My partner and I negate the resolution.

Observation: To affirm, the pro must support a blanket ban on the production, distribution, and use of any single-use plastics in the United States. An exclusion of certain plastics shifts the goalpost unfairly; If they can pick and choose which plastics to ban, they don't affirm a ban on single use plastics, they affirm a ban on SOME single use plastics. The pro must also affirm that some viable alternatives to single-use plastics exist. Otherwise, any harm from Single-use plastics is unavoidable.

Definitions: We define single-use plastics as, per the EU: "those that are used once or for a short period of time before being thrown away" *[Only read if their definition doesn't include bioplastics]*

Contention 1: Single-Use plastics are necessary in critical applications

Subpoint A) Disaster Relief and Emergency Response

Food and Water are critical during disaster response efforts. One survivor of Hurricane Katrina recalled: "We haven't eaten in three to four days. These babies [are] sick. Everybody around here needs water." Per the PIA, 2021: " Disaster preparedness kits rely on plastics to keep us safe [...][they] include water kept sterile in durable plastic bottles, food kept fresh in sustainable plastic packaging, and medicine and first aid items [...] kept dry in plastic containers and packets." Following Hurricane Sandy, Nestlé sent over five million bottles of water to hard hit communities. AND, Per PIA, (2): "Plastics [...][support] first responders [...] Their [...] personal protective gear includ[es] plastic gloves and masks, [...] plastic breathing equipment, [etc.]." Without essential plastics during emergency response, people die from disease, starvation, and dehydration.

Subpoint B) Healthcare and Sanitation

BMP Medical, 2021: Reusable medical devices [...] risk [...] cross-contamination, surgical site infections, and [Healthcare Associated Infections]. [...] Single-use devices are sterilized, individually packaged, disposable instruments that carry none of the [same] risks." PIA 2021 (3): "Nurse[s] [...] check your temperature using [...] single-use plastic fever strips. Surgeons [...] use sterile instruments packaged in plastic that protect the instrument from contamination and reduce the risk of infection [...] PVC (vinyl) is [...] is used to make IV tubing and blood bags, both of which are essential to providing safe medical care." The impacts are staggering. Per the Healthcare Surfaces Institute, 2022: "Every 5 minutes, a patient dies from a healthcare-associated infection in the U.S. [...] Healthcare-associated infections are among the top 10 leading causes of death in the U.S."

Contention 2: Bans fail- other approaches are more effective

Subpoint A) Plastic alternatives fail

From PBS, 2019: "Transporting [glass] requires 40% more energy which [...] means burning more fuel which [...] isn't good for the environment [...] Eco-friendly [bio]plastic[s] [...] can still take hundreds of years [to biodegrade][...][and they] can't be recycled [at] the same [...] facilities." UNEP Ambassador Antoinette Taus notes that "Making a paper bag emits 51 percent more global warming gasses, [...]

creates 50 times more water pollution, uses four times more raw materials, and consumes two times more energy." And the Washington Post explains that "Making virgin aluminum [...] involves mining minerals such as bauxite, [which] can be environmentally destructive and energy intensive." Without practical replacements for plastics, any ban will simply result in replacement with an even worse alternative.

Subpoint B) Economic incentives are more effective

Following Chicago's ban, repeal, and subsequent tax on plastic bags, Homonoff et al., 2020, found that "the introduction of the ban led to at most a[n] [18%] decrease in the [use] of disposable bag[s]. [...] Even with extreme assumptions [...] the tax was almost twice as effective as the ban at reducing the [use of bags] [...] The proportion of customers using a disposable bag was 33[%] [...] lower during the tax than during the ban." Zetlin, 2019 finds that "Straightforward bans can lead to skyrocketing use of paper bags [which are environmentally nasty to process] or thicker plastic that [doesn't qualify as single-use]." Fees and taxes are much more effective, as Zetlin continues, "As long as there is a fee component in place, that really drives people to not want to get that bag [...] you see people walking out with something pressed under the arm." Global examples also prove. Desalegn and Tangl 2022: "China introduced a plastic product tax [...] in 2008. After the tax Implementation, it was observed that the total plastic product consumption declined by 64%."

Subpoint C) Ban alternatives are more equitable

The single-use plastic ban in India demonstrates the unfairness and ineffectiveness of plastic bans. A review by IndiaSpend found that "Three months after India banned [...] single-use plastic items, [...] those banned items [remained] in rampant circulation in Delhi and Mumbai." Local sellers and small businesses were worst affected by the ban. One seller noted that "A packet of plastic straws costs Rs 18 [...] [but] paper straws cost between Rs 30-40 [...] coconut water is already selling at Rs 60 apiece. Customers will simply not buy it anymore." Vulnerable communities also rely on single use plastics. During the years-long water contamination crisis in Flint, Michigan, a Purdue University Report notes that "one hundred thousand residents of Flint, Michigan, could use water only from bottles [...] researchers found that 100 million bottles were generated as waste." However, the report actually finds that community recycling initiatives such as waste hauling prevented these bottles from overloading the waste management system.

Because a ban on single-use plastics is unnecessary, ineffective, and harmful to US citizens, we urge a negative ballot.