liu said the 1998 disaster caused the Chinese government to completely rethink flooding management. The new approach — rolled out in the 10 years after the 1998 flood as part of the National Climate Change Program — shifted the focus toward nature-based solutions for flood risk management. “Definitely this is a very important turning point for the Chinese government to think about the relation between human and nature,” said Liu. Tree-planting and 'sponge cities' For centuries, China’s flood control strategy relied on levees built at the riverbank’s edge to keep the water in narrow river channels, with people living and farming on the other side. With over 20,000 miles of levees, China has had one of the most extensive levee systems in the world. To reverse some of the damage done by an overburdened levee system, China launched some of the largest **ecological restoration projects** in the world, planting billions of trees to prevent runoff into rivers and absorb more water upstream. “The Chinese government initiated a lot of programs for the forestry restoration,” said Liu. “So, when we plant more trees … upstream, this can reduce the runoff. And this is very helpful for the mitigation of flood[s] events.” While the tree-planting schemes have received some criticism for how they were executed, Liu says his studies show that depending on the context, upland **tree planting can help reduce flooding by up to 30%.** Additionally, the government's “sponge cities” project aims to increase green spaces and permeable pavement to absorb more rainwater in urban spaces prone to flooding.

Contention 3: Green Tech Economy

Green tech can only come from prioritizing the environment – we can't just leave the economy alone and hope for the best

Oreskes 15. Naomi Oreskes, Harvard professor of environmental science, 15 Naomi Oreskes, American historian of science. She is a Professor of the History of Science and Affiliated Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences at Harvard University, 12-1-2015, Without Government, the Marketplace Will Not Solve Climate Change, https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/without-government-the-marketplace-will-not-solve-climate-change/, 10-8-2022

A price on carbon will push demand in the right direction, but it needs to be reinforced by the pull of public investment in innovation. The most likely way we will get the innovation we need, at the scale we need, in the time frame we need and at a retail price that people can afford, is if the public sector plays a significant role. It is possible that the market will bring us a technological breakthrough on climate change. But history suggests that this would be a long shot—even with a hefty price on carbon—because **not one of the major technological developments of the 20th century was produced by the private sector working alone**. Entrepreneurs such as Thomas Edison and George Westinghouse developed electricity, but it took the federal government to build the delivery systems that brought it to the lion's share of Americans. The same is true of telephone service. The federal government, starting with President Dwight Eisenhower, was needed to build an interstate highway system. Nuclear power was not a response to market demand: the U.S. government wanted to prove that the destructive power unleashed at Hiroshima and Nagasaki could have a constructive use. The U.S. military invented the Internet, as a technology under the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. Former vice president Al Gore helped draft and pass the legislation that eventually released the Internet as a civilian technology that the private sector could commercialize and sell to millions of customers. The federal government developed digital computers, satellite communications, weather forecasting and the **g**lobal **p**ositioning **s**ystems that tell mobile phones where we are. These transformative technologies were all created as public-private partnerships, more often than not with the government as a lead partner. And they all took sustained effort over decades, the kind of effort for which the private sector has little stomach for. **A government pull is needed to develop climate solutions** that, like the Internet, can be further advanced and marketed by the private sector. ARPA-E (Energy), an agency modeled after DARPA, is funding research in these areas, but its budget is peanuts.

China could center its economy around environmental sustainability – ensures economic survival BOTH short and long-term, as opposed to an unsustainable coal-centered economy without regulations

Holzmann & Grünberg 21. Anna Holzmann is a Junior Research Associate at the Mercator Institute for China Studies (MERICS). Holzmann earned a B.Sc. in International Business Administration, a B.A. in Chinese Studies, and and M.A. in East Asian Economy & Society in Austria, Australia, and China. Nis Grünberg's research focuses on state-party governance, elite politics as well as China's sustainable development. He holds a PhD from CBS and BA and MA degrees in China Studies from Copenhagen University. Holzmann, Anna, and Nis Grünberg. "'Greening' China: An Analysis of Beijing's Sustainable Development Strategies." Merics, 7 Jan. 2021, https://merics.org/en/report/greening-china-analysis-beijings-sustainable-development-strategies. BZ

China's rapid economic growth since 1978 has been fueled mainly by coal. Combined with poorly regulated impacts of industrial production, this led to severe environmental damage to air, land and water. China overtook the US as the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gasses in 2006. Today, it is the source of over a quarter of global carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions. **China's government acknowledges the unsustainability of this development path and has started to attach greater importance to green growth and climate action, especially with regard to pollution.** Domestic sustainability targets have been included in China's Five-Year Plans (FYPs) for social and economic development since 2001 (the 10th FYP). Since then, targets for the environment, energy transition and resource efficiency have proliferated (exhibit 2). Concepts promoting sustainability have become intrinsic [to] parts of national policymaking (exhibit 3). Environmental regulations and emission standards are becoming stricter, and **fighting pollution has become a top-level priority.**

China's green trajectory has been slowed down by the Covid-19 crisis, but it will remain high on Beijing's long-term agenda. The government's Work Report presented at the National People's Congress (NPC) in May emphasized damage control, employment, and economic stability. These priorities may slacken sustainable development and counteract China's green goals. For instance, prioritizing support for the domestic job market could drive up emissions as local **governments tend to favor low-risk investments in heavy and polluting industries such as coal** power plants. However, though China's post-Covid economic stimulus lacks an explicitly green dimension, the pandemic crisis has not halted efforts to promote sustainable development (exhibit 4). 1.2. Strategic concerns ensure a green transformation stays on Beijing's agenda The Party-state has three strategic concerns that suggest Beijing's ambitions for greater sustainability must be taken seriously. Firstly, regime stability is the main driver of Party-state leadership. With the CCP ruling everything,[4] delivering both a livable environment and continuous growth are key to regime survival and its notion of legitimacy. **A healthy climate and environment are increasingly important to the public as well. Severe pollution causes a million premature deaths and costs hundreds of billions of Chinese yuan a year.**[5] Secondly, worsening relations with the US and other providers of strategically important goods and raw materials lead Beijing to strive for more strategic autonomy and security. China is a net-importer of grain, soy, oil, gas and other vital commodities. Food and energy security are thus highly susceptible to external shocks. Sustainable policy for industry and agriculture is furthermore aiding the goal to make [making] domestic supply chains more efficient and self-reliant, especially when it comes to reducing imported critical resources. Thirdly, more sustainable economic upgrading is seen as a great opportunity for assuming tech leadership. Programs such as "Made in China 2025" (MIC25) push for rapid advances in domestic innovation. "Green technologies" (绿色技术) are means of high strategic value in this regard. Beijing hopes to repeat success stories like the domination of the global solar panel market by Chinese companies, such as Jinko Solar and Suntech Power. It wants to clean up China's environment without foregoing growth, with the added benefit of establishing China as a globally competitive innovator and high-tech superpower. To establish sustainability in all spheres of life and fulfill the ambitious goal of creating a "beautiful China", Beijing has launched a centrally orchestrated, non-disruptive and incremental push affecting science, technology, industry, policy making and everyday life. China's top-level policy making is gradually moving towards promoting green notions at all levels, albeit at variable speeds and scope.

Green growth is important for both economic and environmental sustainability

Li et al. 22. Jiaman Li – School of International Trade and Economics, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China. Xiucheng Dong – School of International Trade and Economics, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China. Kangyin Dong – School of International Trade and Economics, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China. Jiaman Li, Xiucheng Dong & Kangyin Dong (April 07, 2022) Is China's green growth possible? The roles of green trade and green energy, Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 35:1, 7084-7108, DOI: 10.1080/1331677X.2022.2058978 | https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1331677X.2022.2058978 BZ

Many countries have experienced remarkable economic growth since the second industrial revolution (Panagiotis et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022). In recent years, China's rapid economic growth is driven by domestic industrialisation expansion, which relies heavily on burning fossil fuels such as coal (Duan & Yan, 2021; Li et al., 2021a; 2022). China has seen a marked increase in its total energy consumption over the last five years (Song et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2022). **This kind of industrial and energy structure poses challenges relating to the depletion of natural resources and degradation of the environment** (Dong et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2020; Ren et al., 2022a). How to balance economic development and environmental issues is an essential problem in China. **Green growth** refers mainly to the promotion of economic growth under conditions that ensure natural resources and environments can provide services that enhance citizens' well-being and achieve sustainable development **without harming the environment** and natural resources (Hallegatte et al., 2012; Hallegatte & Corfee-Morlot, 2011; Li et al., 2021b). During COP26 held in November 2021, many countries pledged to achieve global net-zero emissions by the middle of the current century and limit the global rise in temperatures to 1.5 degrees by 2030. With the strong international effort to achieve these goals, countries all over the world have taken up the challenge to accelerate the reduction of carbon emissions and develop green growth (Ren et al., 2021, 2022b; Shahbaz et al., 2022). China is undertaking a series of steps to collaboratively achieve green growth in tandem with global initiatives to 'go green' (Liu et al., 2018, 2021a; Zhao et al., 2021). There is a global search for green, sustainable, and economically attractive solutions. Studies on green growth are numerous, but no universally standard for measuring green growth exists. Therefore, a more comprehensive evaluation of China's green growth and a clear understanding of China's current situation is extremely important. On the one hand, emerging green product technologies have changed the development trajectory of domestic enterprises**, leading to improved quality and efficiency of traded products**, enabling them to be more

competitive in international markets. The production and use processes of green products always require less energy and produce fewer emissions, and thus, are more environmentally friendly (Sun et al., 2021). Although it is widely accepted that international trade can promote national economic growth (Brini et al., 2017; Gokmenoglu et al., 2015; Rahman, 2021), the relationship between trade in green products and a green economy has not been studied. On the other hand, the transformation towards green energy is considered to be a good solution to the problem of fossil energy depletion and environmental degradation, and therefore attracts worldwide attention (Jiang et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021b; Qin et al., 2022). Green energy refers to the clean energy generated from natural resources available all over the world, and includes hydro, wind, solar, biomass, and other sources of energy (Bhowmik et al., 2017; Dong et al., 2018; Troster et al., 2018). Since 2006, China has begun to implement a subsidy policy based on electricity prices for renewable energy power generation to accelerate the development of renewable energy. After 2012, subsidies are allocated out of government-managed funds. The 13th Five-Year Plan (2016–2020) in **China emphasises the importance of** developing **green energy** in the national energy structure. Furthermore, green energy is regarded as the energy source **that can promote sustainable economic development** due to its low carbon emissions (Apergis & Payne, 2010; Sadorsky, 2009; Sohag et al., 2019). While literature that focuses on the dynamic nexus among green trade, green energy, and green growth in China is scarce.

V2 Extensions

Definitions

Diffen ND | PRC = China = country in East Asia. Controls mainland China.

OECD 1 | Environmental protection = maintain quality of environment thru reducing pollution and preventing degradation of ecosystems

Investopedia 21| Econ growth = increase in production of economic goods & services

Collins ND | Prioritize = treat as more important than other things

Util Framework

Prefer the framework of maximizing human well-being:

1] Rasul 20 | Specifically the word "prioritize" in the resolution is from a perspective of maximizing human well-being, due to having to decide what our highest priority should be for policy choices. Hence, we need to choose the better policy – the one that does the most good for society, a.k.a. saving human lives.

2] Moen 16 | Pain and pleasure are all we value, based on everyday experiences and reasoning. When we ask "why buy soda?", it's to drink. "Why drink soda?" -> "because it's sweet". "Why pursue sweet snacks?" -> "because it makes one happy". Everything comes down to seeking pleasure and avoiding pain, so this is what we ought to use as our framework.

3] Pummer 15 | Disagreements in philosophy have happened for centuries, yet we still can't settle on it. To keep discussing, we need to preserve the human species, but if we all go extinct (along with trillions of future possible people), we will never find the true meaning of morality. Hence, preventing extinction comes first.

Thesis

BBC 21 | China pollutes a lot more than the rest of the world: 27% of all greenhouse gases. Thus, environmental protection in China would be significant globally.

C1.1 – Carbon Tax / Climate

Parry & Wingender 16 | A carbon tax rising by $5 per year could reduce emissions 30%, by 2030. It's easy to implement: tax polluting products at their point of entry, like at a border or coal mine. This gradually seeks to achieve zero emissions by discouraging pollution, yet allows some economic activity to happen.

Krosofsky 21 | The impact is climate change extinction. Rising global temperatures will cook us all alive by 2030 - this is urgent because of its high probability and the short amount of time we have to address it.

C1.2 – US-China Cooperation / Climate

Shen et al. 22 | China prioritizing the environment will set an example globally and contribute to a renewed relationship with the United States to solve climate change. Strong support is necessary to facilitate this collaboration, especially when harmonizing climate goals.

Mallapaty 22 | Talks between China and U.S. are key to advance climate action - setting standards and developing technologies lead to strong environmental protection globally.

Krosofsky 21 | The impact is climate change extinction. Rising global temperatures will cook us all alive by 2030 - this is urgent because of its high probability and the short amount of time we have to address it.

C2 – Flooding (definitely extend in 1AR)

Ye 22 | 70 billion dollars in damage result from flooding and heavy rain, caused by climate change – crops are destroyed, homes demolished, and millions must evacuate. This is because of changing wind currents and warming that messes with weather patterns. You can't build up any economic growth if everything is being destroyed. Hence, the urgency of this issue calls for immediate prioritization of the environment.

Kusmer 20 | In addition, 15 million people have become homeless from recent floodings. The cause is deforestation, due to economic growth, cutting down forests vital to absorbing rainwater. Hence, the Aff proposes ecological restoration projects to plant more trees, reducing flooding by 30%.

C3 – Green Tech Economy

Oreskes 15 | Green technology transitions can only be facilitated by the government. Again and again, major green tech breakthroughs were a result of profit-seeking companies being motivated by policy and prioritization of economy, not on their own.

Holzmann & Grünberg 21 | Letting the market decide if they want to go green will repeat a poorly regulated coal economy and high pollution, due to its short-term returns being attractive. If we want a market that is sustainable, efficient, and will survive long-term, then Beijing should encourage green technology development DIRECTLY.

The Neg's model of economy is unsustainable – they will suffer from material shortages eventually, due to lack of environmental protections and depletion of natural resources. Therefore, their own impacts are inevitable in their world.

Impact Weighing

Environment (timeframe): Climate change extinction will happen by 2030 [Krosofsky].

Environment (probability): It's happening right now, constantly as we speak, and has been happening for the past few centuries – 100% probability if we don't do anything.

Climate 1AC v3

Resolution

I affirm Resolved: The People's Republic of China ought to prioritize environmental protection over economic growth.

Definitions

First on definitions:

“China” is a country in East Asia

Diffen No Date. Diffen is the world's largest collection of unbiased comparisons that help people make decisions. Compare anything on Diffen -- products, services, organizations, religions, athletes, celebrities, programming languages. “People's Republic of China vs Republic of China.” *Diffen*, https://www.diffen.com/difference/People%27s_Republic_Of_China_vs_Republic_Of_China. BZ

The People's Republic of China is commonly **known as China** and the Republic of China is commonly known as Taiwan. These are separate states with a shared history; China claims sovereignty over Taiwan. After the Kuomintang reunified China in 1928, most of mainland China was governed by the Republic of China (ROC). The island of Taiwan was under Japanese rule at the time. At the end of World War II in 1945, Japan surrenedered Taiwan to the Republic of China. In 1949, there was a civil war in China and the government (ROC) lost control of mainland China to the Communist Party, which established the People's Republic of China (**PRC**) and took **control[s]** of all of **mainland China**. Only the island of Taiwan remained under the control of the ROC.

“Environmental protection”

OECD 1. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an international organization that works together with governments, policy makers and citizens to establish evidence-based international standards and finding solutions to a range of social, economic and environmental challenges. OECD provides a unique forum and knowledge hub for data and analysis, exchange of experiences, best-practice sharing, and advice on public policies and international standard-setting. OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms - Environmental Protection Definition, OECD, 25 Sept. 2001, https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=836#:~:text=Definition%3A,polluting%20substances%20in%20environmental%20media. BZ

Environmental protection refers to any activity **to maintain or restore the quality of environment**al media **through preventing** the emission of pollutants **or reducing** the presence of **polluting substances** in environmental media. It may consist of: (a) changes in characteristics of goods and services, (b) changes in consumption patterns, (c) changes in production techniques, (d) treatment or disposal of residuals in separate environmental protection facilities, (e) recycling, and (f) **prevention** of **degradation of** the landscape and **ecosystems**.

“Economic Growth”

Investopedia 21, Investopedia was founded in 1999 with the mission of simplifying financial decisions and information to give readers the confidence to manage every aspect of their financial life. Team, Investopedia. “Economic Growth Definition.” Investopedia, Investopedia, 1 Jan. 2021, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/e/economicgrowth.asp. BZ

Economic growth is an increase in the production of economic **goods and services**, compared from one period of time to another. It can be measured in nominal or real (adjusted for inflation) terms. Traditionally, aggregate economic growth is measured in terms of gross national product (GNP) or gross domestic product (GDP), although alternative metrics are sometimes used.

“Prioritize”

Collins ND, https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/prioritize BZ

If you prioritize something, you treat it as more important than other things. *Prioritize your own wants rather than constantly thinking about others.*

Framework

"Prioritize" is from a perspective of maximizing human well-being

Rasul 20, Dr Golam Rasul, former Chief Economist, at International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD). Prior to his appointment as a Chief Economist, he served as a Theme Leader livelihoods, Head of the Economic Analysis Division and Policy Development Specialist at ICIMOD for about nine years. Dr Rasul holds a PhD in regional and rural development planning from the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), Thailand. Rasul, Golam. "A Framework for Improving Policy Priorities in Managing COVID-19 Challenges in Developing Countries." National Library of Medicine, Frontiers Media S.A., 14 Oct. 2020, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7591500/#:~:text=Priority%20setting%20is%20a%20complex,explicitly%20chosen%20and%20agreed%20criteria. BZ

Priority setting is a complex process involving **[involves] making decisions on** the allocation **[allocating]** of **resources to improve policy** goals. The interests, motivations, and preferences of the diverse array of stakeholders will differ, thus prioritization needs to be based on explicitly chosen and agreed criteria. Dimension of Priorities Prioritization is a multidimensional concept and can be seen from different perspectives, all of which need to be understood and taken into account. **From a moral** and ethical **perspective, managing** existing, and emerging **threats to human lives is** a societal obligation and **the primary responsibility of states** (24, 25). Thus, **the highest priority should be given to policy choices that save human lives** by reducing health risks, improving health care, reducing communicable diseases, and ensuring provision of basic health services, together with those aimed at meeting basic human needs such as access to food, water, and shelter. From a utilitarian perspective, policy choices should be guided by the utility generated and cost-effectiveness, since resources are finite (26, 27). Thus, the highest priority should be given to the policy choices that are most cost-effective **and generate the maximum net social benefits**. From an egalitarian perspective, equity, and fairness are equally important in policy choices (28, 29). Cost-effectiveness is important but should not be the sole criterion; an equally high priority is given to protecting those who are most at risk and serving the most deprived even if this is less cost-effective. From a resilience perspective, present actions should prepare for transition to a more resilient and better society (12, 30). Thus, a high priority should be given to policy options that enhance long-term social, economic, and environmental benefits that lay the basis for long term resilience and build the capacity to deal with future challenges.

Thus, the value of morality is achieved by maximizing human well-being

Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo "An Argument for Hedonism" Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that **a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have.** "Pleasure" and "pain" are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, **I might ask: "What for?" This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so**, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but **for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable.** You might answer, for example: "To

buy soda." This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: "What is buying the soda good for?" This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: "Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it." **If I then proceed by asking "But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?" the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.**3 As Aristotle observes**: "We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**"4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says "This is painful!" we never respond by asking: "And why is that a problem?" We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

AND preventing extinction comes first due to moral uncertainty – save humanity now so we can deliberate more in the future

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. "Moral Agreement on Saving the World" Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] brett

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are **deep and irresolvable**, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – **whether we're consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists** – should all agree that **we should try to save the world**. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions [of] upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even ifthe well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there's nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there's a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations(the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But **that is a huge mistake**. Non-consequentialism is the view that there's more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don't matter. Even John Rawls wrote, "All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy." Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They'd thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn't significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one's character. What's even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial "point of view of the universe," indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one's own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don't care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler's recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I'd have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I've just argued that there's agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It's possible they'll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, **all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world**. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won't get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: "We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy.... Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly." (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

Contentions

Contention 1: Strong Global Environment

China is a major contributor to global warming – protecting the environment is an obligation and within their power

BBC 21. The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) is the national broadcaster of the United Kingdom. Headquartered at Broadcasting House in London, it is the world's oldest national broadcaster, and the largest broadcaster in the world by number of employees. "Report: China Emissions Exceed All Developed Nations Combined." BBC News, BBC, 7 May 2021, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-57018837. BZ

China emits more greenhouse gas than the entire developed world combined, a new report has claimed. The research by Rhodium Group says China emitted 27% of the world's greenhouse gases in 2019. The US was the second-largest emitter at 11% while India was third with 6.6% of emissions, the think tank said. Scientists warn that without an agreement between the US and China it will be hard to avert dangerous climate change. China's emissions more than tripled over the previous three decades, the report from the US-based Rhodium Group added. The Asian giant has the world's largest population, so its per person emissions are still far behind the US, but the research said those emissions have increased too, tripling over the course of two decades. China has vowed to reach net-zero emissions by 2060 with a peak no later than 2030. President Xi Jinping reiterated his pledge at a climate summit organised by US President Joe Biden last month. "This major strategic decision is made based on our sense of responsibility to build a community with a shared future for mankind and our own need to secure sustainable development," President Xi said at the time. However, China is heavily reliant on coal power. The country is currently running 1,058 [1,000] coal plants - more than half the world's capacity. Under the Paris accord, agreed in 2015, 197 nations pledged to limit global warming to below 2C. However, the world is far from meeting that commitment. Central to the Paris Agreement are Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). These are targets intended to cut emissions. NDCs represent the commitments by each country - under the Paris pact - to reduce their own national emissions and adapt to the impacts of climate change. According to the Climate Action Tracker, an independent scientific analysis that tracks government climate action, China's NDC rating is "highly insufficient" and "are not at all consistent with holding warming to below 2C". President Biden's climate envoy, John Kerry travelled to China last month to meet counterparts and discuss how to work together to combat climate change, despite diplomatic tensions between the two countries on a range of other issues. In a joint statement, the two sides committed to working together and with other countries on tackling climate change including specific action on emissions. Leaders will come together for COP26 - a crucial climate change summit - in November in Glasgow, UK to accelerate action towards the goals of the Paris Agreement.

There are three ways China solves:

1] A carbon tax will be passed – deter emissions and generate revenue to spend on healthcare for the people impacted by pollution

Parry & Wingender 16, Ian Parry is an environmental fiscal policy expert for the International Monetary Fund. Philippe Wingender is a senior economist of The World Economic Studies Division of the IMF's Research Department. Parry, Ian, and Philippe Wingender. "The Overwhelming Case for a Carbon Tax in China." IMF, IMF Blog, 27 July 2016, https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2016/07/27/the-overwhelming-case-for-a-carbon-tax-in-china. BZ

A single policy could do it all for China. A carbon tax—an upstream tax on the carbon content of fossil fuel supply—could dramatically cut greenhouse gases, save millions of lives, soothe the government's fiscal anxieties, and boost green growth. According to IMF estimates, a tax on carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions, rising by **$5 per year** between 2017 and 2030, could reduce CO_2 emissions by **30 percent** in **2030**, well in excess of what is needed to fulfill China's pledge for the 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change. The carbon tax [It] could also save close to **4 million** lives during this **14-year[s]** period (Figure 1), principally by deterring use of coal, the main source of the fine particulates that elevate the risk of strokes, heart, and lung diseases. And the tax would raise well over **2 percent of GDP** in new revenue by **2030**, a huge bonus which represents **more than enough to double government spending on healthcare.** In fact, this is good news for the planet given that China is by far the world's leading producer of CO_2 emissions, contributing 25 percent to the global total in

2013, compared with 16 and 6 percent from the United States and India, respectively, the world's second and third largest emitters. Predicting the effects of a carbon tax These findings are based on a new spreadsheet tool developed at the IMF, for projecting future fuel use by economic sector. Using assumptions about how fuel demand would respond to price changes, and previous IMF estimates of local air pollution deaths from fuel combustion for China, we are able to assess the carbon, public health, and fiscal impacts of carbon taxation. The future is of course inherently uncertain so the numbers should not be taken too literally, but they do at least provide a broad indication of the likely impacts of carbon taxes. Moving it forward Administering a carbon tax is straightforward. It involves a **tax** on fossil fuel **products at their point of entry** in the economy with rates levied on coal, petroleum products, and natural gas **based on the tons of CO2 produced** per unit of fuel. The government could collect the tax at the mine mouth for coal (where royalties are already collected) or at coal processing plants, at the refinery for petroleum products, at the border for imported fuel products, and so on. Yes, downsides exist, but they are manageable. The most difficult challenge is dealing with the burden of higher energy prices on vulnerable groups, though impacts should not be overstated—in 2020, for example, the carbon tax raises electricity prices by around 5 percent.

2] We must prevent construction and further environmental damage in forests – ecological redlines will designate protected areas

Gao et al. 20. Jixi Gao is Director of Ministry of Ecology and Environment Center for Satellite Application on Ecology and Environment. Changxin Zou is a researcher at Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences, Ministry of Ecology and Environment. Dimitri de Boer is chief representative in China of ClientEarth, a European environmental law group. Guido Schmidt-Traub is Executive Director of the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network. Arthur Hanson is the former international chief advisor of the China Council for International Cooperation of Environment and Development (CCICED) and former President of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). Li Lin is Director of Global Policy and Advocacy at WWF International, and was previously Executive Program Director for WWF China. Gao, J., Zou, C., Boer, D. D., Schmidt-Traub, G., Hanson, A., & Lin, L. (2021, February 15). How China's ecological redlines could boost it to carbon neutrality. China Dialogue. Retrieved October 8, 2022, from https://chinadialogue.net/en/nature/how-chinas-ecological-redlines-could-boost-it-to-carbon-neutrality/ BZ

Scientists and policymakers widely accept that a much larger share of the planet needs to be protected for biodiversity. Recent research suggests that 30% to **70% of the planet's surface needs protection if biodiversity is** to **conserved effectively.** International negotiations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), due to conclude next year at a summit in Kunming, China, are moving towards a target of 30% by 2030. Continuing nature loss globally shows that the existing approach to conservation, based on protected areas, is insufficient. In response, China has developed its system of **"ecological conservation redlines"**. This important innovation is in the process of being implemented. The redlines [They] can contribute to the **reversing** of **ecological degradation** and biodiversity loss, as well as to climate change mitigation and adaptation. How are redlines different from protected areas? China's ecological redline policy is an improvement on its system for protected areas in several ways. First, and critically, the selection of redline areas is thoroughly science-based. The decision on which areas or habitats to protect is based on a technical assessment of the benefits to both nature and people. These benefits were carefully mapped, based on three criteria: biodiversity, ecosystem services (such as ensuring the availability of fresh water and healthy soils), and disaster risk reduction (such as coastal defence, flood protection, landslides, sand storms, etc). This integrated approach, assessing overall benefits, provides a stronger rationale for protection, bringing more of the key affected communities and organisations on board. As a result of such assessments, the redlines include thousands of areas, of all shapes and sizes, near sparsely as well as heavily populated areas, in a wide array of biomes. Second, the scheme protects all key species and habitats, as defined in the Chinese government document "Ecological Conservation Redlines Delineation Guidance" (MEE and NDRC, May 2017). While China has previously established various types of protected areas, covering about 18% of its land area, this has still left valuable ecosystems, plants and animals unprotected. The ecological redline areas have been drawn with precision to protect the habitats of all rare and endangered animals and plants. With a "top-down" design, the system enables decision-makers to manage the entire landscape holistically, and in a unified way. This greatly benefits the integrity and connectivity of habitats. Third, by going beyond flagship areas such as national parks, the scheme protects more nature. It provides a creative solution to biodiversity protection. The international community has reached a consensus on addressing biodiversity loss using nature reserves and "other effective conservation measures". However, relying solely on the establishment of protected areas falls well short of what science tells us is needed. The ecological conservation redline system provides a new approach to achieve large-scale and holistic protection of species and habitats. This is shifting the culture of "start construction before all permits are obtained", which has been all too common in China Fourth, we expect strict enforcement, aided by top-down management, satellite intelligence and systems to facilitate public supervision. Inside redline areas, all types of development and **construction activities that have a significant impact will be banned: only very limited, low-intensity human activities will be allowed**, for example for local communities. Regarding enforcement, redline areas benefit from regular inspections that force local governments to take note. For example, an offshore airport that began being built near Sanya in Hainan was halted when a disciplinary inspection revealed it was inside an ecological redline area, and lacked proper permits. This is shifting the culture of "start construction before all permits are obtained", which has been all too common in China and has led to

uncontrolled development. The history of China's ecological redlines The ecological redlines were first proposed in 2011, and subsequently enshrined in the Environmental Protection Law of 2015. In 2017, the Chinese government issued the "Opinions on Delineation and Strict Management of Ecological Conservation Redlines" to implement the redline policy for ecological conservation nationwide. In October, the government took an important further step when it issued the draft "Ecological Redline Implementing Regulation" for public comments. The ecological redlines have largely been drawn, giving legal protection to at least **25%** of the country's land and sea area, but the full map is yet to be publicly disclosed. President Xi Jinping has repeatedly emphasised his commitment to the system. Last month, at the Fifth Plenary Session of the 19th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, China once again confirmed "improving the regulatory system for nature reserves and the ecological redlines" as a priority. Conservation and climate action By including habitats such as forests and grasslands the redlines initiative will also benefit climate action. **Plants and soils can sequester [store] significant amounts of carbon dioxide**, complementing efforts to cut carbon emissions from power generation, industry, transportation, etc. These habitats can also provide valuable climate adaptation benefits, for example for flood and drought control. Forests are important participants in the water cycle, helping ensure local rainfall. They also consolidate slopes, [and] preventing land slides and soil erosion. They also benefit the resilience of food production, by ensuring that key ecosystems continue to provide insects for pollination, for instance.

3] China *symbolically showing* that they value and prioritize environment leads to better cooperation with the U.S. in solving climate change, due to a renewed common goal

Shen et al. 22. Shiran Victoria Shen is the W. Glenn Campbell and Rita Ricardo-Campbell national fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution, as well as an assistant professor of environmental politics at the University of Virginia. Jean C. Oi is the William Haas professor of Chinese politics, senior fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute of International Studies, as well as the director of Stanford University's China Program. She is also the Lee Shau Kee director of the Stanford Center at Peking University. Yi Cui is the director of Stanford University's Precourt Institute for Energy, as well as professor of materials science and engineering. He is a senior fellow at the Woods Institute for the Environment, and professor, by courtesy, of Chemistry, Stanford University. Liang Min is managing director of the Bits & Watts Initiative of the Precourt Institute for Energy at Stanford University. Oi, J. C., Shen, S. V., Cui, Y., & Min, L. (2022, April 26). Next steps in US-china climate cooperation. The Hill. Retrieved October 1, 2022, from https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/3464062-next-steps-in-us-china-climate-cooperation/ BZ

Second, we need to be explicitly cognizant of political and institutional constraints. This is necessary in order to translate promises into progress, while protecting social benefits and their equitable distribution amid the green energy transition. As noted in both the joint declaration and our report, bilateral dialogues so far remain very high-level. We need future discussions and workshops at the sectoral and local levels to develop concrete plans. In enacting and implementing concrete plans, political and institutional constraints can pose real obstacles, as demonstrated by China's past and ongoing efforts to control air pollution. Hence, strong support from both national and local governments will be critical. As a first step, we need to gain a good understanding of who the relevant actors are in both policy making and implementation and the incentives they face. In this period of transition when there are still regional mismatches between energy supply and demand, it is too easy to let short term needs push climate mitigation goals to the bottom of the barrel to address regional energy shortages. In both countries policymakers and those charged with implementation face multiple and sometimes conflicting goals. The prioritization of goals is shaped by incentive structures. Fostering incentive structures conducive to decarbonization is particularly important during the transitional period when consensus around goals and priorities is less clear. Furthermore, it is time to standardize standards. A recurring theme across our discussions is the need for shared, clearly **specified regulatory** frameworks and **standards across both nations**. **Harmoniz**ing standards will expedite trade, validation, accounting, **climate pledges** and environmental, social and corporate governance (ESG) evaluation. Only if there is standardization can organizations be required to follow unified disclosure practices for making available important information like the amount of carbon emitted. We need to make and implement more legislation to encourage a faster pace of decarbonization, and having unified terminology and standards is conducive to both effective carbon legislation and policy implementation. Common terminology and standards will provide a basis for carbon legislation. Having clearly stipulated standards and procedures can also make implementation easier and more straightforward. Last but not least, we are hopeful about the future of **U.S.-China cooperation** on climate change and believe that universities

can play a significant role in the global energy transition. Universities are often the birthplaces of innovative technology, training grounds for talent from across the globe, as well as conveners of bilateral and multilateral dialogues. We hope the governments on both sides of the Pacific **will** work together to hammer out the needed details to **build** the **momentum** and make a real impact **in the fight against** global **climate change**.

China-U.S. Cooperation is key to fight global warming

Mallapaty 22. As Editor in Chief, Magdalena leads Nature's magazine and research editorial teams. A geneticist by training, she has considerable editorial and publishing experience: having started in Nature Publishing Group in 2001, she was Chief Editor of Nature Reviews Genetics, Senior Editor for genetics and genomics at Nature, and Executive Editor for the Nature Partner Journals. Mallapaty, Smriti. "Will a Freeze in US–China Climate Talks Threaten Global Action?" Nature News, Nature Publishing Group, 11 Aug. 2022, https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-022-02169-x. BZ

Cooperation between the United States and China on global warming has been dealt a major blow after China's foreign ministry suspended climate talks with the United States. The decision came in response to last week's high-profile trip to Taiwan by Nancy Pelosi, US speaker of the US House of Representatives, which China says violated its sovereignty. Researchers say a temporary freeze in discussions will probably affect only high-level political engagements, but that a longer stand-off could have a chilling effect on academic collaborations. "Climate discussions have always been somewhat immune from the turbulent bilateral politics between the US and China," says Li Shuo, a policy adviser at Greenpeace China in Beijing. "But the announcement last Friday brought this relationship to a very new place." Talks between the world's two largest emitters of greenhouse gases are important for advancing global action on climate change, say researchers. Both countries have demonstrated their commitment to addressing the problem within their borders: over the weekend, the US Senate passed a massive spending bill to invest in clean-energy technologies, and China has promised to become carbon neutral before 2060. But cooperation between the two countries could accelerate action this decade, especially in areas such as the cutting of methane emissions. A protracted rift between the two could also threaten the success of discussions at the next round of global climate talks in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt, in November. Meetings between the United States and China have been crucial in facilitating multilateral consensus at previous summits, says Fei Teng, a climate-policy researcher at Tsinghua University in Beijing. "I hope that China and the US can resolve this conflict soon and go back to the regular routine." If the freeze in communications continues until then, Li Shuo anticipates a more politically divisive climate summit in Egypt. But others think that such multilateral engagements will probably continue. Joint agreement Discussions on climate change between the two countries ramped up when US President Joe Biden took office in January 2021, after being on the back-burner for several years. In April, climate envoy John Kerry became the first senior member of Biden's administration to visit China, meeting Xie Zhenhua, China's representative on climate change. A second trip followed in September, and at the climate summit in Glasgow, UK, in November, the two countries signed a joint declaration to enhance climate action in the 2020s, including setting standards for emissions reduction, deploying carbon-capture and -storage technologies, and measuring and controlling methane emissions. Kerry and Xie met again at the World Economic Forum in Davos in May. Researchers say China's suspension is currently restricted to talks between Kerry's and Xie's teams.

THUS, the impact is the extinction of humanity via climate change – the timeframe is soon

Krosofsky 21, Andrew Krosofsky is a writer and environmental journalist for Green Matters, a media company covering awareness and solutions around the climate crisis. Krosofsky, Andrew. "How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction." Green Matters, Green Matters, 11 Mar. 2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction. BZ

Life on this planet has gone through many extinction-level events over time. Most of these phenomena were caused by natural, cataclysmic forces beyond the control of any of the lifeforms existing at that time. The current cataclysmic forces are anything but natural and they are well within our control. The question is not, "will global warming cause extinction?"— it's, "how can we prevent that inevitability from happening?" Will global warming cause extinction? Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably**

result in the mass extinction of millions of different species, humankind included. In fact, the Center for Biological Diversity says that **global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet.** Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won't be able to handle long-term. **Extreme weather patterns are** shifting climates across the globe, **eliminating habitats and altering the landscape**. As a result, **food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures** themselves, **which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions. What species will go extinct if global warming continues? The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming. Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have** already **led to ocean acidification**. This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia's Great Barrier Reef, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that **more than 30 percent of Earth's plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century,** that number could be as high as **70 percent**. Will global warming cause humanity's extinction? We won't try and sugarcoat things, **humanity**'s own prospects aren't looking that great either. According to The Conversation, our species **has just under a decade left** to get our CO_2 emissions under control. **If we don't cut** those **emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to** potentially **catastrophic levels.** It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense. The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, but **it will mean less food,** less **water,** and **increased hardship** across the world — **especially in low-income areas and developing countries**. This increase will also mean **more pandemics,** devastating **storms, and** uncontrollable **wildfires**. It's difficult to calculate the numbers in these cases or to assess precisely what risks we will all be facing, but this is because we have never experienced anything like it before.

As well, biodiversity loss leads to run away extinction cascades – domino effect, food shortage, etc.

Geib 18. Claudia Geib, Associate Editor at Futurism. February 20th 2018, "Losing biodiversity could lead to "extinction cascades"," Futurism, https://futurism.com/losing-biodiversity-extinction-cascades

Human expansion, destruction of natural habitats, pollution, and climate change have all led to biodiversity levels that are considered below the "safe" threshold for global ecosystems. And the consequences of biodiversity loss aren't just about the extinction of certain charismatic species. A new study published in the journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences shows that **less biodiversity in an area increases the risk of a domino effect of extinctions**, where one species' disappearance can cause other species to follow suit. The research, conducted by ecologists at the University of Exeter, shows that losing a species in an area is dangerous in that it makes the surrounding ecological community simpler, and therefore less robust to change. It makes sense: the **fewer species** that exist in an area, the fewer that are **available to "fill the gap" left by other extinctions.** Other species in the ecosystem will have fewer alternatives to turn to. For example, if there are fewer insects left overall across a region, the bats and amphibians that eat them will feel the loss of just one species much more severely. "Interactions between species are important for ecosystem stability," said Dirk Sanders, lead author and professor in Exeter's Center for Ecology and Conservation, in a news release. "And because species are interconnected through multiple interactions, an impact on one species can affect others as well."The Exeter team investigated this idea by removing a species of wasp from test ecosystems. In many of these systems, the wasp's disappearance caused indirect extinctions of other species at the same level of the food web. In simple communities, the effect was even stronger. Sanders emphasized the **biodiversity loss could cause "run-away extinction cascades."** This research sounds yet another dire warning bell at a time of biodiversity

crisis. Even if you don't care for poster-child species like polar bears, the crisis could also have ramifications for species that everyone cares about, like the **crops** that **are the foundation of our global food supply**. Studies that show how broadly single extinctions reverberate across ecosystems might buoy further efforts to protect global biodiversity.

Contention 2: Economic Impacts

Climate change causes flooding and extreme rain RIGHT NOW, leading to billions of dollars in economic damage

Ye 22. Yuan is a Shanghai-based journalist who writes for Sixth Tone. Ye, Yuan. "Global Warming of 2C Could 'Double' Flooding Costs in China Compared to 1.5C." Carbon Brief, 1 Aug. 2022, https://www.carbonbrief.org/global-warming-of-2c-could-double-flooding-costs-in-china-compared-to-1-5c/. BZ

Economic losses from flooding in China at 2C of global warming could be double those at 1.5C, research suggests. The study, published in the journal Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, estimates future flood risk across China under 1.5C and 2C of warming and its impact on people and wider society. Compared with 1.5C of global warming, "the probability of the severe flood would be significantly higher for global warming of 2C", the study finds, adding that "in some areas, the probability would double". The direct economic losses at 1.5C would total around $33bn per year (£27bn) for "severe" floods, rising to $70bn (£57bn) for "mild" floods that would affect more of the country. At 2C, these projected costs approximately double, the authors say. Flooding would have the largest impact for the "social economy in the regions with lower altitudes and smaller slopes in eastern China", the study says. However, the range of medium-high flood risk will "gradually expand westward and northward". The study presents a "clear message that **the warmer we let the climate get[s], the greater the losses of dollars** will be from flooding", a scientist not involved in the research tells Carbon Brief. They add that the findings are "important" because they allow policymakers to "see the economic cost of not responding". Rising flood risk **In** late July **2021**, a record-breaking deluge dumped close to a year's worth of rain in just three days on the central Chinese city Zhengzhou, home to 12 million people. The resulting flooding became the deadliest natural disaster for the city in decades, with close to 400 people killed. BREAKING – Heavy rain pounded the central Chinese province of Henan, bursting the banks of major rivers, flooding the streets of a dozen cities including Zhengzhou and trapping subway passengers waist-high in floodwaters pic.twitter.com/JSxYhz1k5a— Insider Paper (@TheInsiderPaper) July 20, 2021 Unprecedented **rainfall** also hit the nearby cities in Henan province, triggering **[triggered] flash flooding and landslides. Crops were submerged, more than 50 thousand houses were destroyed and more than 1.4 million people were evacuated from their homes.** Overall, the rain caused direct economic losses of 120bn yuan (£15bn), including 41bn yuan (£5bn) in Zhengzhou alone. In the wake of the floods, mentions of climate change increased, though modestly, in news reports on extreme weather in Chinese media. Wang Zhihua, head of disaster relief at the China Meteorological Administration, blamed climate change for the natural disaster in a press briefing after the flood. He said: "The increased likelihood of extreme weather has become one of the biggest risks facing the world, which requires our great attention. For the response, the focus is to step up monitoring and early warning capacity." Flooding drives the largest economic losses among all other natural disasters in China in recent years, but flood insurance is not yet widely taken up. In 2021, China's economic losses from flood-related events stood at $25bn, behind Europe's losses of $41.8bn, according to Zurich-based reinsurer Swiss Re. This year, extreme weather hit the southern parts of China again with torrential rains, disrupting the lives of half a million people, with flash floods that turned roads into swollen rivers and submerged houses and cars. Economic exposure The new study, conducted by researchers from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, compares the flood exposure and social economic impact from rainfall-driven flooding across China, under different future scenarios. The researchers use the global warming levels of 1.5C and 2C, in keeping with the limits set out in the Paris Agreement. They use two different scenarios for these levels – the intermediate emissions of RCP4.5 and the very high emissions of RCP8.5. Glossary RCP8.5: The RCPs (Representative Concentration Pathways) are scenarios of future concentrations of greenhouse gases and other forcings. RCP8.5 is a "very high baseline" emission scenario brought about by rapid population growth, high energy… Read More The study notes that global warming is "projected to reach 1.5C by around 2030 for both RCPs, whereas the 2C is reached by 2040 under RCP8.5 and by 2050 under RCP4.5".

Focus on environmental policy means China can both peak emissions AND have economic benefits soon

Yang 20. Xiaoliang holds a PhD in Environmental Science from State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry and a MPA from Maxwell School of Syracuse University. Yang, Xiaoliang. "China Can Grow Its Economy through Stronger Climate Action." World Resources Institute, 4 Dec. 2020, https://www.wri.org/insights/china-can-grow-its-economy-through-stronger-climate-action. BZ

President Xi Jinping surprised the world in September 2020 by announcing to the UN General Assembly that China will aim to peak its carbon emissions before 2030 and achieve carbon neutrality before 2060. A new WRI report finds that **China can peak its emissions** as early as **2026 and realize** enormous **economic benefits** over the long term **by strengthening its climate** and energy **policies now.** By taking steps in energy, industry, transportation and carbon capture, the nation could save nearly **1.9 million lives** and generate nearly **$1 trillion** (6.5 trillion RMB) in net economic and social benefits in 2050. China Can Achieve Stronger Climate Targets in 2030 With its 2020 emissions-reduction targets already met, our analysis shows that China is also on track to exceed the 2030 targets set out in its first Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to the Paris Agreement. This suggests that China could achieve more ambitious emissions reductions for 2030 and significantly enhance the targets in its NDC — including establishing a target for non-CO2 emissions — ahead of the COP26 climate talks in Glasgow, Scotland, in 2021. Policy Choices in 14th Five-Year Plan Can Accelerate Long-term Economic Growth China's policy choices now, such as in its soon-to-be-released 14th Five-Year Plan (2021-2025), will lock in emissions trends for many years. Our report finds that if China adopts a set of cost-effective decarbonization strategies (referred to as a "strengthened ambition scenario"), the country can also expect to attain stronger economic gains in terms of GDP, government revenues and employment. **Setting stronger climate policies now would generate cost savings of $530 billion in fuel**, operation **and maintenance** expenditures over 30 years. More ambitious climate policies would also reduce particulate emissions, which could improve air quality and help prevent the premature deaths of up to 1.89 million people in 2050. In addition, such policies would avoid $445 billion [billions of dollars] in climate damages and help China realize its vision for a greener future by reducing 4.7 gigatons of CO2 emissions compared with a business-as-usual scenario — the equivalent of removing 100 million passenger vehicles from the roads each year. WRI analysis using the Energy Policy Solutions modeling tool shows it is technologically and economically feasible for China to plateau its annual CO2 emissions at around 10.3 gigatons by 2025. In addition, the share of non-fossil fuels in China's primary energy consumption could increase to about 20% by 2025 (from 14.3% in 2018). An earlier WRI study found China can avoid an additional 3 gigatons of non-CO2 greenhouse gas emissions—such as methane, nitrous oxide, and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)—over the next 10 years while reaping development benefits if it takes action right away. **Priorities for Climate Action** However, to realize these advances, China will need to make changes in its current national policies for energy, industry and more. During the 13th Five-Year Plan period (2016-2020), China adopted policy measures focused on climate, including establishing a carbon intensity reduction target, advancing a carbon market, accelerating climate adaptation, and raising public awareness of climate change. Our study shows that during the 14th Five-Year Plan period (2021-2025), China can build on these actions to achieve early carbon emissions peaking and get on a net-zero emissions path as quickly as possible.

China could center its economy around environmental sustainability – ensures economic survival BOTH short and long-term, as opposed to an unsustainable coal-centered economy without regulations

Holzmann & Grünberg 21. Anna Holzmann is a Junior Research Associate at the Mercator Institute for China Studies (MERICS). Holzmann earned a B.Sc. in International Business Administration, a B.A. in Chinese Studies, and and M.A. in East Asian Economy & Society in Austria, Australia, and China. Nis Grünberg's research focuses on state-party governance, elite politics as well as China's sustainable development. He holds a PhD from CBS and BA and MA degrees in China Studies from Copenhagen University. Holzmann, Anna, and Nis Grünberg. "'Greening' China: An Analysis of Beijing's Sustainable Development Strategies." Merics, 7 Jan. 2021, https://merics.org/en/report/greening-china-analysis-beijings-sustainable-development-strategies. BZ

China's rapid economic growth since 1978 has been fueled mainly by coal. Combined with poorly regulated impacts of industrial production, this led to severe environmental damage to air, land and water. China overtook the US as the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gasses in 2006. Today, it is the source of over a quarter of global carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions. **China's government acknowledges the unsustainability of this development path and has started to attach greater importance to green growth and climate action, especially with regard to pollution.** Domestic sustainability targets have been included in China's Five-Year Plans (FYPs) for social and economic development since 2001 (the 10th FYP). Since then, targets for the environment, energy transition and resource efficiency have proliferated (exhibit 2). Concepts promoting sustainability have become intrinsic [to] parts of national policymaking (exhibit 3). Environmental regulations and emission standards are becoming stricter, and fighting pollution has become a top-level priority. China's green trajectory has been slowed down by the Covid-19 crisis, but it will remain high on Beijing's long-term agenda. The government's Work Report presented at the National People's Congress (NPC) in May emphasized damage control, employment, and economic stability. These priorities may slacken sustainable development and counteract China's green goals. For instance, prioritizing support for the domestic job market could drive up emissions as local **governments tend to favor low-risk investments in heavy and polluting industries such as coal** power plants. However, though China's post-Covid economic stimulus lacks an explicitly green dimension, the pandemic crisis has not halted efforts to promote sustainable development (exhibit 4). 1.2. Strategic concerns ensure a green transformation stays on Beijing's agenda The Party-state has three strategic concerns that suggest Beijing's ambitions for greater sustainability must be taken seriously. Firstly, regime stability is the main driver of Party-state leadership. With the CCP ruling everything,[4] delivering both a livable environment and continuous growth are key to regime survival and its notion of legitimacy. **A healthy climate and environment are increasingly important to the public as well. Severe pollution causes a million premature deaths and costs hundreds of billions of Chinese yuan a year.**[5] Secondly, worsening relations with the US and other providers of strategically important goods and raw materials lead Beijing to strive for more strategic autonomy and security. China is a net-importer of grain, soy, oil, gas and other vital commodities. Food and energy security are thus highly susceptible to external shocks. Sustainable policy for industry and agriculture is furthermore aiding the goal to make [making] domestic supply chains more efficient and self-reliant, especially when it comes to reducing imported critical resources. Thirdly, more sustainable economic upgrading is seen as a great opportunity for assuming tech leadership. Programs such as "Made in China 2025" (MIC25) push for rapid advances in domestic innovation. "Green technologies" (绿色技术) are means of high strategic value in this regard. Beijing hopes to repeat success stories like the domination of the global solar panel market by Chinese companies, such as Jinko Solar and Suntech Power. It wants to clean up China's environment without foregoing growth, with the added benefit of establishing China as a globally competitive innovator and high-tech superpower. To establish sustainability in all spheres of life and fulfill the ambitious goal of creating a "beautiful China", Beijing has launched a centrally orchestrated, non-disruptive and incremental push affecting science, technology, industry, policy making and everyday life. China's top-level policy making is gradually moving towards promoting green notions at all levels, albeit at variable speeds and scope.

Green growth is important for both economic and environmental sustainability

Li et al. 22. Jiaman Li – School of International Trade and Economics, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China. Xiucheng Dong – School of International Trade and Economics, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China. Kangyin Dong – School of International Trade and Economics, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China. Jiaman Li, Xiucheng Dong & Kangyin Dong (April 07, 2022) Is China's green growth possible? The roles of green trade and green energy, Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 35:1, 7084-7108, DOI: 10.1080/1331677X.2022.2058978 | https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1331677X.2022.2058978 BZ

Many countries have experienced remarkable economic growth since the second industrial revolution (Panagiotis et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2022). In recent years, China's rapid economic growth is driven by domestic industrialisation expansion, which relies heavily on burning fossil fuels such as coal (Duan & Yan, 2021; Li et al., 2021a; 2022). China has seen a marked increase in its total energy consumption over the last five years (Song et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2022). **This kind of industrial and energy structure poses challenges relating to the depletion of natural resources and degradation of the environment** (Dong et al., 2021; Jiang et al., 2020; Ren et al., 2022a). How to balance economic development and environmental issues is an essential problem in China. **Green growth** refers mainly to the promotion of economic growth under conditions that ensure natural resources and environments can provide services that

enhance citizens' well-being and achieve sustainable development **without harming the environment** and natural resources (Hallegatte et al., 2012; Hallegatte & Corfee-Morlot, 2011; Li et al., 2021b). During COP26 held in November 2021, many countries pledged to achieve global net-zero emissions by the middle of the current century and limit the global rise in temperatures to 1.5 degrees by 2030. With the strong international effort to achieve these goals, countries all over the world have taken up the challenge to accelerate the reduction of carbon emissions and develop green growth (Ren et al., 2021, 2022b; Shahbaz et al., 2022). China is undertaking a series of steps to collaboratively achieve green growth in tandem with global initiatives to 'go green' (Liu et al., 2018, 2021a; Zhao et al., 2021). There is a global search for green, sustainable, and economically attractive solutions. Studies on green growth are numerous, but no universally standard for measuring green growth exists. Therefore, a more comprehensive evaluation of China's green growth and a clear understanding of China's current situation is extremely important. On the one hand, emerging green product technologies have changed the development trajectory of domestic enterprises**, leading to improved quality and efficiency of traded products**, enabling them to be more competitive in international markets. The production and use processes of green products always require less energy and produce fewer emissions, and thus, are more environmentally friendly (Sun et al., 2021). Although it is widely accepted that international trade can promote national economic growth (Brini et al., 2017; Gokmenoglu et al., 2015; Rahman, 2021), the relationship between trade in green products and a green economy has not been studied. On the other hand, the transformation towards green energy is considered to be a good solution to the problem of fossil energy depletion and environmental degradation, and therefore attracts worldwide attention (Jiang et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2021b; Qin et al., 2022). Green energy refers to the clean energy generated from natural resources available all over the world, and includes hydro, wind, solar, biomass, and other sources of energy (Bhowmik et al., 2017; Dong et al., 2018; Troster et al., 2018). Since 2006, China has begun to implement a subsidy policy based on electricity prices for renewable energy power generation to accelerate the development of renewable energy. After 2012, subsidies are allocated out of government-managed funds. The 13th Five-Year Plan (2016–2020) in **China emphasises the importance of** developing **green energy** in the national energy structure. Furthermore, green energy is regarded as the energy source **that can promote sustainable economic development** due to its low carbon emissions (Apergis & Payne, 2010; Sadorsky, 2009; Sohag et al., 2019). While literature that focuses on the dynamic nexus among green trade, green energy, and green growth in China is scarce.

V3 Extensions

Definitions

Diffen ND | PRC = China = country in East Asia. Controls mainland China.

OECD 1 | Environmental protection = maintain quality of environment thru reducing pollution and preventing degradation of ecosystems

Investopedia 21| Econ growth = increase in production of economic goods & services

Collins ND | Prioritize = treat as more important than other things

Util Framework

Prefer the framework of maximizing human well-being:

1] Rasul 20 | Specifically the word "prioritize" in the resolution is from a perspective of maximizing human well-being, due to having to decide what our highest priority should be for policy choices. Hence, we need to choose the better policy – the one that does the most good for society, a.k.a. saving human lives.

2] Moen 16 | Pain and pleasure are all we value, based on everyday experiences and reasoning. When we ask "why buy soda?", it's to drink. "Why drink soda?" -> "because it's sweet". "Why pursue sweet snacks?" -> "because it makes one happy". Everything comes down to seeking pleasure and avoiding pain, so this is what we ought to use as our framework.

3] Pummer 15 | Disagreements in philosophy have happened for centuries, yet we still can't settle on it. To keep discussing, we need to preserve the human species, but if we all go extinct (along with trillions of future possible people), we will never find the true meaning of morality. Hence, preventing extinction comes first.

Thesis

BBC 21 | China pollutes a lot more than the rest of the world: 27% of all greenhouse gases. Thus, environmental protection in China would be significant globally.

C1.1 – Carbon Tax / Climate

Parry & Wingender 16 | A carbon tax rising by $5 per year could reduce emissions 30%, by 2030. It's easy to implement: tax polluting products at their point of entry, like at a border or coal mine. This gradually seeks to achieve zero emissions by discouraging pollution, yet allows some economic activity to happen.

Krosofsky 21 | The impact is climate change extinction. Rising global temperatures will cook us all alive by 2030 - this is urgent because of its high probability and the short amount of time we have to address it.

C1.2 – Ecological Redlining / BioD-loss

WE'RE GOING FOR THE INDEPENDENT BIODIVERSITY LOSS IMPACT, which is completely different from climate change.

Gao et al. 20 | Ecological redlines will ban destructive construction projects within certain land and sea areas throughout China. They will set specific zones to be preserved for their diversity of plants and animals. These forests also ensure rainfall and prevent soil erosion so that many plants species can grow.

We need to step up biodiversity protection, or the impact is worldwide extinction of plants, then animals, and eventually humans.

Geib 18 | Less biodiversity in an area leads to a domino effect and extinction of every single species on Earth: crops die due to land cleared for construction, then humans and animals that depend on them will die off too. Eventually the whole global ecosystem starves to death with permanent shocks to crops and food supplies.

Krosofsky 21 | 30% of species will face extinction by 2050, due to ocean acidification and habitat destruction worldwide.

C1.3 – US-China Cooperation / Climate

Shen et al. 22 | China prioritizing the environment will set an example globally and contribute to a renewed relationship with the United States to solve climate change. Strong support is necessary to facilitate this collaboration, especially when harmonizing climate goals.

Mallapaty 22 | Talks between China and U.S. are key to advance climate action - setting standards and developing technologies lead to strong environmental protection globally.

Krosofsky 21 | The impact is climate change extinction. Rising global temperatures will cook us all alive by 2030 - this is urgent because of its high probability and the short amount of time we have to address it.

C2 – Green Economy (definitely extend in 1AR)

Ye 22 | 70 billion dollars in damage result from flooding and heavy rain, caused by climate change – crops are destroyed, homes demolished, and millions must evacuate. This is because of changing wind currents and warming that messes with weather patterns. Hence, the urgency of this issue calls for immediate prioritization of the environment.

Yang 20 | Sustainable development policy results in peak emissions by 2026, millions of lives saved, and a trillion dollars generated, due to preventing climate-related disasters. This can in turn be used to stimulate the economy and help fund sustainable models of growth.

Holzmann & Grünberg 21 | Letting the market decide if they want to go green will repeat a poorly regulated coal economy and high pollution, due to its short-term returns being attractive. If we want a market that is sustainable, efficient, and will survive long-term, then Beijing should encourage green technology development DIRECTLY.

The Neg's model of economy is unsustainable – even if they might succeed in the short term, they will suffer from material shortages eventually, due to lack of environmental protections and depletion of natural resources. Therefore, their own impacts are inevitable in their world.

Impact Weighing

Environment (timeframe): Climate change extinction will happen by 2030 [Krosofsky].

Environment (probability): It's happening right now, constantly as we speak, and has been happening for the past few centuries – 100% probability if we don't do anything.

Biodiversity (timeframe): Major global biodiversity loss will happen by 2050 [Krosofsky].

Biodiversity (probability): Species are losing their habitats and going extinct due to climate change as we speak – happening right now and will continue for sure, if we don't do anything.

Climate 1AC v4

Resolution

I affirm Resolved: The People's Republic of China ought to prioritize environmental protection over economic growth.

Definitions

First on definitions:

“China” is a country in East Asia

Diffen No Date. Diffen is the world's largest collection of unbiased comparisons that help people make decisions. Compare anything on Diffen -- products, services, organizations, religions, athletes, celebrities, programming languages. “People's Republic of China vs Republic of China.” *Diffen*, https://www.diffen.com/difference/People%27s_Republic_Of_China_vs_Republic_Of_China. BZ

The People's Republic of China is commonly **known as China** and the Republic of China is commonly known as Taiwan. These are separate states with a shared history; China claims sovereignty over Taiwan. After the Kuomintang reunified China in 1928, most of mainland China was governed by the Republic of China (ROC). The island of Taiwan was under Japanese rule at the time. At the end of World War II in 1945, Japan surrenedered Taiwan to the Republic of China. In 1949, there was a civil war in China and the government (ROC) lost control of mainland China to the Communist Party, which established the People's Republic of China (**PRC**) and took **control[s]** of all of **mainland China**. Only the island of Taiwan remained under the control of the ROC.

“Environmental protection”

OECD 1. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an international organization that works together with governments, policy makers and citizens to establish evidence-based international standards and finding solutions to a range of social, economic and environmental challenges. OECD provides a unique forum and knowledge hub for data and analysis, exchange of experiences, best-practice sharing, and advice on public policies and international standard-setting. OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms - Environmental Protection Definition, OECD, 25 Sept. 2001, https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=836#:~:text=Definition%3A,polluting%20substances%20in%20environmental%20media. BZ

Environmental protection refers to any activity **to maintain or restore the quality of environment**al media **through preventing** the emission of pollutants **or reducing** the presence of **polluting substances** in environmental media. It may consist of: (a) changes in characteristics of goods and services, (b) changes in consumption patterns, (c) changes in production techniques, (d) treatment or disposal of residuals in separate environmental protection facilities, (e) recycling, and (f) **prevention** of **degradation of** the landscape and **ecosystems**.

“Economic Growth”

Investopedia 21, Investopedia was founded in 1999 with the mission of simplifying financial decisions and information to give readers the confidence to manage every aspect of their financial life. Team, Investopedia. “Economic Growth Definition.” Investopedia, Investopedia, 1 Jan. 2021, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/e/economicgrowth.asp. BZ

Economic growth is an increase in the production of economic **goods and services**, compared from one period of time to another. It can be measured in nominal or real (adjusted for inflation) terms. Traditionally, aggregate economic growth is measured in terms of gross national product (GNP) or gross domestic product (GDP), although alternative metrics are sometimes used.

“Prioritize”

Collins ND, https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/prioritize BZ

If you prioritize something, you treat it as more important than other things. *Prioritize your own wants rather than constantly thinking about others.*

Framework

The value is morality.

The value criterion is preventing structural violence.

Prefer for 3 reasons:

Reason #1] Structural violence is the harming of SPECIFIC minorities

CHER 20. "What Is Structural Violence?" CHER Chicago, 2020, http://www.cherchicago.org/about/structuralviolence/. BZ

"Structural violence" refers to the multiple ways in which social, economic, and political systems expose particular populations to risks and vulnerabilities leading to increased morbidity and mortality. Those systems include[s] **income inequality, racism,** homophobia, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, sexism, ableism, **and** other means of social exclusion leading to vulnerabilities, such as **poverty,** stress, trauma, crime, incarceration, lack of access to care, healthy food, and physical activity. Structural violence **[They]** are social forces that **harm certain groups of people, producing and perpetuating inequality** in health and well-being. It includes social, economic, and political processes that manifest in both material and symbolic means of social exclusion.

Reason #2] The death of the minority is often masked by greater social wellbeing: we need to support the people who DESPERATELY need it, rather than focusing on helping people who are already well off

Reason #3] Structural violence causes death on the scale of unending nuclear war

Gilligan 96 (James Gilligan, Department of Psychiatry at Harvard Med and Director of the Center for the Study of Violence, 1996, Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and its Causes p. 191-196)

The 14 to **18 million deaths a year** caused by structural violence compare with about **100,000 deaths per year** from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military and political violence, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those caused by genocide---or about eight million per year, 1939-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-66 (perhaps 575,000 deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and even a hypothetical nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. (232 million), it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year. In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 deaths, and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermo**nuclear war,** or genocide, perpetuated on the week and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. Structural violence is also the main cause of behavioral violence on a socially and epidemiologically significant scale (from homicide and suicide to war and genocide). The question as to which of the two forms of violence—structural or behavioral—is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect.

Contentions

Contention 1: Air Pollution

China's growing economy is killing its citizens and contributing massively to global warming

Igini 22. Martina is an environmental journalist based in Hong Kong. She holds two Bachelor's degrees in Journalism and Translation/Interpreting Studies and a Master's degree in International Development. Igini, Martina. "Top 5 Environmental Issues in China in 2022." Earth.Org, 4 Aug. 2022, https://earth.org/environmental-issues-in-china/. BZ

According to the 2021 World Air Quality Report, out of 1,374 cities located in East Asia, 143 (or about 11%) recorded annual average PM2.5 concentrations that are seven times greater than World Health Organization (WHO) standards. All of them were located in China, with the town of Hotan in southwestern Xinjiang experiencing the highest level of **pollution** in the country at about 101 µg/m³, over 20 times the WHO guideline value. Estimated to **cause[s]** an average of **1.2 million** premature **deaths every year**, China's poor air quality is primarily attributed to the rapid economic expansion the country experienced since 1979, which resulted in a drastic increase in coal-powered industrial production and electricity demand, as well as an exponential rise in private vehicles. It is estimated that roughly 48% of Chinese CO2 emissions come from the industrial sector, with 40% from the power – mainly coal – and 8% from the transport industry. With an ever-increasing population, the demand for electricity has grown with no respite, leading to even more coal-burning and worsened air standards. Furthermore, despite pledging to reach net zero emissions before 2060, the country remains by far the world's largest producer and consumer of coal, which alone covers 60% of its electricity demand. In an effort to restore the economy to pre-pandemic levels and curb the energy crisis sparked by the exponential rise in industrial activities the country experienced in 2021, the Chinese government ordered factories to increase their production capacity and built more than triple the amount of new coal power capacity as the rest of the world combined. Unsurprisingly, CO2 emissions in the same year almost reached **12 billion tonnes**, accounting for **33% of the global total.**

To truly understand the urgency of this situation, according to The Guardian,

Ad Fontes Media rates The Guardian as Reliable, Analysis/Fact Reporting in terms of reliability. The Guardian is a British news website begun as a print newspaper in 1821. "Air Pollution in China Is Killing 4,000 People Every Day, a New Study Finds." The Guardian, Guardian News and Media, 14 Aug. 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/14/air-pollution-in-china-is-killing-4000-people-every-day-a-new-study-finds. BZ

Air pollution is killing about **4,000 people in China a day**, accounting for one in six premature deaths in the world's most populous country, a new study finds. Physicists at the University of California, Berkeley, calculated about 1.6 million people in China die each year from heart, lung and stroke problems because of incredibly polluted air, especially small particles of haze. Earlier studies put the annual Chinese air pollution death toll at one to two million but this is the first to use newly released air monitoring figures. The study, to be published in the journal PLOS One, blames emissions from the burning of coal, both for electricity and heating homes. It uses real air measurements and then computer model calculations that estimate heart, lung and stroke deaths for different types of pollutants. Study lead author Robert Rohde said 38% of the Chinese population lived in an area with a long-term air quality average the US Environmental Protection Agency called "unhealthy."

Think of the hundreds that have died a slow, painful death since the start of this tournament at the hands of pollution.

The Aff's SOLUTION: A carbon tax will be passed – deter emissions and generate revenue to spend on healthcare for the people impacted by pollution

Parry & Wingender 16, Ian Parry is an environmental fiscal policy expert for the International Monetary Fund. Philippe Wingender is a senior economist of The World Economic Studies Division of the IMF's Research Department. Parry, Ian, and Philippe Wingender. "The Overwhelming Case for a Carbon Tax in China." IMF, IMF Blog, 27 July 2016, https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2016/07/27/the-overwhelming-case-for-a-carbon-tax-in-china. BZ

A single policy could do it all for China. A carbon tax—an upstream tax on the carbon content of fossil fuel supply—could dramatically cut greenhouse gases, save millions of lives, soothe the government's fiscal anxieties, and boost green growth. According to IMF estimates, a tax on carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions, rising by **$5 per year** between 2017 and 2030, could reduce CO_2 emissions by **30 percent** in **2030**, well in excess of what is needed to fulfill China's pledge for the 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change. The carbon tax [It] could also save close to **4 million** lives during this **14-year[s]** period (Figure 1), principally by deterring use of coal, the main source of the fine particulates that elevate the risk of strokes, heart, and lung diseases. And the tax would raise well over **2 percent of GDP** in new revenue by **2030**, a huge bonus which represents **more than enough to double government spending on healthcare.** In fact, this is good news for the planet given that China is by far the world's leading producer of CO_2 emissions, contributing 25 percent to the global total in 2013, compared with 16 and 6 percent from the United States and India, respectively, the world's second and third largest emitters. Predicting the effects of a carbon tax These findings are based on a new spreadsheet tool developed at the IMF, for projecting future fuel use by economic sector. Using assumptions about how fuel demand would respond to price changes, and previous IMF estimates of local air pollution deaths from fuel combustion for China, we are able to assess the carbon, public health, and fiscal impacts of carbon taxation. The future is of course inherently uncertain so the numbers should not be taken too literally, but they do at least provide a broad indication of the likely impacts of carbon taxes. Moving it forward Administering a carbon tax is straightforward. It involves a **tax** on fossil fuel **products at their point of entry** in the economy with rates levied on coal, petroleum products, and natural gas **based on the tons of CO_2 produced** per unit of fuel. The government could collect the tax at the mine mouth for coal (where royalties are already collected) or at coal processing plants, at the refinery for petroleum products, at the border for imported fuel products, and so on. Yes, downsides exist, but they are manageable. The most difficult challenge is dealing with the burden of higher energy prices on vulnerable groups, though impacts should not be overstated—in 2020, for example, the carbon tax raises electricity prices by around 5 percent.

AND if we don't prevent climate change, we face extreme warming and global extinction within a decade

Krosofsky 21, Andrew Krosofsky is a writer and environmental journalist for Green Matters, a media company covering awareness and solutions around the climate crisis. Krosofsky, Andrew. "How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction." Green Matters, Green Matters, 11 Mar. 2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction. BZ

Life on this planet has gone through many extinction-level events over time. Most of these phenomena were caused by natural, cataclysmic forces beyond the control of any of the lifeforms existing at that time. The current cataclysmic forces are anything but natural and they are well within our control. The question is not, "will global warming cause extinction?"— it's, "how can we prevent that inevitability from happening?" Will global warming cause extinction? Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species, humankind included.** In fact, the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet. Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won't be able to handle long-term. **Extreme weather patterns are** shifting climates across the globe, **eliminating habitats and altering the** landscape. As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced. Then, of course, there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions. What species will go extinct if global warming continues? The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming. Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean

acidification. This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia's Great Barrier Reef, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that **more than 30 percent of Earth's plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050.** By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. Will global warming cause humanity's extinction? We won't try and sugarcoat things, humanity's own prospects aren't looking that great either. According to The Conversation, our species has just under a decade left to get our CO_2 emissions under control. **If we don't cut** those **emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to** potentially **catastrophic levels.** It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense. The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, but **it will mean less food, [and]** less **water,** and increased hardship across the world — **especially in low-income areas** and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires. It's difficult to calculate the numbers in these cases or to assess precisely what risks we will all be facing, but this is because we have never experienced anything like it before.

Contention 2: Contaminated Water

Many Chinese rely on polluted water to survive and die as a result

The Aff's SOLUTION to this is to improve sewage laws, and prevent careless waste dumping

Igini 22. Martina is an environmental journalist based in Hong Kong. She holds two Bachelor's degrees in Journalism and Translation/Interpreting Studies and a Master's degree in International Development. Igini, Martina. "Top 5 Environmental Issues in China in 2022." Earth.Org, 4 Aug. 2022, https://earth.org/environmental-issues-in-china/. BZ

2. Water Pollution High on the list of environmental issues in China is water pollution. As much as **90% of** the country's **groundwater is contaminated by toxic** human and industrial **waste** dumping, as well as farm fertilisers, causing about 70% of rivers and lakes to be unsafe for human use. Nearly **half of the population does not have access to** water that is **safe** for human consumption, while two-thirds of the rural population has to rely on tainted **water** due to a lack of adequate systems to treat wastewater. Based on this, it is clear that **in China, the water you drink is as dangerous as the air you breathe.** While air pollution can be observed by the naked eye, underground water pollution in cities is not as visible, causing it to be virtually forgotten and continue unabated. **For decades, factories were able to discharge their wastewater into lakes and rivers across the country due to poor environmental regulations, weak enforcement, and the government's failure to crack down on polluting industries.** However, significant progress has been made in recent years. The Thirteenth Five Year Plan (13FYP) in 2016 set specific goals for water consumption and water quality, aiming at reducing water consumption by 23% from 2015 levels by 2020. This includes upgrading [upgraded] urban sewage facilities, increasing rates of wastewater treatment, and forcing farmers to reduce the use of chemical fertilisers and insecticides in a bid to reduce contamination from agricultural pollutants. According to the 2020 State of Ecology & Environment Report, most of the key targets set in 13FYP have been met and exceeded, owing to the fact that within a very short period of time, the country managed to build [built] more than 39,000 new sewage treatment facilities in **95%** of municipalities and 30% **of** rural **areas.** To further improve water quality, the Chinese government funded the construction or renovation of nearly 80,000 kilometres of sewage collection pipeline network between 2021 and 2025. Despite surface water continuing to improve, groundwater quality still has a long way to go, with just 13.6% considered fit for human consumption, according to the report. **Water pollution still causes more than 100,000 deaths and economic losses of USD$1.5 trillion each year**; this environmental issue is therefore something that China can no longer afford to ignore.

Contention 3: Economic Benefits

Climate change causes flooding and extreme rain RIGHT NOW, leading to billions of dollars in economic damage

Ye 22. Yuan is a Shanghai-based journalist who writes for Sixth Tone. Ye, Yuan. "Global Warming of 2C Could 'Double' Flooding Costs in China Compared to 1.5C." Carbon Brief, 1 Aug. 2022, https://www.carbonbrief.org/global-warming-of-2c-could-double-flooding-costs-in-china-compared-to-1-5c/. BZ

Economic losses from flooding in China at 2C of global warming could be double those at 1.5C, research suggests. The study, published in the journal Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, estimates future flood risk across China under 1.5C and 2C of warming and its impact on people and wider society. Compared with 1.5C of global warming, "the probability of the severe flood would be significantly higher for global warming of 2C", the study finds, adding that "in some areas, the probability would double". The direct economic losses at 1.5C would total around $33bn per year (£27bn) for "severe" floods, rising to $70bn (£57bn) for "mild" floods that would affect more of the country. At 2C, these projected costs approximately double, the authors say. Flooding would have the largest impact for the "social economy in the regions with lower altitudes and smaller slopes in eastern China", the study says. However, the range of medium-high flood risk will "gradually expand westward and northward". The study presents a "clear message that **the warmer we let the climate get[s], the greater the losses of dollars** will be from flooding", a scientist not involved in the research tells Carbon Brief. They add that the findings are "important" because they allow policymakers to "see the economic cost of not responding". Rising flood risk **In** late July **2021**, a record-breaking deluge dumped close to a year's worth of rain in just three days on the central Chinese city Zhengzhou, home to 12 million people. The resulting flooding became the deadliest natural disaster for the city in decades, with close to 400 people killed. BREAKING – Heavy rain pounded the central Chinese province of Henan, bursting the banks of major rivers, flooding the streets of a dozen cities including Zhengzhou and trapping subway passengers waist-high in floodwaters pic.twitter.com/JSxYhz1k5a— Insider Paper (@TheInsiderPaper) July 20, 2021 Unprecedented **rainfall** also hit the nearby cities in Henan province, triggering **[triggered] flash flooding and landslides. Crops were submerged, more than 50 thousand houses were destroyed and more than 1.4 million people were evacuated from their homes.** Overall, the rain caused direct economic losses of 120bn yuan (£15bn), including 41bn yuan (£5bn) in Zhengzhou alone. In the wake of the floods, mentions of climate change increased, though modestly, in news reports on extreme weather in Chinese media. Wang Zhihua, head of disaster relief at the China Meteorological Administration, blamed climate change for the natural disaster in a press briefing after the flood. He said: "The increased likelihood of extreme weather has become one of the biggest risks facing the world, which requires our great attention. For the response, the focus is to step up monitoring and early warning capacity." Flooding drives the largest economic losses among all other natural disasters in China in recent years, but flood insurance is not yet widely taken up. In 2021, China's economic losses from flood-related events stood at $25bn, behind Europe's losses of $41.8bn, according to Zurich-based reinsurer Swiss Re. This year, extreme weather hit the southern parts of China again with torrential rains, disrupting the lives of half a million people, with flash floods that turned roads into swollen rivers and submerged houses and cars. Economic exposure The new study, conducted by researchers from the Chinese Academy of Sciences, compares the flood exposure and social economic impact from rainfall-driven flooding across China, under different future scenarios. The researchers use the global warming levels of 1.5C and 2C, in keeping with the limits set out in the Paris Agreement. They use two different scenarios for these levels – the intermediate emissions of RCP4.5 and the very high emissions of RCP8.5. Glossary RCP8.5: The RCPs (Representative Concentration Pathways) are scenarios of future concentrations of greenhouse gases and other forcings. RCP8.5 is a "very high baseline" emission scenario brought about by rapid population growth, high energy… Read More The study notes that global warming is "projected to reach 1.5C by around 2030 for both RCPs, whereas the 2C is reached by 2040 under RCP8.5 and by 2050 under RCP4.5".

Focus on environmental policy means China can both peak emissions AND have economic benefits soon

Yang 20. Xiaoliang holds a PhD in Environmental Science from State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry and a MPA from Maxwell School of Syracuse University. Yang, Xiaoliang. "China Can Grow Its Economy through Stronger Climate Action." World Resources Institute, 4 Dec. 2020, https://www.wri.org/insights/china-can-grow-its-economy-through-stronger-climate-action. BZ

President Xi Jinping surprised the world in September 2020 by announcing to the UN General Assembly that China will aim to peak its carbon emissions before 2030 and achieve carbon neutrality before 2060. A new WRI report finds that **China can peak its emissions** as early as **2026 and realize** enormous **economic benefits** over the long term **by strengthening its climate** and energy **policies now.** By taking steps in energy, industry, transportation and carbon capture, the nation could save nearly **1.9 million lives** and generate nearly **$1 trillion** (6.5 trillion RMB) in net economic and social benefits in 2050. China Can Achieve Stronger Climate Targets in 2030 With its 2020 emissions-reduction targets already met, our analysis shows that China is also on track to exceed the 2030 targets set out in its first Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to the Paris Agreement. This suggests that China could achieve more ambitious emissions reductions for 2030 and significantly enhance the targets in its NDC — including establishing a target for non-CO2 emissions — ahead of the COP26 climate talks in Glasgow, Scotland, in 2021. Policy Choices in 14th Five-Year Plan Can Accelerate Long-term Economic Growth China's policy choices now, such as in its soon-to-be-released 14th Five-Year Plan (2021-2025), will lock in emissions trends for many years. Our report finds that if China adopts a set of cost-effective decarbonization strategies (referred to as a "strengthened ambition scenario"), the country can also expect to attain stronger economic gains in terms of GDP, government revenues and employment. **Setting stronger climate policies now would generate cost savings of $530 billion in fuel**, operation **and maintenance** expenditures over 30 years. More ambitious climate policies would also reduce particulate emissions, which could improve air quality and help prevent the premature deaths of up to 1.89 million people in 2050. In addition, such policies would avoid $445 billion [billions of dollars] in climate damages and help China realize its vision for a greener future by reducing 4.7 gigatons of CO2 emissions compared with a business-as-usual scenario — the equivalent of removing 100 million passenger vehicles from the roads each year. WRI analysis using the Energy Policy Solutions modeling tool shows it is technologically and economically feasible for China to plateau its annual CO2 emissions at around 10.3 gigatons by 2025. In addition, the share of non-fossil fuels in China's primary energy consumption could increase to about 20% by 2025 (from 14.3% in 2018). An earlier WRI study found China can avoid an additional 3 gigatons of non-CO2 greenhouse gas emissions—such as methane, nitrous oxide, and hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)—over the next 10 years while reaping development benefits if it takes action right away. **Priorities for Climate Action** However, to realize these advances, China will need to make changes in its current national policies for energy, industry and more. During the 13th Five-Year Plan period (2016-2020), China adopted policy measures focused on climate, including establishing a carbon intensity reduction target, advancing a carbon market, accelerating climate adaptation, and raising public awareness of climate change. Our study shows that during the 14th Five-Year Plan period (2021-2025), China can build on these actions to achieve early carbon emissions peaking and get on a net-zero emissions path as quickly as possible.

THUS, IN SUMMARY

1] Because air pollution is happening RIGHT NOW, killing thousands every day and hour, we need to solve climate change. The solution is to tax emissions.

2] Because people are dying from contaminated water RIGHT NOW, we need to solve this by upgrading sewage regulations.

3] Economic benefits can result from preventing climate change and extreme floods. This ensures a prosperous and sustainable economy for all of us.

Thus I proudly affirm. I stand open to CX.

V4 Extensions

Definitions

Diffen ND | PRC = China = country in East Asia. Controls mainland China.

OECD 1 | Environmental protection = maintain quality of environment thru reducing pollution and preventing degradation of ecosystems

Investopedia 21| Econ growth = increase in production of economic goods & services

Collins ND | Prioritize = treat as more important than other things

SV Framework

Prefer the criterion of minimizing structural violence:

1] Cher 20 | Structural violence is inherent and discriminates against specific minorities in society – poverty, racism, inequality: the list goes on.

2] Debate centering around extinction events that are highly improbable, such as nuclear war, ignore every day poverty faced by people in need – the point of debate is to solve injustices, not to ignore them.

3] Gilligan 96 | Structural violence kills more than any war: 18 million compared with 100,000. So you always vote for structural violence, because it happens infinitely and continuously.

4] Probability outweighs – the structure of debate helps improbable and far-off extinction impacts to ALWAYS win. This prevents us from addressing what actually matters: ONGOING every day harm done to people who need the most help.

5] Survival assumes that life is worth living – there's no value to life if one is under constant torture, violation, fear of genocide and oppression.

C1 – Carbon Tax / Climate

Parry & Wingender 16 | A carbon tax rising by $5 per year could reduce emissions 30%, by 2030. It's easy to implement: tax polluting products at their point of entry, like at a border or coal mine. This gradually seeks to achieve zero emissions by discouraging pollution, yet allows some economic activity to happen.

Igini 22 + Guardian | The immediate impact is a slow mass-death. That's 4000 Chinese people dying PER DAY, and 1.2 million EVERY YEAR. And because China contributes to one third of all pollution on Earth, a carbon tax in China will be significant to help stop warming.

Krosofsky 21 | The long-term impact is climate change extinction. Rising global temperatures will cook us all alive by 2030 - this is urgent because of its high probability and the short amount of time we have to address it.

C2 – Contaminated Water

Igini 22 | 90% of China's water is toxic, because of poor environmental regulations and unrestricted waste-dumping near rivers and lakes. Half the population doesn't have clean drinking water, causing hundreds of thousands of deaths EVERY YEAR.

The solution is to upgrade sewage and further enforce regulations on waste disposal – no more careless littering by factories.

C3 – Economic Benefits (definitely extend in 1AR)

Ye 22 | 70 billion dollars in damage result from flooding and heavy rain, caused by climate change – crops are destroyed, homes demolished, and millions must evacuate. This is because of changing wind currents and warming that messes with weather patterns. Hence, the urgency of this issue calls for immediate prioritization of the environment.

Yang 20 | Sustainable development policy results in peak emissions by 2026, millions of lives saved, and a trillion dollars generated, due to preventing climate-related disasters. This can in turn be used to stimulate the economy and help fund sustainable models of growth.

Impact Weighing

Environment (timeframe): Climate change extinction will happen by 2030 [Krosofsky].

Environment (probability): It's happening right now, constantly as we speak, and has been happening for the past few centuries – 100% probability if we don't do anything.

Aff Blocks

Rebuild the Climate 1AC

AT Carbon Tax Burden

Turn: Carbon tax generates revenue needed for essential services helping the structurally disadvantaged

Parry & Wingender 16, Ian Parry is an environmental fiscal policy expert for the International Monetary Fund. Philippe Wingender is a senior economist of The World Economic Studies Division of the IMF's Research Department. Parry, Ian, and Philippe Wingender. "The Overwhelming Case for a Carbon Tax in China." IMF, IMF Blog, 27 July 2016, https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2016/07/27/the-overwhelming-case-for-a-carbon-tax-in-china. BZ

Our analysis reveals that a carbon tax imposes a disproportionately large burden on low income households, 50 and 25 percent larger for the lowest 20 percent of income earners, compared with the top ten percent of income earners, given that low income households spend a greater share of their budget on energy. The good news is that only about 5 percent of the carbon tax revenues would be needed to compensate the bottom twenty percent [of income earners], for example, through reduced social security contributions and increased welfare and social spending (areas where China has been lagging relative to advanced and other middle income countries). How about the impact on export sectors? Here again, our analysis shows that exporting sectors do not bear a disproportionate share of the tax burden compared with other sectors. Moreover, compensation for these industries would again use up a minor fraction (at most 10 percent) of carbon tax revenues. Any compensation should be temporary however, as firms that cannot compete with energy efficiently priced should eventually cease operation. And the needed compensation could be smaller if more countries follow China's and others' lead to mitigate emissions. To tax or trade? As China continues its transition to a sustainable growth path, a carbon tax can be a powerful policy to support economic re-balancing and improve the environment. It is true that China has already committed to introducing a nationwide emissions trading system (ETS) in 2017 for large industrial sources. A carbon tax is still imperative, however, because by comprehensively covering fuels and emissions, it has about twice the environmental and revenue impacts of an equivalently scaled ETS. There is no reason the tax cannot be introduced in tandem with the ETS for the interim (perhaps allowing carbon tax refunds for entities required to obtain emissions permits), as what matters is establishing a robust and far-reaching emissions price to reap the badly needed health and fiscal benefits—while at the same time taking a major step forward in addressing the global environmental challenge of our time.

Cross-apply Parry & Wingender again, where they say that

And the tax would raise well over **2 percent of GDP** in new revenue by **2030**, a huge bonus which represents **more than enough to double government spending on healthcare.**

AT “need better econ to build the sponge cities”

1] Govn’t spends money

2] Can’t build up economy until you solve flooding first

3] Money from economy won’t go towards sponge cities anyways without govn’t regulation

ECON

AT Green Economy / Tech

Empirics prove this - we can't just leave the economy alone and hope for the best – green tech can only come from prioritizing the environment

Oreskes 15. Naomi Oreskes, Harvard professor of environmental science, 15 Naomi Oreskes, American historian of science. She is a Professor of the History of Science and Affiliated Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences at Harvard University, 12-1-2015, Without Government, the Marketplace Will Not Solve Climate Change, https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/without-government-the-marketplace-will-not-solve-climate-change/, 10-8-2022

A price on carbon will push demand in the right direction, but it needs to be reinforced by the pull of public investment in innovation. The most likely way we will get the innovation we need, at the scale we need, in the time frame we need and at a retail price that people can afford, is if the public sector plays a significant role. It is possible that the market will bring us a technological breakthrough on climate change. But history suggests that this would be a long shot—even with a hefty price on carbon—because **not one of the major technological developments of the 20th century was produced by the private sector working alone**. Entrepreneurs such as Thomas Edison and George Westinghouse developed electricity, but it took the federal government to build the delivery systems that brought it to the lion's share of Americans. The same is true of telephone service. The federal government, starting with President Dwight Eisenhower, was needed to build an interstate highway system. Nuclear power was not a response to market demand: the U.S. government wanted to prove that the destructive power unleashed at Hiroshima and Nagasaki could have a constructive use. The U.S. military invented the Internet, as a technology under the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. Former vice president Al Gore helped draft and pass the legislation that eventually released the Internet as a civilian technology that the private sector could commercialize and sell to millions of customers. The federal government developed digital computers, satellite communications, weather forecasting and the **g**lobal **p**ositioning **s**ystems that tell mobile phones where we are. These transformative technologies were all created as public-private partnerships, more often than not with the government as a lead partner. And they all took sustained effort over decades, the kind of effort for which the private sector has little stomach for. A government pull is needed to develop climate solutions that, like the Internet, can be further advanced and marketed by the private sector. ARPA-E (Energy), an agency modeled after DARPA, is funding research in these areas, but its budget is peanuts.

AT Recession / Econ UQ

No China recession – the government will intervene anyways while still prioritizing climate

Roberts 22. Michael Roberts is the creator and author of Michael Roberts Blog. Roberts, Michael. "Is China Headed for a Crash?" MR Online, 21 July 2022, https://mronline.org/2022/07/22/is-china-headed-for-a-crash/. BZ

There is not going to be a financial crash in China. That's **because the government controls the financial levers of power: the central bank**, the big four state-owned commercial banks which are the largest banks in the world, and the so-called 'bad banks', which absorb bad loans, big asset managers, most of the largest companies. The government can order the big four banks to exchange defaulted loans for equity stakes and forget them. It can tell the central bank, the People's Bank of China, to do whatever it takes. It can tell state-owned asset managers and pension funds to buy shares and bonds to prop up prices and to fund companies. It can tell the state bad banks to buy bad debt from commercial banks. It can get local governments to take up the property projects to completion. **So a financial crisis is ruled out because the state controls the banking system.**

No housing crash – the Chinese government solves with control over the financial system

Power 22. Journalist whose writing has appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Quartz, Al Jazeera, The Guardian. Power, John. "As China's Property Crisis Grows, Is the Global Economy at Risk?" Property | Al Jazeera, Al Jazeera, 30 Aug. 2022, https://www.aljazeera.com/economy/2022/8/30/what-chinas-property-crisis. BZ

China's economy is unlikely to experience an economic meltdown of that severity. But it could be on track for a protracted slump that drags on global growth in the coming **years**, according to analysts. Teneo's Wildau said that Chinese policymakers have tools not readily available in more capitalistic countries to avert a full-blown financial crisis. "Chinese leaders have a much greater degree of control over the financial system and the real economy than US policymakers did in **2008**. So they have the tools to stave off an acute crisis," he said. "They have the tools to stave off financial contagion and a complete collapse in credit flows because they can simply order the banks to lend. They can work outside the legal bankruptcy system to keep everyone liquid, to avoid disorderly chains of default." But Wildau said China could still be looking at years of economic stagnation, which would feel like a recession to many Chinese after decades of strong growth. "We could just see an extended period of slow growth, something more like a Japan scenario, a sort of grinding slowdown over many years even absent acute financial distress or panic in the market," he said.

AT “env = decrease innov”

TURN: Empirics prove the Aff motivates innovation, the cornerstone of the economy

Tang 22 Jing Tang1 and Shilong Li1, 2022, How Do Environmental Regulation and Environmental Decentralization Affect Regional Green Innovation? Empirical Research from China, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9222837/, 10-20-2022

Building a scientific and rational modern environmental management system is an institutional guarantee to achieve green development. How environmental management affairs are appropriately divided between the central and local governments closely affects the efficiency and quality of regional green innovation. Therefore, this paper analyzed environmental regulation, environmental decentralization, and regional green innovation under the same framework by constructing a fixed-effects model and a panel threshold model. The research draws the following conclusions. First, environmental regulation significantly promotes regional green innovation while environmental decentralization exacerbated regional innovation, and their effect coefficients are 1.112 and −0.761 respectively. Second, the impact of environmental regulation and environmental decentralization on green innovation is heterogeneous, with the level of economic development and the type of environmental decentralization being key factors influencing the role of environmental regulation. The result confirms that green innovation utility of environmental regulation increases with the improvement of regional economic level [86]. Finally, excessive environmental decentralization inhibits green innovation by hindering the effective implementation of environmental regulatory policies, and the biggest threshold of environmental decentralization is 0.9694. According to the conclusions, some policy implications can be obtained as follows. First, the central government can appropriately increase the intensity of environmental regulations to increase the motivation of local governments to engage in green innovation. Currently, Chinese enterprises have the strength to withstand high standards of environmental regulations. The government should not only increase emission charges for heavy polluters, but also actively encourage enterprises to engage in green innovation activities such as clean technology research and development. Second, under China’s environmental decentralization system, the local government’s attitude of sacrificing the environment for the economy is rooted in the imperfection of the performance appraisal system. Therefore, it is necessary to accelerate improving the good performance evaluation system, combining economic and environmental indicators. The setting of performance evaluation indicators should coordinate the relationship between economic growth and environmental governance. The government cannot sacrifice the environment for rapid growth, nor can it excessively pursue environmental quality at an economical cost [87]. Third, differentiated environmental decentralization strategies need to be developed for different regions. Since developed regions have stronger economic and technological strength, local environmental autonomy can be moderately relaxed to make full use of the information advantages of local governments so as to improve regional green innovation performance. For underdeveloped regions, the central government should reduce the environmental administrative and monitoring powers of local governments, while increasing environmental assessment and supervision, as well as setting environmental bottom-line standards and incentives to motivate local governments to conduct green innovation.

AT "Econ solves environment" (more C2)

"Prioritize"

Collins ND, https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/prioritize BZ

If you prioritize something, you treat it as more important than other things. *Prioritize your own wants rather than constantly thinking about others.*

1] Turn: Environmental protection is my opponent's reason to invest in economy. Based on our definition of "prioritize", which is to "treat as more important than other things", they're treating the environment as the end goal rather than economy thus more importantly. THIS IS AFF GROUND and justification why you must affirm.

2] Chinese economic growth bad for the environment – renewable energy

Tang et al, 15(Xu Tang, School of Business Administration, China University of Petroleum, Beijing; Benjamin C. McLellan, Graduate School of Energy Science, Kyoto University; Simon Snowden, Management School, University of Liverpool; Baosheng Zhang School of Business Administration, China University of Petroleum, Beijing; Mikael Höök, Global Energy Systems, Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University; "Dilemmas for China: Energy, Economy and Environment "; 2/8/15; Sustainability (journal); pages 2-3; https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:812129/FULLTEXT01.pdf)KW

China is an excellent example of the current crises faced by the rapidly developing and emerging economies of the world, but with close to 20% of global population, it is a country that stands alone in its potential to show the benefits and failures, challenges and enablers of development. It can be argued that China's unique size and nature as a centrally-planned economy may make it less of a representative example of the developing world, but we would argue that many of the decisions that must be made remain as representative challenges for the rest of the developing world. In this paper, we seek to broadly examine some of the key, intertwined challenges that affect the ability of developing nations to establish sustainable development transitions, drawing on the case of China. The sustainable development of developing countries is largely posited on the goal of attaining higher standards of living (including such development goals as high educational participation, good health and longevity), underpinned by improved economic performance. This economic performance in turn has largely been based to date on an industrialization pattern very similar to the path that the developed countries followed, though certain technological steps are being omitted, and the path is often being compressed in time (what took the developed countries over 200 years is being achieved in perhaps half that time in some developing nations). Importantly, economic growth requires energy and resources, which are largely being sought from non-renewable energy technologies and potentially the over-exploitation of natural resources. Thus, economic growth has largely come at a cost to the environment, which at some point, must either be rectified or present unavoidable barriers to further development. China's success or failure in achieving a sustainable developmental pattern may serve as an example for the remainder of the developing world and will inevitably have a significant influence on the global environment. The energy, economy and environment (E3) issue is an intricate problem, where three separate strands intertwine in a complex knot. From the perspective of academic research, coordinated development of E3 in China has attracted much attention, especially subsequent to 2000. Current research can be divided into three areas: (1) establishing macro-simulation models, such as computable general equilibrium (CGE) models, to optimize energy utilization by economic policies on the premise that environmental conditions remain unchanged or even improve [1,2]; (2) establishing evaluation indices and systems to assess the coordinated development of the E3 system [3,4]; and (3) establishing econometric models to study the co-integration relationship of the E3 system [5]. Ma et al. [6] undertook a comprehensive literature review on the co-integration of the energy and economic system in China, observing that most existing studies demonstrate a causal relationship between national aggregate energy consumption and national aggregate economic growth in China. Although research on the E3 issue in China has attracted much attention in the current academic literature, the conflicting relationships between and within the energy, the economic and the environmental sectors of China still lack clear elucidation. This paper will first review each aspect of the E3 triad to illuminate the dilemmas faced by China when interacting with the rest of the world and then will discuss the reasons why it is difficult for China to address these E3 dilemmas.

Chinese economic growth directly related to energy consumption – speeds up climate change and water pollution.

3] Tang et al, 15(Xu Tang, School of Business Administration, China University of Petroleum, Beijing; Benjamin C. McLellan, Graduate School of Energy Science, Kyoto University; Simon Snowden, Management School, University of Liverpool; Baosheng Zhang School of Business

Administration, China University of Petroleum, Beijing; Mikael Höök, Global Energy Systems, Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University; "Dilemmas for China: Energy, Economy and Environment "; 2/8/15; Sustainability (journal); pages 4-5; https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:812129/FULLTEXT01.pdf)KW

China's economic growth has driven and been fuelled by a large energy requirement. It is questionable whether China can stop this pattern of demand for fossil energy through changes to its economic structure, with findings in recent years indicating sustained and rapid growth in China's energy demand [21–29]. This outlook is unlikely to change even considering anthropogenic climate change in the long term, although a potential for the reduction of the impact through an improved energy mix, industrial structural adjustments and enhanced technological developments cannot be rejected [30]. Concurrently, significant energy is still required to support further economic growth. Thus, the peak of energy consumption is expected to occur later than the peak production year for both oil [31] and coal [10]. Two observations can further illuminate this phenomenon. The first is the rapid expansion of China's automobile fleet. Fast economic development has brought continuous improvement in people's living standards, and these rising living standards manifest themselves in a booming demand for automobiles. Over the last 10 years, the total number of civil vehicles increased from 20.5 million in 2002 to 120.9 million in 2012 with an average annual growth rate of 19.4%. Among these, the total number of registered private vehicles increased from 9.7 million to 93.1 million with an average annual growth rate of 25.4% over the same period [32]. China's GDP per capita has already reached over 6700 USD in 2013, permitting a growing medium-high and medium income population to acquire and use automobiles. Transportation will continue to consume more energy, especially oil, since other forms of energy cannot yet substitute for oil as a transportation fuel at the scope and scale required. The second observation relates to the heterogeneous levels of economic development witnessed throughout China. In a vast country such as China, there are both historic and geographic reasons for regional differences in economic development [33–35]. Some eastern regions of China have already entered a stage of economic development comparable to moderately-developed countries, presenting a gradually stabilized energy consumption trend. In contrast, the majority of the central and western regions are still undergoing extensive economic growth. These regions reflect the initial stages of industrialization focused on low-level construction/manufacturing, typical of patterns of earlier industrialization in the eastern areas of China. Therefore, China's energy consumption and energy-related CO2 emissions have different profiles depending on the region being examined [36]. Since the regional difference in economic development in China is considerable, demand could be expected to rise dramatically as standards of living rise in areas of low GDP per capita [37]. 2.3. Environmental Concerns There are many key environmental impacts attributable to energy production and consumption, including anthropogenic climate change, particulate emissions and water pollution. Energy production and consumption have become one of the main reasons for environmental deterioration in China. In recent years, serious haze has become the dominant environmental issue for not only the government, but also the Chinese public [38]. Most air pollution in China results from coal combustion, which is the source of 90% of SO2 emissions, 70% of dust emissions and 67% of NOx emissions [39]. A coal-dominated energy structure is the major reason for this atmospheric pollution [40]. Anthropogenic global warming is perhaps the most important global issue of the 21st century [41], and nearly 72.5% of China's total CO2 emissions were from coal in 2010 [40]. Coal will continue to dominate China's energy consumption and production system in the foreseeable future, challenging the government in its pursuit of a greenhouse gas abatement policy in the short-to-medium term [42]. On the international stage, this makes China appear to be one of the main perpetrators of anthropogenic global warming and places the nation's diplomats in a tough position caught between demands to decarbonize and domestic calls for more energy to sustain economic development. Developing alternative energy is certainly an option in theory, but will take time and significant investment to realize the benefits [43]. Moreover, China's use of coal for construction minerals (cement and steel) is currently exceedingly difficult to substitute for renewable alternatives anywhere in the world; thus, these key materials of development are almost unavoidable emitters of greenhouse gases [44]. China's national energy policy has also plunged its renewable industrial development into a passive state [45]. Recent amendments to this policy have mitigated some of the problems [46], although it is still too early to fully evaluate the effectiveness of these changes in promoting non-fossil energy sources. According to the Chinese government's renewable energy medium- and long-term development plans [47], non-fossil fuel energy will account for 15% of total energy use in 2020. Even if this target can be achieved successfully, fossil fuels will still be the main source for China's energy consumption

mix. Depletion of conventional fossil fuels can potentially trigger increased economic pressure to develop unconventional hydrocarbon resources, ranging from shale gas to oil sands. However, the EROI is less for these resources, and hence, the carbon footprint is also higher than more conventional hydrocarbon sources, making the emission problem even worse [48]. It is likely that unconventional oil and gas will be affected by future climate change mitigation initiatives [49].

4] Chinese environmental growth causes environmental degradation—resource and energy consumption cause pollution

Liu,12 (LIU QIAN QIAN; Masters in Science Candidate; "The Environment Quality and Economics Growth in China-A literature Review and Discussion"; 2012; pages 24; http://www.diva-portal.se/smash/get/diva2:512687/FULLTEXT01.pdf)KW

China, as a developing country, has a large population and rich natural resources. The comprehensive research on China's national conditions shows that since the 1980s China's economy has maintained rapid growth in GDP per capita GDP is higher than the past, but economic growth seem to have been gained by **consuming a large number of resources and causing environmental damage**. From an economic perspective, we notice that China's rapid growth depends on increased capital investment in huge capital, promotion of international trade, a cheap and growing labor force, rich land resources, and a huge domestic consumer market. However, from the angle of environment and resource economics, China's rapid growth also **is based on high energy consumption, high pollution emission** and perhaps over-reliance on the increase in investment. High consumption of resources is **the main reason** for environmental pollution. In the production process, only parts of raw materials have been transformed into products, with the remaining parts being wasted and discharged into the environment, causing environmental pollution.

AT Econ DA -> Nuke War

1] US-CHINA co-op on climate change prevents nuking each other

2] No Taiwan war – China isn't ready to go down against the world like Russia

Stavridis 22. James Stavridis is a retired U.S. Navy admiral, former supreme allied commander of NATO, and dean emeritus of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. He is vice chairman of global affairs at the Carlyle Group. Stavridis, James. "A US-China War over Taiwan Isn't Happening Anytime Soon." Bloomberg.com, Bloomberg, 9 Aug. 2022, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-08-09/a-us-china-war-over-taiwan-isn-t-happening-anytime-soon. BZ

Tensions, already very high between the US and China over Taiwan, were exacerbated by House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's "farewell tour" visit to the island. Many analysts are warning that an invasion by Beijing could come sooner rather than later — within 18 months is a common projection — often citing the Ukraine conflict as a model: China playing the part of Russia and bringing what it views as a non-nation sharply to heel. Based on many years of engagement with the Chinese around the Pacific both operationally and diplomatically, I believe we are years away from any potential military move by Beijing against Taipei, and it is particularly unlikely to happen in the immediate future. There are several reasons. More from Bloomberg Opinion How the Tories Brought Endless Anarchy to the UK UK Pensions Didn't Understand What They Were Buying Putin Is Making Nuclear Warfare the New Normal Musk Gutting Twitter Would Be a Threat to Us All First, events in Ukraine are likely to give Chinese President Xi Jinping pause, not encouragement. He must be asking himself, "I wonder if my generals and admirals are as bad as those Russians appear to be?" Xi was probably assured by Putin, when they met at the Olympics in February, that this would be a sharp, short war and that the Russians would have full control of Ukraine before the West could get its collective boots on. Things turned out very differently for the Kremlin. The Chinese military, similar in many ways to Russia's, lacks even the level of combat experience the Russians had in Afghanistan, Chechnya and Syria, and in the previous invasions of Ukraine and Georgia. A second reason for Chinese hesitancy is uncertainty about the Taiwanese. Would they fold or fight? Polling is never fully reliable, but all indications are that the Taiwanese have a strong sense of national identity and are unlikely to simply roll over when the first wave of Chinese missiles strike on the island. (Beijing gave a preview of its muscle in the exercises responding to the Pelosi visit.) President Tsai Ing-wen is a steely leader — she's not unlike Ukrainian leader Volodymyr Zelenskiy — and my assessment is that the Taiwanese will fight, and fight hard. The geography of the island — mountain and forest — is a nightmare for an invader, especially one that must mount the assault by sea. Third, Beijing is watching the alignment of the Western democracies across Europe and the Far East in enacting crippling [devastating] sanctions on Russia, causing Moscow to default on its debt for the first time in more than a century. Almost all Western corporations decamped from Moscow, helping cause a collapse in imports, and few look to be going back anytime soon. The NordStream 2 pipeline between Russia and Germany will have nothing but air whistling through its long tubes for the foreseeable future, and the Europeans are making strides toward energy independence from Moscow. Sure, the Chinese will say to themselves, our economy is too big to sanction, and they would be largely correct. But could the West produce real pain-inducing sanctions on specific sectors? Absolutely. And at a moment when the Chinese economy has been slowed by the ravages of zero-Covid lockdowns, this prospect is particularly unappetizing. Fourth, as the old saw goes, "all politics are local," and Xi has a very delicate political situation before him. At the 20th Communist Party Congress late in the fall, he will almost certainly be given a third five-year term. It is a remarkable achievement, vaulting him into the company of Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping. He does not want a major conflict with the US to interfere with this anointment, and even after he fully consolidates control it seems unlikely he would quickly manufacture a crisis that could crater the global economy. Finally, China's military and political leaders probably assess that they are not (quite) ready for a full-scale war with the US. They have a backlog of military capability they will want to fully integrate into the People's Liberation Army: a new strategic nuclear force, nuclear-powered warships (notably aircraft carriers), hypersonic missiles, improved offensive cyberwarfare techniques, and a far better satellite network for reconnaissance and actual combat in space.

3] Decline doesn't cause war---incites cooperation and no nukes

Christina L. **Davis &** Krzysztof J. **Pelc 17**, Christina L. Davis is a Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton; Krzysztof J. Pelc is an Associate Professor of Political Science at McGill University, "Cooperation in Hard Times: Self-restraint of Trade Protection," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 61(2): 398-429

Conclusion Political economy theory would lead us to expect rising trade protection during hard times. Yet **empirical evidence** on this count has been mixed. Some studies find a correlation between poor macroeconomic conditions and protection, but the worst recession since the Great Depression has generated surprisingly moderate levels of protection. We explain this apparent contradiction. Our statistical findings show that under conditions of

pervasive economic crisis at the international level, states exercise more **restraint** than they would when facing crisis alone. These results throw light on behavior not only during the crisis, but throughout the WTO period, from 1995 to the present. One concern may be that the restraint we observe during widespread crises is actually the result of a decrease in aggregate demand and that domestic pressure for import relief is lessened by the decline of world trade. By **controlling** for **product-level imports**, we show that the restraint on remedy use is not a byproduct of declining imports. We **also** take into account the ability of some countries to **manipulate their currency** and demonstrate that the relationship between crisis and trade protection **holds** independent of exchange rate policies. Government decisions to impose costs on their trade partners by taking advantage of their legal right to use flexibility measures are driven not only by the domestic situation but also by circumstances abroad. This can give rise to an individual **incentive for strategic self-restraint** toward trade partners in similar economic trouble. Under conditions of widespread crisis, government leaders **fear** the **repercussions** that their own use of trade protection may have on the behavior of trade partners at a time when they cannot afford the economic cost of a trade war. Institutions provide **monitoring** and a venue for **leader interaction** that **facilitates** **coordination** among states. Here the key function is to reinforce expectations that any move to protect industries will trigger similar moves in other countries. Such coordination often draws on shared historical analogies, such as the Smoot–Hawley lesson, which form a focal point to shape beliefs about appropriate state behavior. Much of the literature has focused on the more visible action of legal enforcement through dispute settlement, but this only captures part of the story. Our research suggests that tools of informal governance such as leader pledges, guidance from the Director General, trade policy reviews, and plenary meetings **play a real role** within the trade regime. In the absence of sufficiently stringent rules over flexibility measures, compliance alone is insufficient during a global economic crisis. These **circumstances** trigger **informal mechanisms** that complement legal rules to **support cooperation**. During widespread crisis, legal enforcement would be inadequate, and informal governance helps to bolster the system. Informal coordination is by nature difficult to observe, and we are unable to directly measure this process. Instead, we examine the variation in responses across crises of varying severity, within the context of the same formal setting of the WTO. Yet by focusing on discretionary tools of protection—trade remedies and tariff hikes within the bound rate—we can offer conclusions about how systemic crises shape country restraint independent of formal institutional constraints. Insofar as institutions are generating such restraint, we offer that it is by facilitating informal coordination, since all these instruments of trade protection fall within the letter of the law. Future research should explore trade policy at the micro level to identify which pathway is the most important for coordination. Research at a more macro-historical scope could compare how countries respond to crises under fundamentally different institutional contexts. In sum, the determinants of protection include economic downturns not only at home but also abroad. Rather than reinforcing pressure for protection, pervasive crisis in the global economy is shown to generate countervailing pressure for restraint in response to domestic crisis. In some cases, **hard times bring more, not less, international cooperation**.

AT Environment Time Frame

People in China are dying RIGHT NOW of pollution, due to prioritizing economy over environment in the past

Igini 22. Martina is an environmental journalist based in Hong Kong. She holds two Bachelor's degrees in Journalism and Translation/Interpreting Studies and a Master's degree in International Development. Igini, M. (2022, August 4). Top 5 environmental issues in China in 2022. Earth.Org. Retrieved October 9, 2022, from https://earth.org/environmental-issues-in-china/ BZ

The climate crisis is accelerating at a pace like never before. From deforestation and droughts to air and plastic pollution, these are just several factors that are exacerbating climate change and its consequences are felt everywhere in the world. China is certainly not spared by the effects of global warming, and is experiencing more frequent natural disasters, which lead to destruction, great human suffering, and biodiversity loss. As of 2021, the economic superpower is ranked fourth in the world among countries with the most natural disasters worldwide. On track to becoming the world's largest economy, China's extreme rapid industrial expansion in recent decades has also contributed to record levels of air and water pollution. Here are five of the most worrisome environmental issues in China. — 1. Air Pollution First on the list of environmental issues in China is air pollution. The country's poor air quality is not exactly news. Since the beginning of its industrial expansion and economic boom in the late 1970s – which lifted 800 million people out of poverty and saw the country's GDP grow at an average annual rate of 10% for four decades – the quality of air has progressively deteriorated. According to the 2021 World Air Quality Report, out of 1,374 cities located in East Asia, 143 (or about 11%) recorded annual average PM2.5 concentrations that are seven times greater than World Health Organization (WHO) standards. All of them were located in China, with the town of Hotan in southwestern Xinjiang experiencing the highest level of pollution in the country at about 101 µg/m³, over 20 times the WHO guideline value. Estimated to cause [Causing] an average of **1.2 million premature deaths every year**, China's poor air quality is primarily attributed to the rapid economic expansion [and] the country experienced since 1979, which resulted in a drastic increase in coal-powered industrial production and electricity demand, as well as an exponential rise in private vehicles. It is estimated that roughly 48% of Chinese CO2 emissions come from the industrial sector, with 40% from the power – mainly coal – and 8% from the transport industry. With an ever-increasing population, the demand for electricity has grown with no respite, leading to even more coal-burning and worsened air standards. Furthermore, despite pledging to reach net zero emissions before 2060, the country remains by far the world's largest producer and consumer of coal, which alone covers 60% of its electricity demand. In an effort to restore the economy to pre-pandemic levels and curb the energy crisis sparked by the exponential rise in industrial activities the country experienced in 2021, the Chinese government ordered factories to increase their production capacity and built more than triple the amount of new coal power capacity as the rest of the world combined. Unsurprisingly, CO2 emissions in the same year almost reached 12 billion tonnes, accounting for 33% of the global total.

AT Kuznets

1] NO KUZNETS CURVE (EKC) – they're just going to accelerate emissions until resource shortages

Goutzamanis 16. Goutzamanis, Yannis. "The Environmental Kuznets Curve: Fact or Fiction?" Economics Student Society of Australia (ESSA), 21 Feb. 2016, http://economicstudents.com/2014/08/the-environmental-kuznets-curve-fact-or-fiction/. BZ

The implications of the EKC hypothesis, if it were true, would be radical. It would mean that we could grow our way out of environmental problems. Cap and Trade Schemes or taxation measures to ameliorate pollution would be unnecessary – the answer is economic growth. This sounds too good to be true. Yet according to the EKC it is correct. The reality Given that the EKC hypothesis makes intuitive sense and the major consequences it would have for public policy if it were true, it seems prudent to test the hypothesis empirically. Thankfully, there have been a multitude of studies which do just this. **The major flaw in the EKC which the literature reveals is that it assumes all pollutants will behave in generally the same way in relation to income.** However, empirical studies have revealed that this is not the case. Whilst certain pollutants such as sulphur or nitrogen oxides have decreased as income has increased, others such as carbon dioxide emissions and solid waste have increased (Stern, 2004). The above point was reiterated in a study by Brajer, Mead and Xiao testing for an EKC in relation to China's air pollution. Brajer, Mead and Xiao stated that because overall air pollution is comprised of various discrete pollutants one cannot infer an aggregate EKC; because each pollutant has a discrete relationship with income. Expressed in econometric terms, an aggregate EKC suffers from problems of heteroscedasticity. Consequently, the EKC literature is varied depending on the pollutants selected. Whilst acknowledging the problem of heteroscedasticity, Brajer, Mead and Xiao nevertheless tested for an EKC with various aggregate pollution index measures and found the weight of the empirical evidence pointed away from 'the inverted U type hypothesis' and favoured 'an environmentally bleaker cubic relationship'. Thus, even where attempts are made to aggregate discrete pollutants, the EKC hypothesis does not hold. Another problem with the EKC is that it is not empirically robust. Sensitivity analyses on much of the early EKC literature demonstrate this, as adding explanatory variables, removing outliers and extending the dataset all cause large changes to the outcome. Conclusion It appears that the EKC exists in reality only in relation to certain pollutants. Accordingly, **it is not a theory which should be generalised and applied in public policy** formation. In order to craft effective pollution abatement schemes, policy-makers should examine the discrete relationship between the pollutant they are seeking to abate and income. Assuming that the pollutant will eventually decrease as incomes rise would be unempirical, lazy and dangerous.

2] We cannot sit around for Kuznets to happen – the people demand change and we need to deliver it now. Policies we are passing right now are a result of this

3] China cracks down on protests, so we need to do it now through government policy

4] Companies won't try to develop green tech – short term profitability is all that matters

AT Tech Solution

Over-reliance on tech pushes back climate action: we need more direct efforts and government step-up

Fuge 21. Lauren Fuge is a science journalist at Cosmos. She holds a BSc in physics from the University of Adelaide and a BA in English and creative writing from Flinders University. Fuge, Lauren. "From the Vault: Tech Alone Cannot Solve Climate Crisis." Cosmos, 5 Aug. 2021, https://cosmosmagazine.com/technology/tech-alone-cannot-solve-climate-crisis/. BZ

An international team of scientists says that **we cannot rely on technology to meet climate targets** – instead, wealthy countries must change their lifestyles to dramatically reduce emissions and avoid climate breakdown. The new article, published in Nature Energy, calls for the urgent development of new climate models that explore ways economies can remain stable without constantly growing, reducing the reliance on potentially unfeasible new technologies to fix our problems. "We cannot keep temperature rises below 1.5 degrees using technology alone – unfortunately this will require lifestyle changes in wealthy countries," says Manfred Lenzen from the University of Sydney, co-author of the study. "Because we've not implemented significant emissions reductions over the past decades when we should have, we now need to reduce emissions rapidly and like we've never done before." Models attempt to predict future temperatures and climate based on current data and simulations; they can follow a variety of pathways to different outcomes based on our choices now. Many of these current models accept that economies will continue to strive for growth, and factor in dramatic technological change in order to meet climate targets such as the Paris Agreement. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, for example, argues that innovative technology is essential for not only cutting greenhouse gas emissions but also adapting to the impacts of climate change. But this new study argues that technological fixes – such as carbon capture and storage, nuclear fusion, or injecting particulates into the atmosphere – may be unfeasible to scale up to the required levels, especially as increased economic growth drives up energy demand. The authors point out that to remove carbon from the atmosphere at a fast enough rate, direct air carbon capture and storage (DACCS) methods may use up to half of the world's current electricity generation. This would then make it difficult to make the global transition to renewables. "Scientists have raised substantial questions about the risks of negative emissions technologies and the feasibility of sufficiently decoupling economic growth from rising emissions," says Jason Hickel, lead author of the paper from the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). "Put bluntly, these approaches may not be adequate to address the crisis we face. We're gambling the future of humanity and the rest of life on Earth because of the assumption that GDP must continue to grow in rich countries." This echoes previous research arguing that over-reliance on new technology is enabling us to delay a dramatic reduction in emissions, creating a dangerous cycle of technological promises and re-framed climate change targets. Instead, scientists call for widespread cultural, social and political transformation. "It doesn't have to be this way," Hickel and colleagues write. "High-income nations can maintain economic stability, invest in innovation and achieve strong social outcomes without the need for additional growth, thereby making mitigation easier to achieve." They instead propose policies that will reduce inequality, guarantee living wages, shorten the working week, and ensure access to healthcare, education and other essential services. "If we share the yields of our economy more fairly, we can ensure good lives for all without plundering the planet for more," Hickel says. By updating existing climate models to address alternative 'post-growth' scenarios, the authors conclude, this would "help broaden the range of policy options for public debate".

AT “Enforcement Bad”

1] China enforces climate policy more effectively than international standards

Pang 20. Mr. Pang has over 35 years of experience as a practicing attorney in both China and North America. He has attended University of Hong Kong, Tsinghua University, UC Berkeley, Santa Clara Law School, University of Houston and the Fuqua School at Duke University. Pang, Peter C. “China's Evolving Environmental Protection Laws - Clean Air / Pollution - China.” China's Evolving Environmental Protection Laws - Clean Air / Pollution - China, IPO Pang Xingpu, 18 June 2020, https://www.mondaq.com/china/clean-air-pollution/955486/china39s-evolving-environmental-protection-laws. BZ

China updated its Environmental Protection Law in 2015. This was the nation's first major reform of its environmental policies in more than two decades. The updated law includes stricter punishments on polluters. It also allows [NGOs] non-governmental organizations to file environmental lawsuits against violators in the name of the greater public intertest. These reforms are meaningful, and new environmental protections are likely to emerge soon. The National People's Congress is working to revise other major pieces of legislation, including the Law on the Prevention and Treatment of Air Pollution and the Law on the Prevention and Treatment of Water Pollution. The legislative body is also considering a new set of policies under the proposed Law on the Prevention and Treatment of Soil Pollution, which will add even more requirements to an expanding environmental regime. China's commitment to protecting our environment does not end with domestic policies. As a signatory to the Paris Agreement on climate change, China committed to a Five Year Plan that cuts carbon emissions and shows more dedicated commitment to environmental protection. This year, China is releasing a new plan, the "China Standards 2035," designed to influence next-generation technologies like telecommunications and artificial intelligence in a manner that encourages climate neutrality and environmental conservation. Environmental Enforcement Improves Throughout China After spending years under an outdated environmental law, China created standards and regulations that are even stricter than the international ones. In fact, some of the new mandates exceeded the abilities of current day science and technology, which created some difficulties for companies required to adjust. In some respects, regulators demanded industry meet environmental goals that conflicted with business' abilities to meet contractual obligations. Some enterprises struggled to keep costs reasonable and keep up with demand. Nevertheless, noncompliance is not an option. China's new environmental policies are being robustly enforced. In 2015, a monumental Chinese judicial decision commonly referred to as The Nanping Case sent a strong signal that the courts have jurisdiction to enforce environmental laws beyond just awarding money damages for pollution injuries. This case followed quickly on the heels of another notable environmental public interest lawsuit, The Taizhou Case, which sentenced individuals who illegally dumped hazardous waste into China's rivers to jail time.

2] LD is a value debate, thus a discussion whether the fundamental idea of it is good or not, not about how to implement or enforce. If that were the case, then Affirmatives would always lose because the Negative could pick out one single thing that won’t work while we can’t do anything about it. Fairness is key to having a debate in the first place.

3] We assume fiat because both Aff and Neg won’t be able to pass any policy – makes sure the debate focuses on the topic rather than enforcement

AT Poverty

If we don't try to solve climate change right now, pollution will continue to worsen poverty for people all around the world

Heart 19, HEART. "Pollution and Poverty." HEART, 28 June 2019, https://www.heart-resources.org/reading_pack/pollution-and-poverty/. BZ

Pollution is strongly linked to poverty. Nearly **92% of pollution-related deaths occur** in low- and middle-income countries. Children face the highest risks and are the most vulnerable victims of pollution because small exposures to chemicals in utero and early childhood can result in lifelong disease, disability, [&] premature death, as well as reduced learning and earning potential. The health impact of pollution is likely to be much larger than can accurately be quantified today because of insufficient data collection and scientific research from many pollutants. Pollution is costly. Pollution-related illnesses result in direct medical costs, costs to healthcare systems and opportunity costs resulting from lost productivity and economic growth. Welfare losses due to pollution are estimated at **$4**.6 **trillion per year**, 6.2% of global economic output. **The claim that** pollution control stifles economic growth and that poor **countries must pollute in order to grow is false.**

China's poverty-solving claims are inflated by false statistics and lowered data standards

Feng 21. Reporter - Voice of America (VOA News). Feng, Gao. "China Claims It Has Eliminated Poverty but Is That True?" VOA, Voice of America (VOA News), 3 Mar. 2021, https://www.voanews.com/a/east-asia-pacific_voa-news-china_china-claims-it-has-eliminated-poverty-true/6202791.html. BZ

Shifting standards Beijing continues to use World Bank standards for the world's poorest nations even though it is classified as an upper-middle-class country. China defines extreme rural poverty as annual per capita income of less than $620, or about $1.69 a day at current exchange rates, according to Reuters. That compares to the World Bank's global threshold of $1.90 a day. "In 2021 … measuring progress using the official poverty lines of the world's poorest countries as a benchmark may be the very definition of underachievement," wrote Brookings Institution economist Indermit Gill. The ceremony "and the associated party propaganda are aimed at painting [paints] Xi Jinping as the victorious commander leading China to success in its millennia-long battle against poverty and allowing him to claim personal credit for this accomplishment," Carl Minzner, a professor at Fordham Law School who specializes in Chinese law and governance, told Bloomberg. "This will have dramatic ramifications in terms of Xi's personal power, the extent to which a cult of personality surrounding Xi will be tacitly or directly encouraged," he said. Xi and the official media remained largely silent about more than four decades of market-style economic reforms that began with opening China to foreign investment after the Cultural Revolution. As 2020 closed, Martin Raiser of the World Bank told the New York Times: "We're pretty sure China's eradication of absolute poverty in rural areas has been successful—given the resources mobilized, we are less sure it is sustainable or cost effective." The government subsidized jobs for rural workers with poverty alleviation projects, gave farmers animals, and pumped money into poor provinces with loans and grants, according to the Times. This aerial view shows people shopping for groceries at a farmers' market in Jishou, in central China's Hunan province. This aerial view shows people shopping for groceries at a farmers' market in Jishou, in central China's Hunan province. Doubts raised The money flows through China's Rural Subsistence Allowance System based on an application, its review and approval, and distribution of funds, a process that moves through China's three basic levels of rural governance — village to township to county. Rural households apply for subsidies by providing township officials with household registration, disability documents and endorsement from their village governments. The paperwork goes to grassroots level administrative offices such as department of civil affairs. Township officials review the applications and submit them to county-level government officials for approval. If approved, an applicant's money is dispersed on a monthly basis to a designated account in a rural bank or credit union, which does not charge management fees. Each recipient receives an allowance card that works like a debit card, allowing cash withdrawal as needed. Temporary or one-time living subsidies — such as those granted for holidays — are paid to households in full if all requirements are met. Huang Xiaomin, a rights activist in Chengdu, Sichuan Province, told VOA Mandarin that, in some places, records used by Xi and other top officials can be inflated. In Sichuan province, for example, many residents of Heshu town in Peng'an county appear to have received social security and health care benefits. But, the activist said, the reality is different because several people in one family share the money that arrives as a cash payment or bank transfer. According to Huang, the one-month minimum living allowance for one person is about $42 to $56. When shared among four or five family members of one household, each person got about $11, he said. "It's definitely not enough to get out of poverty. But under pressure from the government, [unless the poor people] sign their names to claim everyone has got the full amount, they won't get any money," he told VOA's Mandarin Service "So there's definitely adulteration." Maintaining stability Xi's messaging Thursday contrasts with a statement by Chinese Premier Li Keqiang last May.

Homelessness increases when homes are destroyed by ***floods***. Prioritizing the environment through methods such as ***tree planting*** can solve

Kusmer 20. Anna Kusmer is a reporter and producer at The World focusing on the environment. Kusmer, Anna. "How China's Nature-Based Solutions Help with Extreme Flooding." The World from PRX, 31 July 2020, https://theworld.org/stories/2020-07-31/how-china-s-nature-based-solutions-help-extreme-flooding. BZ

Southern China's rainy season lasted nearly twice as long this year. Record rainfall caused the country's longest river, the Yangtze, to overflow along the river's middle and lower regions. "A normal rainy season is about 24 days," said Xiquan Dong, an extreme weather expert at the University of Arizona. "This year we got 43." But so far, this year's flooding has not been as catastrophic as the fatal floods of 1998, leading some environmental experts to evaluate how nature-based mitigation strategies like tree planting and floodplain restoration have helped to ease the

fallout. “[This year’s] precipitation is much higher than the year of 1998, but the flooding has been less serious and damaging." Junguo Liu, chair professor, School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen, China “[This year’s] precipitation is much higher than the year of 1998, but the flooding has been less serious and damaging,” said Junguo, chair professor in the School of Environmental Science and Engineering at Southern University of Science and Technology in Shenzhen, China. This year, about 158 people have been reported dead or missing so far, and more than 400,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, according to China’s Ministry of Emergency Management. In contrast, the 1998 flood killed more than 3,000 people and left 15 million people homeless. The Chinese government attributed the 1998 floods to uncharacteristically heavy rains, as well as rampant deforestation and high population density along the Yangtze and its tributaries. Liu said the 1998 disaster caused the Chinese government to completely rethink flooding management. The new approach — rolled out in the 10 years after the 1998 flood as part of the National Climate Change Program — shifted the focus toward nature-based solutions for flood risk management. “Definitely this is a very important turning point for the Chinese government to think about the relation between human and nature,” said Liu. Tree-planting and 'sponge cities' For centuries, China’s flood control strategy relied on levees built at the riverbank’s edge to keep the water in narrow river channels, with people living and farming on the other side. With over 20,000 miles of levees, China has had one of the most extensive levee systems in the world. To reverse some of the damage done by an overburdened levee system, China launched some of the largest ecological restoration projects in the world, planting billions of trees to prevent runoff into rivers and absorb more water upstream. “The Chinese government initiated a lot of programs for the forestry restoration,” said Liu. “So, when we plant more trees … upstream, this can reduce the runoff. And this is very helpful for the mitigation of flood[s] events.” While the tree-planting schemes have received some criticism for how they were executed, Liu says his studies show that depending on the context, upland **tree planting can help reduce flooding by up to 30%.** Additionally, the government's “sponge cities” project aims to increase green spaces and permeable pavement to absorb more rainwater in urban spaces prone to flooding.

AT Subnat (sponge cities solve)

Local governments can't be expected to properly implement sponge cities – lack of coordination and possibility of embezzlement

The Economist in 2021 states: Economist. "To Prevent Floods, China Is Building 'Sponge Cities.'" The Economist, The Economist Newspaper, 18 Nov. 2021, https://www.economist.com/china/2021/11/18/to-prevent-floods-china-is-building-sponge-cities. BZ

It is the case that local governments sometimes misspend the money they are given for sponge-city building. They are often reluctant to use expensive land to create natural drainage systems such as parks and ponds. For a sponge city to work, many government units must collaborate, from water-conservation and weather bureaus to education and emergency departments. For two days before the worst of the flooding, Zhengzhou's meteorological office issued its highest level of alert for a rainstorm. But few officials appeared to pay much attention.

AT BRI

BRI harms the environment and contributes towards China's war plans – makes global conflict likely

Business Standard 21. Business-standard.com is the online property of Business Standard Private Limited, publisher of India's leading business daily, Business Standard. The website attracts over 15 million unique visitors every month, the highest such number for any standalone business newspaper website in India. Standard, Business. "China's BRI Left Several Countries Saddled with 'Hidden Debts': Report." Business Standard News, Business-Standard, 30 Sept. 2021, https://www.business-standard.com/article/international/china-s-bri-left-several-countries-saddled-with-hidden-debts-report-121093000947_1.html. BZ

China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) has left scores of lower- and middle-income countries (LMIC) saddled with "hidden debts" totalling USD 385 billion [dollars], according to new research. The findings are part of a report published by AidData, an international development research lab based at the College of William and Mary in Virginia. According to this report, China has used debt rather than aid to establish a dominant position in the international development finance market. The report has analysed more than 13,000 aid and debt-financed projects worth more than USD 843 billion across 165 countries. According to AidData, over 40 LMIC now have levels of debt exposure to China higher than 10 per cent of their national gross domestic product. The number of "mega-projects"--financed with loans worth USD 500 million or more--approved each year tripled during the first five years of BRI implementation. Despite larger loans and expanded loan portfolios, BRI has not led to any major changes in the sectoral or geographical composition of China's overseas development finance program, the report said. As per the report, 35 per cent of the BRI infrastructure project portfolio has encountered major implementation problems, such as corruption scandals, labour violations, **environmental hazards**, and public protests. By comparison, only 21 per cent of the Chinese government's infrastructure project portfolio outside of the BRI has encountered similar implementation problems, according to AidData. Since its launch in 2013, the BRI has been well received across the globe due to its easy loan parameters. However, **these concessions facilitated economic and military expansion for the Chinese, allowing them to build infrastructure, establish military bases in BRI- recipient countries**, reported The Times of Israel. A large number of these sovereign loans are in fact extended to developing countries and are negotiated in secret. A few of these loans use resources as collateral. This dept trap diplomacy, the lack of transparency and unreasonable loan conditions have made these schemes extremely unpopular and as a result, have earned the BRI a lot of bad press. Unsustainable loans and cases of debt traps in countries like Sri Lanka and Malaysia as well as the use of sovereign land for building China's military installations have made the BRI a cause for concern. The latest report reveals new insights about the BRI, and it comes at a time when the U.S. government and its allies are seeking to develop a viable alternative to the BRI, under the auspices of the Build Back Better World (B3W) initiative that the G7 announced in June 2021. In a bid to compete with BRI, even the European Union recently launched the Global Gateway, a new infrastructure development scheme.