



Talking Points: Cap and Trade

1. **Cap and trade is a massive tax.** Even though it's indirect, it is the largest tax hike in history.ⁱ It will raise the cost of energy, hurting Americans directly and indirectly.
 - a. Conservative estimates are that direct energy costs will raise the average American family's energy bill by \$1,241 per year, or more than \$100 per month.ⁱⁱ
 - b. Indirectly, it will raise the cost of all goods and services produced with energy—essentially, everything—making basic necessities like food, housing, and transportation more expensive.
2. **Cap and trade is a regressive tax.**
 - a. Because the poor spend a higher proportion of their monthly income on energy than do others, they pay more of their disposable income for the increase in energy costs.
 - b. God repeatedly commands protection for the poor (Exodus 23:3; Leviticus 14:21) and condemns those who “enact evil statutes” and “record unjust decisions,” one of the chief characteristics of which is to “deprive the needy of justice and rob the poor of My people of their rights” (Isaiah 10:1-2).
3. **Cap and trade is based on lousy science.** It assumes that recent and foreseeable global warming is overwhelmingly manmade and will have catastrophic effects. But:
 - a. As a petition signed by over 31,000 scientists, including over 9,000 Ph.D.'s, puts it, “There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate.”ⁱⁱⁱ
 - b. The highly politicized U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), relying on speculative computer models rather than real-world observation, exaggerates human influence on global temperature, making it five to ten times what it most likely is, and alarmists like Al Gore make claims that go far beyond even those of the IPCC.
 - c. Multiplying studies show that Earth's warming and cooling are influenced far more by natural causes—like solar cycles, ocean current cycles, and natural changes in cloudiness—than by manmade CO₂ or other greenhouse gas emissions.
4. **Cap and trade is based on lousy economics.** It assumes that catastrophic warming can be prevented by reducing CO₂ emissions at a cost that will be outweighed by benefits. But:
 - a. Even promoters of global warming alarmism estimate that cap-and-trade policies would achieve only about 0.09° F reduction in global temperature in fifty years.
 - b. The cost of achieving that insignificant, undetectable reduction would be enormous^{iv}:
 - (i) nearly 2 million jobs lost by 2012, with additional job losses to follow;
 - (ii) \$9.4 trillion in lost GDP through 2035, with continuing costs afterward;
 - (iii) the federal debt will be 26% above what it would have been by 2035, equal to about \$115,000 for the average family of four.
 - c. The return on every dollar invested in cap-and-trade schemes is only a few cents (i.e., a huge loss) in terms of human well being, but other programs like sewage sanitation, water purification, nutrition supplements, and malaria prevention—programs crowded out by money wasted on futile efforts to fight climate change—could bring high positive returns on investment.
5. **Cap and trade rests on an unbiblical world view.** It assumes that a minuscule change in atmospheric chemistry (carbon dioxide rising from about 3 in every 10,000 to about 5 in every 10,000 molecules in the atmosphere) could cause catastrophic climate change, putting human and other life at risk. That belief is contrary to the Biblical teaching that a wise Creator made the Earth (Genesis 1–2) and on observing it saw that it was “very good” (Genesis 1:31).

References

ⁱ See “Biggest Tax Increase in World History,” *Human Events*, 5/27/09. <http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=32001>.

ⁱⁱ See “Son of Waxman-Markey,” June 16, 2009. Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/wm2450.cfm>.

ⁱⁱⁱ See the Petition Project, <http://www.PetitionProject.org>.

^{iv} See “Son of Waxman-Markey,” <http://www.heritage.org/Research/EnergyandEnvironment/wm2450.cfm>.