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#### Interpretation—the aff may not specify a just government

#### A is an generic indefinite singular. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf>

\*IS generic = Indefinite Singulars

French, then, expresses the two types of reading differently. In English, on¶ the other hand, generic BPs are ambiguous between inductivist and normative¶ readings. But even in English there is one type of generic that can express only¶ one of these readings, and this is the IS generic. While BPs are ambiguous¶ between the inductivist and the rules and regulations readings, ISs are not. In¶ the supermarket scenario discussed above, only (44.b) is true:¶ (44) a. A banana sells for $.49/lb.¶ b. A banana sells for $1.00/lb.¶ The normative force of the generic IS has been noted before. Burton-Roberts¶ (1977) considers the following minimal pair:¶ (45) a. Gentlemen open doors for ladies.¶ b. A gentleman opens doors for ladies.¶ He notes that (45.b), but not (45.a), expresses what he calls “moral necessity.”7¶ Burton-Roberts observes that if Emile does not as a rule open doors for ladies, his mother could utter [(45.b)] and thereby successfully imply that Emile was not, or was¶ not being, a gentleman. Notice that, if she were to utter. . . [(45.a)] she¶ might achieve the same effect (that of getting Emile to open doors for¶ ladies) but would do so by different means. . . For [(45.a)] merely makes a¶ generalisation about gentlemen (p. 188).¶ Sentence (45.b), then, unlike (45.a), does not have a reading where it makes¶ a generalization about gentlemen; it is, rather, a statement about some social¶ norm. It is true just in case this norm is in effect, i.e. it is a member of a set of¶ socially accepted rules and regulations.¶ An IS that, in the null context, cannot be read generically, may receive a¶ generic reading in a context that makes it clear that a rule or a regulation is¶ referred to. For example, Greenberg (1998) notes that, out of the blue, (46.a)¶ and (46.b) do not have a generic reading:¶ (46) a. A Norwegian student whose name ends with ‘s’ or ‘j’ wears green¶ thick socks.¶ b. A tall, left-handed, brown haired neurologist in Hadassa hospital¶ earns more than $50,000 a year.¶ However, Greenberg points out that in the context of (47.a) and (47.b),¶ respectively, the generic readings of the IS subject are quite natural:¶ (47) a. You know, there are very interesting traditions in Norway, concerning the connection between name, profession, and clothing. For¶ example, a Norwegian student. . .¶ b. The new Hadassa manager has some very funny paying criteria. For¶ example, a left-handed. . .¶ Even IS sentences that were claimed above to lack a generic reading, such¶ as (3.b) and (4.b), may, in the appropriate context, receive such a reading:¶ (48) a. Sire, please don’t send her to the axe. Remember, a king is generous!¶ b. How dare you build me such a room? Don’t you know a room is¶ square?

#### That outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how indefinite singulars are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution. This means throw out aff counter-interpretations that are purely descriptive

#### Violation—they specified brazil

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision –any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits—specifying a just government offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of hundreds of governments in the world depending on their definition of “just government”.

#### DTD – same thing as drop the arg

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be topical.
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#### CP text: Firms in Brazil should be transformed into worker self-directed enterprises.

Wolff ND - Richard D. Wolff [professor of economics emeritus at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst and a visiting professor at the New School in New York City. He has also taught economics at Yale University, the City University of New York, and the University of Paris I (Sorbonne)], “Start with Worker Self-Directed Enterprises,” *The Next System Project*. <https://thenextsystem.org/sites/default/files/2017-08/RickWolff.pdf> AT

We therefore propose reorganizing enterprises such that workers become their own bosses. Specifically, that means placing the workers in the position of their own collective board of directors, rather than having directors be nonworkers selected by major shareholders. This is not primarily a matter of workers as owners of these enterprises (fine, but not required), nor primarily as managers (likewise fine, but not required). It is the tasks of direction—the decision making now assigned usually and primarily to corporate boards of directors and only secondarily to the major shareholders who choose them—that must be transferred to the workers collectively. We call such enterprises worker self-directed enterprises (WSDEs). They embody and concretize what we mean by economic democracy by locating it first and foremost inside the enterprises producing the goods and services upon which society depends. WSDEs represent the goal and their growth and proliferation represent the mechanism to transition from the present capitalist system to a far better next system. The strategic focus, then, is not upon the government, as in traditional liberal and socialist thinking; it is rather more microeconomic than macroeconomic. Of course, winning government support of WSDEs and their proliferation would be helpful and sought after—perhaps by political parties rooted in and funded by an emerging WSDE sector within otherwise private or state capitalist economies. But the main emphasis would be on working people who either convert existing enterprises into WSDEs or start new enterprises as WSDEs. Core Goals Briefly, what are the principal, core goals your model or system seeks to realize? Our core goal is the development of a major—and, if possible, prevailing—sector of the economy that is comprised of enterprises (offices, factories, farms, and stores) in which the employees democratically perform the following key enterprise activities: (a) divide all the labors to be performed, (b) determine what is to be produced, how it is to be produced, and where it is to be produced, and (c) decide on the use and distribution of the output or revenues (if output is monetized) therefrom. Major Changes What are the principal changes you envision in the current system—the major differences between what you envision and what we have today? A large portion of existing capitalistically organized enterprises would have to transition out of structures in which owners, top managers, or boards of directors perform the key enterprise activities mentioned above. Principal Means What are the principal means (policies, institutions, behaviors, whatever) through which each of your core goals is pursued? The means to achieve the transition would need to be several. Laws would need to be enacted or changed to facilitate the conversion of capitalistically organized enterprises into WSDEs, the formation of new WSDEs, and the functioning of WSDEs. School curriculums would need to be changed and teachers be trained to explain, explore, and study WSDEs systematically as alternative-enterprise organizations alongside their traditional capitalist counterparts (corporations, partnerships, and family enterprises). Political parties and platforms need to emerge to represent the interests of WSDEs—the WSDE sector—in terms of state policies, much as now the Democrats and Republicans represent the interests of the capitalist sector.

#### Empirics prove that self-directed firms are more democratic and successful.

Jerry **Ashton, 13** - ("The Worker Self-Directed Enterprise: A "Cure" for Capitalism, or a Slippery Slope to Socialism?," HuffPost, 1-2-2013, accessed 11-16-2021, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/worker-self-directed-enterprise\_b\_2385334)//MS

Decidedly so, Wolff responds, providing two financially successful examples of **the workplace being a social activity governed by the norms of community**, one in Spain and one in California. ¶ Wolff offers as his first example, **the Mondragon Cooperative** in the North of Spain. ¶ This co-op took its name from the Mondragan University founded by a local Catholic priest by the name of "Father Arizmendi" as a mechanism to enable the poor in that community to learn how to cooperatively run their own business. ¶ Beginning with six workers producing agrarian goods, some 55 years later **it now employs 120,000** people employed **in some 100 worker-owned enterprises** and affiliated organizations. It is the **10th largest cooperative in Spain** and a bulwark against that country's steep (elsewhere) unemployment rate of 22 percent. ¶ "This is a 'a family of cooperatives' in which the first commitment is to preserve jobs -- not satisfy stockholders." Wolff points out. ¶ That same philosophy infuses **the Arizmendi Bakery** comprising five "sister cooperatives" in the San Francisco Bay Area. Proudly assuming the name of the famous Basque Priest, this group **gets rave reviews** for its pastries and thin-crust pizza **and handily outperforms** its more traditional bakery competitors **in both revenue and employee satisfaction**. ¶ As their website [proudly states](http://arizmendi.coop/), "We are a cooperative -- a worker-owned and operated business. We make decisions democratically, sharing all of the tasks, responsibilities, benefits and risks." ¶
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**The economy is steadily recovering now, but is fragile.**

Rugaber 11/8 - Christopher Rugaber [Economics Reporter, Associated Press], “'A struggle and a journey': Report shows US economy recovering,” *Christian Science Monitor* (Web). Nov. 8, 2021. Accessed Nov. 8, 2021. <<https://www.csmonitor.com/Business/2021/1108/A-struggle-and-a-journey-Report-shows-US-economy-recovering>> AT

America’s employers accelerated their hiring last month, adding a solid 531,000 jobs, the most since July and a sign that the recovery from the pandemic recession is overcoming a virus-induced slowdown.¶ Friday’s report from the labor department also showed that the unemployment rate fell to 4.6% last month from 4.8% in September.¶ That is a comparatively low level though, still well above the pre-pandemic jobless rate of 3.5%. And the job gains in August and September weren’t as weak as initially reported: The government increased its estimate of hiring for those two months by a hefty combined 235,000 jobs.¶ All told, the figures point to an economy that is steadily recovering from the pandemic recession, with healthy consumer spending prompting companies in nearly every industry to add workers. Though the effects of COVID-19 are still causing severe supply shortages, heightening inflation, and keeping many people out of the workforce, employers are finding gradually more success in filling near record-high job postings.¶ “This is the kind of recovery we can get when we are not sidelined by a surge in COVID cases,” said Nick Bunker, director of economic research at the employment website Indeed. “The speed of employment gains has faltered at times this year, but the underlying momentum of the U.S. labor market is quite clear.”¶ The better-than-expected jobs report was welcomed on Wall Street, where investors sent stocks further into record territory. The Dow Jones Industrial Average rose more than 200 points, or roughly 0.6%, in Friday trading. Short-term Treasury yields rose as some investors moved up their expectations for when the Federal Reserve will begin raising interest rates. But longer-term yields dipped amid muted expectations for inflation over the long term.¶ By most barometers, the economic recovery appears solidly on track. Service companies in such areas as retail, banking, and warehousing have reported a sharp jump in sales. Sales of new and existing homes surged last month. And consumer confidence rose in October after three straight declines.¶ At the same time, though, the nation remains 4.2 million jobs short of the number it had before the pandemic flattened the economy in March 2020. The effects of the virus are still discouraging some people from traveling, shopping, eating out, and attending entertainment venues.¶ In October, the pickup in hiring was spread across nearly every major industry, with only government employers reporting a job loss, mostly in education. Shipping and warehousing companies added 54,000 jobs. The battered leisure and hospitality sector, which includes restaurants, bars, hotels, and entertainment venues, gained 164,000. Manufacturers, despite their struggles with supply shortages, added 60,000, the most since June 2020.¶ And employers, who have been competing to fill jobs from a diminished pool of applicants, raised wages at a solid clip: Average hourly pay jumped 4.9% in October compared with a year earlier, up from 4.6% the previous month. Even a gain that strong, though, is barely keeping pace with recent surges in consumer inflation.¶ Those price increases pose a headwind for the economy. Higher costs for food, heating oil, rents, and furniture have burdened millions of families. Prices rose 4.4% in September compared with 12 months earlier, the sharpest such jump in three decades.¶ Among people who are receiving pay raises, some of the biggest beneficiaries are the record-high number of people who have been quitting jobs to take new ones. One of them is Christian Frink, who has begun work as a business analyst at a digital consulting firm. In his new job, Mr. Frink of Ferndale, Michigan, helps business clients determine the technologies they need.¶ Earlier this year, Mr. Frink held a marketing job but left it because, like many people during COVID, he felt burnt out. He then worked for Door Dash during the spring and summer to earn money and searched for new work. Although employers were complaining about a labor shortage, several told him they wouldn’t hire anyone without a college degree. (Mr. Frink attended college but didn’t graduate.)¶ This past summer, Mr. Frink took coding classes at Tech Elevator, a boot camp, and then landed his new position. Now, he’s earning 35% more than in his previous job and says he’s “blown away” that he already has health care coverage and doesn’t have to wait months to become eligible.¶ Yet it isn’t only job-switchers who are receiving pay raises. Chad Leibundguth, a regional director in Tampa for the Robert Half staffing agency, said the job market is the strongest for workers he has seen in his 22-year career. Before the pandemic, he said, you could fill a customer service job in Florida for $14 an hour.¶ “Nowadays,” he said, “you’ve got to be closer to $20 an hour, because people have options.”¶ Job prospects are brightening even for people who have been out of work for prolonged periods. The number of long-term unemployed – people who have been jobless for six months or more – has fallen sharply in recent months, to 2.3 million in October from 4.2 million in April. That’s still double the pre-recession total. But it’s an encouraging sign because employers are typically wary of hiring people who haven’t held jobs for an extended time.¶ At the same time, disparities in the job market have persisted. The Black unemployment rate was unchanged in October at 7.9%, for example, while for white workers, it fell to 4% from 4.2%. The Latino jobless rate dropped to 5.9% from 6.3%.¶ And though white-collar jobs in professional services like information technology, engineering, and architecture are nearly back to their pre-pandemic employment levels, leisure and hospitality still has 1.4 million fewer jobs.¶ Hari Ravichandran, CEO of digital security provider Aura in Boston, says his 800-person company has 140 positions open, mostly in software development.¶ Mr. Ravichandran is willing to hire remote workers; 170 of his staffers have never regularly worked in any of the company’s buildings. Still, hiring remains as tough as he’s ever experienced.¶ One disappointing note in Friday’s report is that the workforce – the number of people either working or looking for a job – was unchanged in October. That suggested that the reopening of schools in September, the waning of the virus, and the expiration of a $300-a-week federal unemployment supplement have yet to coax many people off the sidelines of the job market in large numbers.¶ Drawing many people back into the workforce after recessions is typically a prolonged process. There are now 7.4 million people officially out of work – just 1.7 million more than in February 2020, before the pandemic struck the economy. Yet millions more who lost jobs during the recession have given up their job hunts, and employers might have to raise pay and benefits to draw them back in, said Aaron Sojourner, a labor economist at the University of Minnesota.¶ Even so, some companies still can’t find enough workers. Many parents, particularly mothers, haven’t returned to the workforce after having left jobs during the pandemic to care for children or other relatives. Yet there was evidence of a small rebound last month: The proportion of women who were either working or looking for work rose after two months of declines.

#### Strikes cause widespread economic harm - GM strikes prove.

John McElroy, 2019, Strikes Hurt Everybody.Wards Auto Industry News, October 25, https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody

But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants. The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. Suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenu**e**. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – into a recession. That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible.

#### Turns their first advantage – they lead to greater inequality and nuclear war
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#### Counterplan text: Brazil ought to raise the minimum wage as per the Moser and Engbom card in the AC and implement a carbon tax.

**A carbon tax substantially decreases greenhouse gas emissions and increases revenue under every plausible implementation.**

**Barron et. al 5/7** - Alexander R. Barron [Assistant Professor of Environmental Science & Policy, Smith College; Alex Barron graduated from Carleton College with a B.A. in chemistry and obtained his Ph.D. in ecology and evolutionary biology from Princeton University], Marc A. C. Hafstead [PhD in economics, Stanford University, 2011, BA in mathematical methods in the social sciences & economics, Northwestern University, 2004], and Adele Morris [Adele Morris is a senior fellow and policy director for Climate and Energy Economics at the Brookings Institution], “Policy insights from comparing carbon pricing modeling scenarios,” *Brookings Institute Climate And Energy Economics Discussion Paper* (Web). May 7, 2019. Accessed Oct. 19, 2019. <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/ES\_20190507\_Morris\_CarbonPricing.pdf> AT

Carbon pricing is an important policy tool for reducing greenhouse gas pollution. **The Stanford Energy Modeling Forum exercise 32 convened eleven modeling teams to project** emissions, energy, and economic **outcomes of an** illustrative **range of** economy-wide **carbon price policies**. The study compared a coordinated reference scenario involving no new policies with policy scenarios that impose a price on all fossil fuel-related carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions **in the U.S.** The CO2 price scenarios begin in 2020 at $25/ton or $50/ton and rise each year over inflation at one percent or five percent. The scenarios also vary by the use of the revenue from the carbon pricing policy; scenarios include rebates to households and deficit neutral reductions in marginal tax rates on capital and labor income. **Across all models and policy scenarios**, the study finds that **carbon pricing leads to significant reductions in CO2 emissions**, the majority of which occur in the electricity sector via the reduction of coal use. Policy effects on other energy sources vary by model, for example owing to different technology cost assumptions (e.g., cost of natural gas vs. wind generation). Some models translate energy shifts into changes in conventional air pollutants, reporting declines consistent with substantial air quality benefits from the policy scenarios. ¶ The **economic costs** of the policies **are** expected to be **modest** – allowing for nearly identical economic growth– **but** vary across models. These costs are **offset by benefits from avoided climate damages** (which are not modeled in this study) **and health benefits** from reductions in conventional air pollution**.** The study finds that the **CO2 taxes generate significant revenue**; a $25/ton price would generate **roughly $1.4 trillion** over the first decade and all models reported that emissions reductions do not significantly depend on the use of the revenue. Using revenues to reduce capital or labor taxes reduces economy-wide costs in most models relative to household rebates, but the estimated size of the cost reductions varies significantly across models. Across all models that estimated impacts across households, **devoting** at least **some revenue to household rebates improves outcomes for low income households** relative to applying all revenue to reductions in other taxes. We focus here on results through 2030, concluding that beyond a decade model uncertainties are too large to make quantitative results useful for near-term policy design. Read the full paper here.

**Carbon taxes dramatically reduce emissions and save lives from air pollution – international consensus and best studies prove.**

**Barron et. al 5/7** - Alexander R. Barron [Assistant Professor of Environmental Science & Policy, Smith College; Alex Barron graduated from Carleton College with a B.A. in chemistry and obtained his Ph.D. in ecology and evolutionary biology from Princeton University], Marc A. C. Hafstead [PhD in economics, Stanford University, 2011, BA in mathematical methods in the social sciences & economics, Northwestern University, 2004], and Adele Morris [Adele Morris is a senior fellow and policy director for Climate and Energy Economics at the Brookings Institution], “Policy insights from comparing carbon pricing modeling scenarios,” *Brookings Institute Climate And Energy Economics Discussion Paper* (Web). May 7, 2019. Accessed Oct. 19, 2019. <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/ES\_20190507\_Morris\_CarbonPricing.pdf> AT

An extensive literature supports the economic case for imposing a price on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to reduce damages from climatic disruption. In particular, **a tax on the carbon content of fossil fuels changes the relative prices of** different **energy sources**. 1 This approach cost effectively reduces emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2)**,** the largest contributor to the increase in global atmospheric concentrations of GHGs, **by incentivizing** shifts to lower emission fuels, **reductions in overall energy use**, **and** the **development and deployment of lower cost lower-carbon technologies.** The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the World Bank, OECD, and the International Monetary Fund have all endorsed carbon pricing as a cost effective tool for reducing emissions (Davenport, 2016; IPCC, 2014). Some form of carbon price is in place or under development in 46 national and 28 subnational jurisdictions (World Bank Group, 2018). ¶ Given the complexity of the global energy system and its links to the economy, modeling is one of the best available tools to anticipate possible outcomes of a carbon price and explore tradeoffs between policy design choices. Since all models come with strengths and limitations, one way to obtain a more robust understanding of the likely impacts of a policy is to analyze it with several different models. This helps identify results that are consistent across a range of model types (and their embedded assumptions) and those that are more sensitive to model design and inputs. **The Stanford Energy Modeling Forum** (EMF) **has been analyzing policy-relevant topics with multiple models since the** late **1970s.** Its thirty-second study (EMF 32) convened eleven modeling teams to analyze alternative carbon pricing policies in the United States.2 ¶ The study began with a coordinated reference scenario, which assumes no new climate policies in the United States or other countries. To the extent feasible, modelers calibrated their reference scenarios to the AEO 2016 Early Release No Clean Power Plan case. ¶ Economically speaking, a carbon tax is actually two policies that operate in tandem – a price on carbon and the use of the revenue. This study examines twelve core policy variants that vary by price path and revenue use. Four price trajectories begin in 2020 at either $25 or $50 per ton of CO2 and rise at either one percent or five percent over inflation per year, leveling off in 2050. All dollar values are expressed in constant 2010 dollars. The policies apply the revenue either for direct rebates to households or to cuts in capital or labor taxes. All policy scenarios hold the U.S. federal budget deficit constant relative to the reference scenario. Modelers did not analyze new spending or deficit reduction scenarios, which are also options available to policymakers. ¶ 2. EMISSIONS OUTCOMES¶ Annual emissions¶ Figure 1 reports CO2 emissions projections in the reference (no new policy) scenario and four carbon price trajectories across the eleven EMF 32 models. The red lines show the average emissions levels across the models. The blue shaded area shows the range of model results; the individual model trajectories appear as blue lines. For better readability, the vertical axis starts above zero. ¶ Assuming the adoption of no new climate policies in the United States or other countries, most models projected U.S. CO2 emissions to remain flat over the coming decade, continuing their annual contribution to rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations (the first column in Figure 1).3 The policy scenarios, labeled by their initial value in 2020 and the rate at which they escalate each year relative to inflation, appear in the subsequent columns. They show that **the larger the carbon price, the deeper the projected emissions reductions.** A CO2 price of $25 in 2020 that rises at one percent per year reduces CO2 emissions roughly 16 to 28 percent below 2005 CO2 emissions levels4 by 2020 and 17 to 38 percent below 2005 levels by 2030. A CO2 price of $50 in 2020 rising at 5 percent per year reduces emissions 21 to 35% below 2005 levels by 2020 and 26 to 47 percent below 2005 levels by 2030. Doubling the carbon price does not double the reduction in emissions, reflecting an increase in the marginal costs per ton reduced as the policy becomes more ambitious. For example, as the electricity sector becomes decarbonized, further reductions must come from less price-responsive sectors such as transportation and industry. ¶ The range in emissions performance across models reflects both differences in model structure and inherent uncertainty in key economic parameters that drive emissions reductions in these models. Adding the full host of uncertainties around technology futures and economic growth would increase the spread. This suggests that if policymakers want to ensure achieving a specific national emissions target (annual or cumulative), they may need to adjust the price trajectory as policy outcomes evolve (Aldy et al., 2017). Conversely, if policymakers want to ensure that a particular carbon price path or range prevails, they must be flexible in the emissions outcomes. ¶ Figure 1 shows only the scenarios in which the carbon tax revenue is returned to households in equal rebates. Importantly, for a given carbon price path, the different uses of revenue have little, if any, impact on emissions. This is good news, as it gives policymakers freedom to address other policy priorities (such impacts on low-income households, the federal deficit, infrastructure, or tax reform) without sacrificing environmental benefits. An approach that uses the revenue to fund additional GHG reduction measures, for example in GHGs outside the taxed sources, could produce greater overall emissions reductions than shown in Figure 1. ¶ **All four price trajectories appear sufficient to achieve (or exceed) a 26 percent economy-wide emissions reduction** below 2005 levels **by 2025** – the low end of the U.S. commitment in Paris.5 In scenarios not shown here, modelers found that a price trajectory to achieve a 26 percent reduction target would begin between $9 and $22 per ton of CO2 in 2020 and rise to between $11 and $28 by 2025. ¶ Cumulative emissions¶ Because CO2’s effect in the atmosphere is long-lived and climate impacts scale with the total CO2 concentration in the atmosphere, cumulative emissions are a better metric of environmental benefits than emissions in any one year. By 2030 the $50 trajectories achieve considerably greater cumulative emissions reductions, with the $50-1% scenario achieving roughly 35 percent more total emissions reductions than the $25- 5% price path. ¶ Reductions in conventional air pollutants¶ **As carbon prices reduce fossil fuel use**, especially coal and transportation fuels, **they also reduce air pollutants** like sulfur dioxide (SO2) and nitrogen oxide (NOx). **Reducing** these conventional **pollutants results in economically significant health benefits** -- benefits that accrue within the United States to current populations. EMF 32 models that include some of these pollutants6 report significant air quality benefits in the first decade; projected SO2 emissions from coal-fired power decline 52 to100 percent relative to reference. The health benefits from the average reduction in SO2 and NOx in 2025 from a $25 CO2 price are on the order of 3,500 to 8,000 avoided cases of premature mortality and 90,000 cases of exacerbated asthma using standard epidemiological estimates (Krewski et al., 2009; Lepeule et al., 2012) and EPA tools (Abt, 2017).

**A carbon tax sparks manufacturing in clean tech. James ‘13**

Adam James (Research Assistant at the Center for American Progress), Kate Gordon, "Clean Energy Manufacturing Fights Climate Change, Increases U.S. Competitiveness, and Creates Jobs," 6/28/2013, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/report/2013/06/28/68401/clean-energy-manufacturing-fights-climate-change-increases-u-s-competitiveness-and-creates-jobs/

Passing a progressive carbon tax The economic opportunity from creating clean energy products is clear. But **creating** consistent **investment** in manufacturing from the private sector also **requires** generating **new demand.** There are a number of policies that fit into this category. But passing **a** progressive **carbon tax is the** simplest, **most direct means of creating strong and consistent demand** **for low-carbon products** across a variety of energy and transportation sectors while simultaneously fighting climate change**.** **Currently, fossil fuels have a** distinct **market advantage** over renewable-energy technology **because they do not pay for** the externalities or the **social costs**, such as pollution, from their product**.** **Being permitted to pollute for free provides a massive subsidy**, one **that creates an unfair playing field against clean energy** because the true costs of fossil fuels are not reflected in the price, whereas the true costs of renewable energy are**.** To top it off, fossil fuels directly benefit from the balkanized, centralized structure of the energy grid and its accompanying levels of regulation. This is because the electrical grid has been designed to accommodate fossil fuels, and although technological innovations such as forecasting software, storage, and better energy management have made renewable energy practical, the regulatory structure at the federal and state levels is slower to change. **A carbon tax would place a cost on pollution and generate new revenue that could be put toward** a variety of purposes, including deficit reduction and **clean energy investment.** In addition, it would stimulate demand for clean energy products by requiring fossil fuels to internalize their costs. If designed the right way, **such a tax would** also **be progressive** instead of hitting the wallets of middle- and lower-class families. Conclusion There is a massive economic opportunity if the clean energy future were to be manufactured in the United States. To accomplish this, the Obama administration should continue to prioritize clean energy manufacturing as a central component of its second-term agenda, and Congress should pass supportive legislation that will put America on the cutting edge of competitiveness while creating well-paying jobs at home. Funding National Networks for Manufacturing Innovation that will have a clean energy focus, supportive tax credits, and a progressive carbon tax are the essential elements of spurring economic growth while fighting climate change, and Congress and the administration should work to ensure the passage of all three.

#### Solves the entire aff. Their evidence says that raising the minimum wage reduces inequality. It is better to just enact this policy than to leave it to unpredictable strikes leading to a minimum wage raise. Their evidence says action to stop emissions is key, the cp does that directly. The Carbon tax stops deforestation – it’s no longer economically valuable to expend the resources to cut down Amazonian forests.