## 1NC Shell

**Eminent Collapse Now Good- only way to shift to a sustainable system – tech doesn’t solve**

Tim, **Jackson**. Tim Jackson is Professor of Sustainable Development at the University of Surrey and Director of the ESRC Research Group on Lifestyles, Values and Environment.**2009**. [“Prosperity without growth? The transition to a sustainable economy”. Sustainable Development Commission.] pg. 60-134 [www.sd-commission.org.uk/.../prosperity\_without\_growth\_report.pdf](http://www.sd-commission.org.uk/.../prosperity_without_growth_report.pdf)

Fear may not be all bad. The threat of imminent¶ collapse may have been the only force strong enough¶ to bring so many countries together in late 2008,¶ with a pledge to ‘achieve needed reforms in the¶ world’s financial systems’. Decisiveness in the face¶ of fear won Gordon Brown his international plaudits¶ during the early phase of financial recovery.¶ and yet the sense of a more fundamental, a more¶ pervasive anxiety underlying the modern economy¶ is an enduring one. Could it really be the case, as¶ The Economist suggests, that we are still behaving¶ like hunted animals, even in the 21st Century, driven¶ by the fine distinction between predator and prey?¶ If we are, it would be good to recognize it. And to¶ understand why. For without that understanding,¶ solutions to the dilemmas we face will inevitably¶ prove elusive.¶ Admittedly, the dilemma of growth isn’t helping¶ much, looking as it does like an impossibility¶ theorem for lasting prosperity. Perhaps at some¶ instinctive level, we have always understood this.¶ Maybe we’re haunted by subconscious fear that the¶ ‘good life’ we aspire to is already deeply unfair and¶ can’t last forever. That realization – even repressed¶ – might easily be enough to taint casual joy with¶ existential concern.¶ And of course the analysis in Chapter 5 doesn’t¶ allay those fears. It more or less closes down the¶ most obvious escape from the dilemma of growth.¶ Efficiency is a grand idea. And capitalism sometimes¶ delivers it. But even as the engine of growth delivers¶ productivity improvement, so it also drives forward¶ the scale of throughput. Nowhere is there any¶ evidence that efficiency can outrun – and continue¶ to outrun – scale in the way it must do if growth is¶ to be compatible with sustainability.¶ There is still a possibility that we just haven’t tried¶ hard enough. With a massive policy effort and huge¶ technological advances, perhaps we could reduce¶ resource intensities the two or three orders of¶ magnitude necessary to allow growth to continue¶ – at least for a while. And yet, the idea of running¶ faster and faster to escape the damage we’re¶ already causing is itself a strategy that smacks of¶ panic. So before we settle for it, a little reflection¶ may be in order.¶

#### <INSERT TERMINAL IMPACT OF CHOICE>

## Growth Unsustainable

Generic

#### Three limiting factors to economic growth: resource depletion, environmental impacts, and financial inadequacies – empirics prove.

Richard Heinberg – Post Carbon Institute Senior Fellow-in-Residence, author of ten books, leading educator on Peak Oil theory – 11/12/10, “The End of Growth: Adapting to Our New Economic Reality,” New Society Publishers, <http://www.postcarbon.org/article/178709-the-end-of-growth>, ama

Why Is Growth Ending?¶ Many financial pundits point to profound problems internal to the economy—including overwhelming, un-repayable levels of public and private debt, and the bursting of the real estate bubble—as immediate threats to the resumption of economic growth. The assumption generally is that eventually, once these problems are dealt with, growth can and will pick up again. But the pundits generally miss factors external to the financial economy that make a resumption of conventional economic growth a near-impossibility. This is not a temporary condition; it is essentially permanent.¶ Altogether, as we will see in the following chapters, there are three primary factors that stand firmly in the way of further economic growth:¶ The depletion of important resources including fossil fuels and minerals;¶ The proliferation of environmental impacts arising from both the extraction and use of resources (including the burning of fossil fuels)—leading to snowballing costs from both these impacts themselves and from efforts to avert them and clean them up; and¶ Financial disruptions due to the inability of our existing monetary, banking, and investment systems to adjust to both resource scarcity and soaring environmental costs—and their inability (in the context of a shrinking economy) to service the enormous piles of government and private debt that have been generated over the past couple of decades.¶ Despite the tendency of financial commentators to focus only on the last of these factors, it is possible to point to literally thousands of events in recent years that illustrate how all three are interacting, and are hitting home with ever more force.

#### US Economic Growth unsustainable and detrimental on a Global scale. – 4 reasons

Samuel Alexander –author of the “Simplicity Collective” movement, a grassroots organization with a goal for society to live simple lives to reduce the impact on the environment, and graduated from University of Melbourne - Jul 1, 2011, “Simplicity Collective”, 2, http://simplicitycollective.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Planned-economic-contraction1.pdf

Even to consider looking ‘beyond growth’ would seem rather premature, of course, if the analysis were to be directed toward the poorest nations on the planet, where the need for further economic development, of some form, is immediate and obvious (World Bank, 2009). But when the analysis is focused, as it will be presently, on the richest nations, it is much less clear why economic growth, measured by increases in Gross Domestic Product (GDP), should remain a central policy objective of governments. Indeed, there are four main arguments for why the richest nations should give up the pursuit of economic growth and try to manage without growth (Victor and Rosenbluth, 2007): (1) Continued economic growth worldwide is no longer a sustainable option due to environmental and resource constraints, so the richest nations should leave room for growth in the poorest nations where the benefits of growth are evident (Meadows et al, 2004); (2) in the richest nations growth has become ‘uneconomic,’ in the sense that it detracts from overall wellbeing more than it contributes, all things considered (Daly, 1999); (3) growth in the richest nations is neither necessary nor sufficient for meeting policy objectives such as full employment, elimination of poverty and protection of the environment (Victor, 2008); and (4) growth in the richest nations is an ineffective and unsustainable means of reducing global poverty (Woodward and Simms, 2006). Taken together, these arguments provide the foundations for a radically new phase of macroeconomic policy in the richest nations, one in which economic growth should lose its privileged position as the touch stone of policy and institutional success (Alexander, 2011a; Stiglitz et al, 2010).

**Growth Unsustainable we must “scrap” the system**

Ted, **Trainer**. Dr. Trainer is Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of New South Wales (Australia); lecturer and author of books regarding the transition to a sustainable society. Trainer is the organizer of "The Simpler Way: Analyses of global problems and the sustainable alternative society... environment, limits to growth, simpler lifestyles, self-sufficient and cooperative communities, and a new economy. **9/6/11**.[“The radical implications of a zero growth economy”.paecon.net.]<http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue57/Trainer57.pdf>

Yet its supreme goal is to increase its levels of production, consumption and GDP.¶ Thus growth is a major cause of global problems.¶ This “limits to growth” analysis is crucial if one is to understand the nature of the environmental problem, the Third World problem, resource depletion and armed conflict in the world. Although there may also be other causal factors at work, all these problems are directly and primarily due to the fact that there is far too much producing and consuming going on.¶ For instance, we have an environment problem because far too many resources are being drawn out of nature and far too many wastes dumped back in, at rates technical advance cannot cut to sustainable levels. We have an impoverished and underdeveloped Third World because people in rich countries insist on taking most of the resources, including those in the Third World that should be being used by Third World people to meet their own needs. And how likely is it that we will ever have peace in the world if resources are very scarce and all cannot use them at the rate a few do now, yet all insist on getting richer and richer all the time without limit? If you insist on remaining affluent then you should arm yourselves heavily, you will need arms if you want to continue to take far more than your fair share.¶ The quality of life¶ The ultimate paradox is that for decades it has been clear in the literature that increasing the GDP of rich countries does not increase the quality of life. (Eckersley, 1997; Speth, 2001.) In fact we are now probably seeing a falling quality of life in the richest countries. What then is the point of striving for economic growth? 76¶ real-world economics review, issue no. 57¶ “But growth will make us so rich we will be able to afford to save the environment.”¶ This statement is characteristic of the conventional economic mind …just create more monetary wealth and we can solve all problems with it. The fatal mistake in the argument is transparent. If we don’t reduce “wealth” production dramatically and quickly the environmental consequences will soon eliminate our capacity to produce any wealth at all.¶ The conclusion?¶ To repeat, the point of the foregoing sketch has been to make clear the magnitude of the problem. The volumes of producing and consuming going on in the world are many times beyond levels that might be sustainable. It is not just a matter of getting to an economy that does not grow any further; the imperative is to reach a steady state economy in which production, consumption, investment, trade and GDP are very small fractions of their present quantities. The following discussion seeks to show that this means that most of the core structures and systems in this society will therefore need to be scrapped.¶ The far reaching and profoundly radical implications of zero-growth¶ The growth problem is not just that the economy has grown to be too big, now depleting resources and damaging and eventually destroying ecosystems. The more central problem is that growth is integral to the system. Most of the systems basic structures and mechanisms are driven by growth and cannot operate without it. Growth cannot be removed leaving the rest of the economy more or less as it is. Unfortunately people in the current “De-growth” movement tend to think growth is like a faulty air conditioning unit in a house, which can be taken away and the rest of the house will function more or less as it did before.¶ •¶ If you do away with growth then there can be no interest payments. If more has to be paid back than was lent or invested, then the total amount of capital to invest will inevitably grow over time. The present economy literally runs on interest payments of one form or another; an economy without interest payments would have to have totally different mechanisms for carrying out many processes.¶ •¶ Therefore almost the entire finance industry has to be scrapped, and replaced by arrangements whereby money is made available, lent, invested etc., without increasing the wealth of the lender.

#### Zero- growth economy is sustainable

Trainer 09, Conjoint Lecturer at University of New South Wales the School of Social Sciences, 10/22/09 “The simpler way: an outline of the global situation, the sustainable alternative society, and the transition to it,” <http://socialsciences.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/TSWmain.html>

The foregoing argument has been that the way of life we have in rich countries is grossly unsustainable and unjust and inevitably damage the quality of life. Some of the core lines or argument indicate that we should be trying to reduce per capita resource consumption by 90% or more. Nothing like this can be done without huge and radical change to new systems. The crucial point here is that the problems cannot be fixed in a consumer-capitalist society. That kind of society creates the problems. If for example you have a growth economy that will inevitably generate a problem of resource depletion and environmental destruction. A sustainable society must have a zero-growth economy. If you let market forces determine production, distribution and exchange and development you will inevitably deprive most people of a fair share. A just society must allow need not profit or, market forces to determine distribution and development. Easily overlooked is the fact that there is no possibility of a peaceful world if all strive for greater affluence and increased GDP and therefore compete more and more fiercely for resources. “If you want affluence then arm heavily.” You can only solve these problems if you change to a very different kind of society. Yet these extremely important criticisms are not recognised. What we are dealing with here is a problem of ideology, a wilful delusion and refusal to question cherished values. The foregoing general analysis of our situation has been argued by scientists and others for more than 40 years now, but it has been almost impossible to get people to take any notice. Politicians, bureaucrats, teachers, journalists, economists and ordinary people flatly refuse to even think about the possibility that the obsession with affluence and growth is the basic cause of our problems and should be abandoned.

Well, folks, you can block all this from your mind, you can argue that recessions are not a part of Schumpeter's thinking, that they are inconsistent with your political ideology. But the fact is, we let the housing/credit boom become a massive bubble, it popped and a recession is coming. So think positive, consider some of the benefits of a recession:

1. Purge the excesses of the housing boom

No, it's not heartless. Not like wartime calculations of "acceptable collateral damage." Yes, The Economist admits "the economic and social costs of recession are painful: unemployment, lower wages and profits, and bankruptcy." But we can't reverse Greenspan's excessive rate cuts that created the housing/credit crisis. It'll be painful for everyone, especially millions of unlucky, mislead homeowners who must bear the brunt of Wall Street's greed and Washington's policy failures.

2. U.S. dollar wake-up call

Reverse the dollar's free fall and revive our global credibility. Warnings from China, France, Iran, Venezuela and supermodel Gisele haven't fazed Washington. Recession will.

3. Write-offs

Expose Wall Street's shadow-banking system. They're playing with $300 trillion in derivatives and still hiding over $100 billion of toxic off-balance sheet asset-backed securities, plus another $300 billion hidden worldwide. A lack of transparency is killing our international credibility. Write it all off, now!

4. Budgeting

Force fiscal restraint back into government. America has been living way beyond its means for years: A recession will cut back revenues at all levels of government and cutbacks will encourage balanced budgeting.

5. Overconfidence

A recession will wake up short-term investors playing the market. In bull markets traders ride the rising tide, gaining false confidence that they're financial geniuses. Downturns bruise egos but encourage rational long-term strategies.

6. Ratings

Rating agencies have massive conflicts of interest; they aren't doing their job. They're supposed to represent the investors, but favor Corporate America, which pays for the reports. Shake them up.

7. China

Trigger an internal recession in China. Make it realize America's not going into debt forever to finance China's domestic growth and military war machine. A recession will also slow recycling their reserves through sovereign funds to our equities.

8. Oil

Force the energy and auto industries to get serious about emission standards and reducing oil dependency.

9. Inflation

Expose the "core inflation" farce Washington uses to sugarcoat reality.

#### **Growth Unsustainable**

Daly and Townsend 93 Herman Daly, Professor at the University of Maryland, School of Public Policy. From 1988 to 1994 he was Senior Economist in the Environment Department of the World Bank, Kenneth Townsend, Ph.D. Louisiana State University and professor at Hampden-Sydney College, January 1 1993, “Valuing the Earth: Economics, Ecology, Ethics”, The MIT Press, p. 267

Impossibility statements are the very foundation of science. It is impossible to: travel faster than the speed of light; create or destroy matter-energy; build a perpetual motion machine, etc**.** By respecting impossibility theorems we avoid wasting resources on projects that are bound to fail. Therefore economists should be very interested in impossibility theorems, especially the one to be demonstrated here**,** namely that it is impossible for the world economy to grow its way out of poverty and environmental degradation. In other words, sustainable growth is impossible.¶ In its physical dimensions the economy is an open subsystem of the earth ecosystem, which is finite, nongrowing, and materially closed. As the economic subsystem grows it incorporates an ever greater proportion of the total ecosystem into itself and must reach a limit at 100 percent, if not before. Therefore its growth is not sustainable. The term "sustainable growth" when applied to the **economy** is a bad oxymoron—self-contradictory as prose, and unevocative as poetry.

#### SQ rate of Economic growth collapses economy

Trainer 09, Conjoint Lecturer at University of New South Wales the School of Social Sciences, 10/22/09 “The simpler way: an outline of the global situation, the sustainable alternative society, and the transition to it,” <http://socialsciences.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/TSWmain.html>

The most serious fault in our society is the commitment to an affluent-industrial-consumer lifestyle and to an economy that must have constant and limitless growth in output. Our way of life is grossly unsustainable. Our levels of production and consumption are far too high to be kept up for very long and could never be extended to all people. We are rapidly depleting resources and damaging the environment. Following are some of the main points that support these limits to growth conclusions. (For the detailed limits case see Note 1.) Rich countries, with about one-fifth of the world’s people, are consuming about three quarters of the world’s resource production. Our per capita consumption is about 15+ times that of the poorest half of the world’s people. World population will probably reach around 9 billion, somewhere after 2060. If all those people were to have the present Australian per capita resource consumption, then world production of all resources would have to be about 6 times as great as it is now. If we tried to raise present world production to that level by 2050 we would by then have completely exhausted all probably recoverable resources of one third of the basic mineral items we use. All probably recoverable resources of coal, oil, gas, tar sand and shale oil, and uranium (via burner reactors) would have been exhausted by 2045. Petroleum appears to be especially limited. A number of geologists have concluded that world oil supply will probably peak by 2010. If all 9 billion people were to use timber at the rich world per capita rate we would need 3.5 times the world's present forest area. If all 9 billion were to have a rich world diet, which takes about .5 ha of land to produce, we would need 4.5 billion ha of food producing land. But there are only 1.4 billion ha of cropland in use today and this is likely to decrease. Ecological resources are being severely depleted. We are losing species, forests, land, coral reefs, grasslands and fisheries at accelerating rates. Water shortages are serious and increasing. There are already food shortages causing riots in several countries.

#### The economy is exponentially growing and cannot be sustained

Bond 03 Michael Bond, For over 30 years Michael has done extensive research and study on multinational companies and globalization with special regard to their impact upon the environment and social wellbeing, 2003, “Why Economic Growth is Unsustainable”, http://www.eveoftheapoc.com.au/Downloads/DebtVsGrowth.html

By the beginning of the 21st century the world's environment was in critical decline. Oceans are turning acidic from atmospheric CO2 threatening marine life, melting glaciers are flooding cities where soon little water will flow at all, species are disappearing from the Earth at a faster rate than during the dinosaur extinction 65 million years ago.¶ The design of the global economy demands that by 2019 the economy will be twice the size it was in 2000. At its present rate of growth, by 2059 the global economy will be ten times its 2000 size. But Earth cannot sustainably support a global economy the size it was in 2000.¶ Even if the economy slid along at a minimal 3% growth it would still be 10 times its 2000 size by the year 2080. ¶ So in order to survive, the global economy is compelled to keep growing like a cancer, at an unsustainable rate that will kill its host. This self-destructive design is a direct result of the flaw in the global money system (see accompanying article Money - Deadlier Than Plutonium).¶ But wait - there's more!¶ Let's assume, like most corporations and politicians do, that the world's resources are endless and that no environmental threats exist. Even if that were the case, the global economy is self-destructive for an entirely different reason, if the first way isn't fast enough.¶

Studies

#### **Economic growth leads to economic collapse by 2030 according to MIT study. We continue to follow the predicted trend.**

Smithsonian 2012 April 2012, “Looking Back on the Limits of Growth”, http://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/Looking-Back-on-the-Limits-of-Growth.html#

Recent research supports the conclusions of a controversial environmental study released 40 years ago: The world is on track for disaster. So says Australian physicist Graham Turner, who revisited perhaps the most groundbreaking academic work of the 1970s,The Limits to Growth.¶ Written by MIT researchers for an international think tank, the Club of Rome, the study used computers to model several possible future scenarios. The business-as-usual scenario estimated that if human beings continued to consume more than nature was capable of providing, global economic collapse and precipitous population decline could occur by 2030.¶ However, the study also noted that unlimited economic growth was possible, if governments forged policies and invested in technologies to regulate the expansion of humanity’s ecological footprint. Prominent economists disagreed with the report’s methodology and conclusions. Yale’s Henry Wallich opposed active intervention, declaring that limiting economic growth too soon would be “consigning billions to permanent poverty.”¶ Turner compared real-world data from 1970 to 2000 with the business-as-usual scenario. He found the predictions nearly matched the facts. “There is a very clear warning bell being rung here,” he says. “We are not on a sustainable trajectory.”

#### Modern economic theories are wrong.

Richard Heinberg – Post Carbon Institute Senior Fellow-in-Residence, author of ten books, leading educator on Peak Oil theory – 11/12/10, “The End of Growth: Adapting to Our New Economic Reality,” New Society Publishers, <http://www.postcarbon.org/article/178709-the-end-of-growth>, ama

But many economists don’t see things this way. That’s probably because current economic theories were formulated during the anomalous historical period of sustained growth that is now ending. Economists are merely generalizing from their experience: they can point to decades of steady growth in the recent past, and they simply project that experience into the future. Moreover, they have ways to explain why modern market economies are immune to the kinds of limits that constrain natural systems: the two main ones have to do with substitution and efficiency. If a useful resource becomes scarce, its price will rise, and this creates an incentive for users of the resource to find a substitute. For example, if oil gets expensive enough, energy companies might start making liquid fuels from coal. Or they might develop other energy sources undreamed of today. Many economists theorize that this process of substitution can go on forever. It’s part of the magic of the free market.¶ Increasing efficiency means doing more with less. In the U.S., the number of inflation-adjusted dollars generated in the economy for every unit of energy consumed has increased steadily over recent decades (the amount of energy, in British Thermal Units, required to produce a dollar of GDP dropped from close to 20,000 BTU per dollar in 1949 to 8,500 BTU in 2008). Part of this increasing efficiency has come about as a result of the outsourcing of manufacturing to other nations—which burn the coal, oil, or natural gas to make our goods (if we were making our own running shoes and LCD TVs, we’d be burning that energy domestically). Economists also point to another, related form of efficiency that has less to do with energy (in a direct way, at least): the process of identifying the cheapest sources of materials, and the places where workers will be most productive and work for the lowest wages. As we increase efficiency, we use less—of energy, resources, labor, or money—to do more. That enables more growth.¶ Finding substitutes for depleting resources and upping efficiency are undeniably effective adaptive strategies of market economies. Nevertheless, the question remains as to how long these strategies can continue to work in the real world—which is governed less by economic theories than by the laws of physics. In the real world, some things don’t have substitutes, or the substitutes are too expensive, or don’t work as well, or can’t be produced fast enough. And efficiency follows a law of diminishing returns: the first gains in efficiency are usually cheap, but every further incremental gain tends to cost more, until further gains become prohibitively expensive.¶ In the end, we can’t outsource more than 100 percent of manufacturing, we can’t transport goods with zero energy, and we can’t enlist the efforts of workers and count on their buying our products while paying them nothing.¶ Unlike most economists, most physical scientists recognize that growth within any functioning, bounded system has to stop sometime.

Resource Depletion

#### The status quo leads to resource depletion – creates global chaos

Murphy 12 Tom Murphy, PhD. Professor of Physics at UC San Diego, March 29 2012, “Resource Depletion Is A Bigger Threat Than Climate Change: An Interview With Tom Murphy”, The Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/james-burgess/resource-depletion-is-a-b_b_1385397.html>

I see climate change as a serious threat to natural services and species survival, perhaps ultimately having a very negative impact on humanity. But resource depletion trumps climate change for me, because I think this has the potential to effect far more people on a far shorter timescale with far greater certainty. Our economic model is based on growth, setting us on a collision course with nature. When it becomes clear that growth cannot continue, the ramifications can be sudden and severe. So my focus is more on averting the chaos of economic/resource/agriculture/distribution collapse, which stands to wipe out much of what we have accomplished in the fossil fuel age. To the extent that climate change and resource limits are both served by a deliberate and aggressive transition away from fossil fuels, I see a natural alliance. Will it be enough to avert disaster (in climate or human welfare)? Who can know -- but I vote that we try real hard.

#### Peak oil threatens to destroy the economy and create disaster

Craft 11 Doug Craft, CEO and Principal of Craft Geochemistry Consulting, 34 years’ experience as a research principal investigator and consultant working in a civil ¶ engineering/water resources management agency, May 2011, “Peak Oil and our Future, How Energy Consumption will Change our Lives”, http://dougcraftfineart.com/PeakOilandOurFutureEssaybyDougCraft.pdf

The important point of this section is that our current economic¶ system will likely interact with Peak Oil and energy supply shortfalls to exacerbate the energy crisis, rather than¶ quickly adjusting infrastructure and fuel alternatives to maintain current energy use and living standards. The¶ collapse in oil and natural gas prices after 2008 coupled with tight credit caused the cancellation of many energy¶ exploration and drilling projects. These energy development activities cannot be re-started as quickly as they were¶ abandoned, and many projects have been permanently canceled. While the lower energy costs may act to help¶ stimulate economic recovery, any expansion of demand may quickly cause supply shortages and produce¶ another serious price spike (Rubin 2009).¶ If mitigation activities are undertaken to soften our transition beyond Peak Oil, they need to be large and¶ significant efforts involving risky long-term investments. While the economic crisis has produced greater public¶ support for government regulation of finance and job creation, the end of cheap energy also signals the end of¶ easy credit. Significant capital will be needed to fund a shift to renewables and rebuilding localized manufacturing¶ and shipping infrastructures or even to fund expansion of emergency stocks and reserves. Any widening¶ economic depression that accompanies resource depletion will destroy the value of assets and dry up capital that¶ will be desperately needed to invest in Peak Oil mitigation. And finally, globalism has left America with a looted¶ manufacturing economy and a gigantic, overstressed, and poorly maintained energy and transportation¶ infrastructure just as the permanent energy crisis looms. We are truly facing a "perfect storm" of Peak Oil and¶ other peaking essential resources interacting in unpredictable ways with a highly complex and unstable global¶ economic system, a broken banking system coupled with excessive debt and money supply growth, and the¶ specter of climate change disasters and war.

#### Economic growth must be stopped—energy consumption is too high

Feasta 05, The Foundation for the Economics of Sustainability, 12/09/05, “Eliminating the Need for Economic Growth,” <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/climatechange_feasta.pdf>

Whichever is the case, economic growth should be halted now because the changes that the OECD countries are making to achieve it make them less able to adapt to a low-fossil-fuel-use world. This is because, at present, they are generating their growth primarily by technologies that substitute fossil energy for that from the sun and human and animal sources. This confers a massive competitive advantage upon them and other industrialised countries since one litre of petrol can do as much work (in the sense of lifting a load a certain distance) as a man can do in a hundred hours. They are applying fossil energy in two ways to achieve this growth. One is as capital, the energy embodied in buildings, infrastructure and equipment. The other is as income, the amount of energy needed to operate and maintain the capital stock. Consequently, as they grow economically, they become increasingly dependent on energy use. Even if they can avoid collapse if no growth happens, they need a lot of energy to maintain their current methods of production and distribution and hence their income levels. This will be an enormous burden in future since all types of energy are likely to become considerably more expensive in relation to labour whether or not an effective climate treaty comes into force because of the rapid depletion of supplies of oil and gas.

Growth Zero Sum

#### Global economic growth is finished – growth is now zero-sum and relative.

Richard Heinberg – Post Carbon Institute Senior Fellow-in-Residence, author of ten books, leading educator on Peak Oil theory – 11/12/10, “The End of Growth: Adapting to Our New Economic Reality,” New Society Publishers, <http://www.postcarbon.org/article/178709-the-end-of-growth>, ama

The central assertion of this book is both simple and startling: Economic growth as we have known it is over and done with.¶ The “growth” we are talking about consists of the expansion of the overall size of the economy (with more people being served and more money changing hands) and of the quantities of energy and material goods flowing through it.¶ The economic crisis that began in 2007-2008 was both foreseeable and inevitable, and it marks a permanent, fundamental break from past decades—a period during which most economists adopted the unrealistic view that perpetual economic growth is necessary and also possible to achieve. There are now fundamental barriers to ongoing economic expansion, and the world is colliding with those barriers.¶ This is not to say the U.S. or the world as a whole will never see another quarter or year of growth relative to the previous quarter or year. However, when the bumps are averaged out, the general trend-line of the economy (measured in terms of production and consumption of real goods) will be level or downward rather than upward from now on. ¶ Nor will it be impossible for any region, nation, or business to continue growing for a while. Some will. In the final analysis, however, this growth will have been achieved at the expense of other regions, nations, or businesses. From now on, only relative growth is possible: the global economy is playing a zero-sum game, with an ever-shrinking pot to be divided among the winners.

Brink of Collapse Now

#### Right now we are at a unique point – economic contraction is the only alternative.

Richard Heinberg – Post Carbon Institute Senior Fellow-in-Residence, author of ten books, leading educator on Peak Oil theory – 11/12/10, “The End of Growth: Adapting to Our New Economic Reality,” New Society Publishers, <http://www.postcarbon.org/article/178709-the-end-of-growth>, ama

This is just one event—admittedly a spectacular one. If it were an isolated problem, the economy could recover and move on. But we are, and will be, seeing a cavalcade of environmental and economic disasters, not obviously related to one another, that will stymie economic growth in more and more ways. These will include but are not limited to:¶ Climate change leading to regional droughts, floods, and even famines;¶ Shortages of water and energy; and¶ Waves of bank failures, company bankruptcies, and house foreclosures.¶ Each will be typically treated as a special case, a problem to be solved so that we can get “back to normal.” But in the final analysis, they are all related, in that they are consequences of growing human population striving for higher per-capita consumption of limited resources (including non-renewable, climate-altering fossil fuels), all on a finite and fragile planet.¶Meanwhile, the unwinding of decades of buildup in debt has created the conditions for a once-in-a-century financial crash—which is unfolding around us, and which on its own has the potential to generate substantial political unrest and human misery.¶ The result: we are seeing a perfect storm of converging crises that together represent a watershed moment in the history of our species. We are witnesses to, and participants in, the transition from decades of economic growth to decades of economic contraction.

Tech Doesn’t Solve

**Degrowth Needed Now- Tech Innovation entrenches us in an ecocatastrophic crisis**

Pascal, **Griethuysen**. Pascal van Griethuysen is senior lecturer in evolutionary economics and sustainable development at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva, Switzerland. **2011**. [“Why are we growth-addicted? The hard way towards degrowth in the involutionary western development path”. Elsevier Ltd. pg. 4-6] Switzerland http://degrowth.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Van-Griethuysen-why-are-we-growth-addicted.pdf

The economic pressures imposed by the self-expansion of the¶ property-based economy through capitalisation are exponential¶ monetary growth, time pressure, monetary cost efficiency and¶ favorable institutional conditions [11]. In the past, property-based¶ economies have responded to such imperatives through territorial¶ expansion, property concentration and over-exploitation of¶ renewable resources (e.g. Refs. [4,26,27]). With the advent of the¶ thermo-industrial revolution [28,29] and the invention of technologies¶ allowing the exploitation of fossil energy, **technological**¶ **innovation** became the main method for materializing economic¶ growth. Based on mineral resources,12 industrial innovations have¶ appeared particularly well suited to the capitalist goals of¶ producing more, faster and newer. In return, industrial development¶ has imposed new constraints on economic activities, such as¶ mechanisation, standardisation and planning, reinforcing¶ economic and political power concentration [32]. Such an industrialising¶ path has reinforced the dependency of the capitalist¶ expansion on mineral resources, increasing the scarcity of these¶ resources together with their strategic character.¶ The physical growth process on which property-based industrial¶ expansion ultimately rests affects the natural environment in¶ many, interrelated ways: over-exploitation of local biotic resources¶ leading to a global biodiversity crisis, expansive depletion of¶ mineral resources, lowering of ecosystem resilience and disruption¶ of the global ecosystem, the Biosphere. Altogether, such human induced¶ phenomena affect natural processes up to the point that¶ both the Biosphere and humanity are said to be entering a new¶ geological era called the Anthropocene by eminent scientists [33],¶ where the evolution of the Earth System is for the very first time¶ dominantly shaped by the activities of one single species, humans.¶ Resting on the exclusive privileges of the proprietors and the¶ exclusion of non-proprietors, the expansion of the property-based¶ economy contributes to widening social inequality, the reinforcement¶ of a capitalist elite together with an increasing underclass of¶ excluded non-proprietors. In the absence of significant redistribution¶ policies (which most members of the elite oppose) such sociocultural¶ evolution spontaneously locks itself into a recurrent social¶ crisis. Moreover, the widening of social inequality reinforces environmental¶ disruption, as both extreme poverty and opulence are¶ causal factors of ecological degradation [22,34,35].¶ In order to avoid such an eco-social collapse, a radical reorientation¶ of social decision criteria needs to be implemented.¶ Conceptually, such a reorientation would imply the shift from the¶ property-based hierarchy where social and ecological considerations¶ are subordinated to the capitalist economic rationality¶ towards an eco-social rationale [36], where economic activities are¶ subordinated to social and ecological imperatives.13 Movements such as ecodevelopment in the 70s, alterglobalisation and¶ degrowth nowadays, rest on such an eco-social rationale.¶ A radical inversion in the hierarchy of decision-making is thus¶ required. But what could be the chances for success of such¶ a transition phase when property criteria play an ever more¶ dominant role in the cultural evolution? Besides the systematic¶ opposition coming from interest-groups that take advantage of the¶ capitalist expansion (Veblen’s vested interests) and the huge¶ technical difficulties involved in concretely shifting from an¶ industrialised, mineral-based development path to a sustainable¶ one, we want to point out here that the very particular nature of the¶ western development path acts in itself as a systemic obstacle to¶ such a reorientation.

**Degrowth Now allows paradigm shift to new economic policies- key to mitigating environmental impacts and new approach to economic policy**

Francois, **Schneider**. François Schneider is an industrial ecologist and degrowth researcher. He worked on the development of Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) methodology at the INSA engineering school in Lyon and at the CML in Holland**. 2008**. [“Macroscopic rebound effects as argument for economic degrowth”.First international conference on Economic De-growth for Ecological Sustainability and Social Equity. Pg. 33-34]http://events.it-sudparis.eu/degrowthconference/appel/Degrowth%20Conference%20-%20Proceedings.pdf

Economic growth is seen as a solution more than a¶ problem, when it could be seen as general failure of¶ efficiency on a larger scale. Continuous growth outstrips¶ gains of efficiency, this is not bad luck, it is the result of¶ growth strategies and policies at the micro and macro level.¶ we should really deal with what blows the balloon, and¶ deblow it, or degrow it, instead pressing one side: another¶ side inflates even more. We need just, fair, eco, right-sizing¶ of the global economy that would give everybody its¶ sufficient share. In the OECD, it would mean absolute¶ reduction of material, energy and land use taking into¶ account a cradle to grave vision, in the Global South this¶ would mean post-developments (Rist 1997) away from the¶ present affluent and influent consumption and production¶ model. Because of the rebound effect we cannot limit goals¶ to physical degrowth, economic degrowth, EDSE is needed.¶ More than a good analysis, the rebound effect is a central¶ argument for economic degrowth: degrowth of¶ environmental impacts cannot be obtained without an¶ economic degrowth of industrial countries, it also gives an¶ approach to understand the implication of specific policies¶ and technical choices for growth or degrowth. Economic¶ degrowth could be seen as long term risk prevention:¶ immaterial economy is at risks to become material again,¶ sequestration of carbon is at risks of liberating carbon... The¶ only real prevention could be degrowth.¶ The present growth paradigm involves rebound strategies¶ inducing growth and these are reinforced by growth policies¶ that promote rebound strategies again. For degrowth¶ paradigm shift we suggest instead pathways combining¶ debound strategies supporting degrowth policies and¶ degrowth policies supporting debound, taking into account of¶ limits to consumption and production and adjusting limiting¶ factors.¶ Real societal benefits are actually prevented with growth or¶ would be enabled with degrowth. The rebound effect or so called¶ Jevons paradox is the failure of attempts to reduce¶ exploitation of natural resources. We intended to reduce¶ this exploitation of natural resources while neglecting the¶ degrowth of capacities to exploit those.

## Alternative

1NC

#### We have to let the global economy collapse now – extinction is inevitable without it and a recovery WILL happen after collapse

Farrel 11 (Paul B., PhD and writer for WSJ MarketWatch, I’m just as surprised as you are that WSJ came out with an article like this, “A ‘no-growth’ boom will follow 2012 global crash”, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2011-08-23/commentary/30755764_1_catastrophe-global-economy-global-population>, 8/23/11, JNP)

SAN LUIS OBISPO, Calif. (MarketWatch) — There is a global economic boom coming, but unfortunately, that boom comes only after a systemic collapse of the global economy, markets and capitalism — a collapse that may well eliminate billions of people from the planet. Shocking? Cruel? Brutal? Yes.¶ ¶ But folks, that is the coded message in many recent warnings from environmental economists who finally realize that nothing will wake up the public. Nothing but a catastrophic system failure. Only then, a path to reform, recovery, a new boom.¶ ¶ But wait, you ask: If the consequences are worse than an asteroid slamming into Earth, why don’t we just plan ahead? Avoid the Black Swan? Why wait for some “creative destruction” to wipe out capitalism, reduce the global population to 5 billion? Why? Because our human genes are not good at planning ahead for catastrophes. Our brains are designed for fight-or-flight. Otherwise we procrastinate. We respond best when our backs are against the wall. Then we rally the troops, go to war, so to speak.¶ ¶ Until we reach that point, we focus on everyday stuff, like jobs, the kids, short-term buy-sells and ideological stuff like today’s anti-science, anti-intellectual political rhetoric. Free-market capitalism. Don’t tread on me. Stuff like that keeps us in denial about the future. No, we don’t plan, don’t act until a crisis. Not till the asteroid is about to hit. Even then, we pray for divine intervention to rescue us. Or a Churchill to emerge, take charge of the impossible challenge, get people energized and focused on a common cause. Then we’ll charge ahead, solve the problem. Until then, our brains can only think short-term.¶ ¶ ¶ Massive denial of global catastrophe dead ahead¶ And yet, the facts about the coming catastrophe are so obvious. Just apply a little grade-school math and economic common sense: Our planet’s natural resources can reasonably support about 5 billion people. That’s a fact. Another: Today we have 7 billion. That’s a problem, 2 billion too many. We’re consuming commodities and natural resources at a rate of 1.5 Earths, according to estimates by the Global Footprint Network of scientists and economists.¶ ¶ Flash forward: This scenario gets scarier than a horror film, very fast. United Nations demographers warn the Earth’s population will reach 10 billion in just one generation, around 2050. That’s two times the 5 billion the Earth can reasonably support. But the equation gets even scarier: Those 10 billion people will demand lifestyle improvements. That increases their consumption of scarce resources by 300% per person. Bottom line: 10 billion people will be consuming the equivalent of six Earths. Very bad news.

Collapse Now Solves Extinction

#### Quick collapse allows us to survive – delay only makes things much worse

Vail 5 (Jeff, attorney at Davis Graham & Stubbs LLP in Denver, Colorado specializing in litigation and energy issues, former intelligence officer with the US Air Force and energy infrastructure counterterrorism specialist with the US Department of the Interior, April 28, 2005, “The Logic of Collapse,” online: http://www.jeffvail.net/2005/04/logic-of-collapse.html)

But despite the declining marginal returns, society is not capable of reducing expenditure, or even reducing the growth in expenditure. I discuss this at length in A Theory of Power, but the basic fact is that society is—at its very root—an evolutionary development that uses a continual increase in complexity to address social needs—and to ensure its own survival. So, as societies continue to invest more and more in social complexity at lower and lower marginal rates of return, they become more and more inefficient until eventually they are no longer capable of withstanding even commonplace stresses. They collapse.¶ This may seem too deterministic—after all, it suggests that all societies will eventually collapse. While that may cause our inherent sense of hubris to perk up for a moment, we should remember that this equation fits our data quite well—every civilization that has ever existed has, in fact, collapsed. Our present global civilization is, or course, the sole exception. A look back at the contemporary chroniclers of history shows that every “great” civilization thinks that they are somehow different, that history will not repeat with them—and their hubris is shared with gusto by members of the present global civilization.¶ Of course, as discrete empires and societies grow ever more cumbersome they do not always collapse in the spectacular fashion of the Western Roman Empire. If they exist in a “peer-polity” situation—that is, they are surrounded by competitors of similar levels of complexity—then they will tend to be conquered and absorbed. It is only in the case of a power vacuum—like the Chacoans or Western Romans—that we witness such a spectacular loss of complexity. In the “modern” world, we have not witnessed such a collapse as we exist in a global peer-polity continuum. When the Spanish empire grew too cumbersome the British were there to take over, and the mantel has since passed on to America, with the EU, China and others waiting eagerly in the wings. In the modern world there can no longer be an isolated collapse—our next experience with this will be global.¶ In fact, the modern civilization continuum has existed for so long without a global collapse because we have managed to tap new energy sources—coal, then oil—each with a higher energy surplus than the last. This has buoyed the marginal return curve temporarily with each discovery, but has not changed the fundamental dynamics of collapse.¶ Perhaps we should take a step back and look at collapse in general. Our psychological investment in the “goodness” of “high-civilization” leads to the commonly held conclusion that collapse is bad—and that to advocate it would be irrational. But from a purely economic point of view, collapse actually increases the overall benefit that social complexity provides to society for their level of investment. It makes economic sense. In the graph above, C3-B1 and C1-B1 provide the same benefit to society—but for dramatically different support burdens required to maintain their respective levels of complexity. C1-B1 is a much more desirable location for a society than C3-B1, so collapse from C3-B1 to C1-B1 is actually a good thing. With the growing burden of today’s global society, the global inequality and injustice that seems to grow daily, collapse is beginning to make economic sense. In fact, an entire philosophical movement, Primitivism, has sprung up dedicated to convincing the world that a “C1-B1”, hamlet society is in fact a far better place.¶ Despite the growing logic of collapse, in today’s peer-polity world that option does not exist except on a global scale. Today we have 3 options:¶ 1. Continue business as usual, accepting declining marginal returns on investments in complexity (and very soon declining overall returns) until an eventual, inevitable collapse occurs globally. Continuation of present patterns will continue the escalating environmental damage, and will continue to grow the human population, with population levels in increasing excess of the support capacity of a post-collapse Earth (i.e. more people will die in the collapse).¶ 2. Locate a new, more efficient energy source to subsidize marginal returns on our investments in complexity. This does not mean discover more oil or invent better clean coal technology—these, along with solar or wind power still provide lower marginal returns than oil in the heyday of cheap Saudi oil. Only the development of super-efficient fusion power seems to provide the ability to delay the decline of marginal returns any appreciable amount, and this will still serve to only delay and exacerbate the eventual return to option #1.¶ 3. Precipitate a global collapse now in order to reap the economic benefits of this action while minimizing the costs of the collapse that will continue to increase with the complexity and population of our global civilization. When combined with a strategy to replace hierarchy with rhizome, as outlined in A Theory of Power, Chapter 9, this may even represent a long-term sustainable strategy.¶ Whoa. Am I seriously suggesting the triggering of a global collapse? For the moment I’m just suggesting that we explore the idea. If, after deliberation, we accept the totality of the three options as outlined above, then triggering collapse stands as the only responsible choice. It is—admittedly—a choice that is so far outside the realm of consideration of most people (who are strongly invested in the Myth of the West) that they will never take it seriously. But critically, it does not necessarily require their consent…¶ These may seem like the ramblings of a madman. But in the late Western Roman Empire, there is a fact that is simply not taught today because it is too far outside our tolerance for things that run counter to the Myth of the West: The citizens of Rome wanted to end the Empire, to dissolve its cumbersome structure, but could not reverse its pre-programmed course. Many—perhaps most—welcomed the invading barbarians with open arms.¶ So should collapse be triggered now, or should we wait as long as possible? If we accept the inevitability of collapse, then it should be triggered as soon as possible, as the cost of implementing a collapse strategy is continually growing…¶ Throughout history, when collapse has occurred, it has been a blessing. The mainstream continues to cling to the beliefs that collapse will be a terrible loss, and that it is not inevitable. Even with all of our cultural brain-washing, do we really have so much hubris as to hold on to the tired mantra that “this time, in our civilization, things will be different”?

#### Extinction is inevitable without collapse – it’ll transform society for the better

Djordjevic 98 (Interdisciplinary Minor in Global Sustainability Senior Seminar University of California, Irvine, 1998, Johnny, “Sustainability”, Senior Seminar UC Irvine, March, http://www.dbc.uci.edu/sustain/global/sensem/djordj98.html)

Despite all the gloomy facts and sad stories, there is a solution, to create a sustainable society. Rather than being greedy and only thinking about the self, each individual must realize the impacts of his/her selfish tendencies, and disregard their former view of the world. One must come into harmony with what is really needed to survive, and drawn a strict distinction between what is necessity and what is luxury. Not every family needs three cars, or five meals a day or four telephones and two refrigerators. Countries do not need to strive for increasing growth, less materials could be imported/exported and international tension could be greatly reduced. The major problems seem not to step from the determination of what a sustainable society is, but on how to get people to change their values. This task is not an easy one. People must be forced to realize the harmful and catastrophic consequences lie in their meaningless wants and greed. The problem of cognitive dissonance is hard to overcome, but it is not impossible. The solution to this dilemma lies in castastrophe. The only event that changes people's minds is social trauma or harm. The analogy is that a person who refuses to wear a seat belt and one day gets thrown through his/her windshield will remember to wear the seat belt after the accident. The logic behind this argument is both simple and feasible. So the question of dissonance is answered in part, but to change a whole society obviously takes a bigger and more traumatic event to occur. An economic collapse or ice age would trigger a new consciousness leading to a sustainable society.¶ The power of an idea should never be underestimated. Hitler's idea of the Aryan race lead to the Holocaust, Marx's idea of socialism lead to Stalin's reign and the deaths of over 50 million people. But ideas change be changed, disregarded and adopted. As developed countries find themselves engaging in a greedy philosophy, once that realization is made, the first step to a better society is taken. Our current path will lead to massive suffering all across the world, with extinction a distinct possibility. Global sustainability must be adopted by every person on the planet, (starting in the developed world), otherwise the world will cease to support life.

#### Collapse would guarantee the death of the current social order

Kassiola 90 (Joel Jay, The Death of Industrial Civilization: The Limits to Economic Growth and the Repoliticization of Advanced Industrial Society, Pg. 171-172)

Therefore, it is essential to emphasize that the end or death of industrial civilization will not necessarily bring the apocalyptic termination of life on earth! It will mean the end of the world, but only one world; it could mean merely the end of a particular (and defective) social order! For people who have absorbed its worldview uncritically and completely, and furthermore, who have adjusted successfully to the resulting social structure and values, the impending loss of a civilization does appear to be terrifying. They will experience the death of the only desirable-and for the industrial elite, self-serving-world they know as a totally destructive, and therefore traumatic, phenomenon rather than what it actually is: the passing of a specific, elite-benefitting world that indeed can and should be transformed. When the flaws of a social order are understood, and its fantastic elements and promises (like industrialism's unlimited economic growth) are recognized and appreciated for what they are-impossible dreams preserving the ruling group's control and benefits-they should be cast aside. The loss of social fantasies causes immediate despair but the mourning period, for their death should be temporary and surmountable. As both Slater and Harman emphasize, such despair is both appropriate and necessary to the achievement of social and individual transformation.

#### We must allow a collapse sooner than later – now is the time

Barry 8 (Dr. Glen, PhD Land Resources, Masters Sustainable Development, “Economic Collapse

And Global Ecology”, <http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm>, 1/14/8, JNP)

Given widespread failure to pursue policies sufficient to reverse deterioration of the biosphere and avoid ecological collapse, the best we can hope for may be that the growth-based economic system crashes sooner rather than later¶ Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life.¶ With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later.¶ Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure.¶ Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition. Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products.¶ Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration.¶ This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption.¶ We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured.¶ Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies.¶ It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil.¶ Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again.¶ Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon.¶ A successful revolutionary response to imminent global ecosystem collapse would focus upon bringing down the Earth's industrial economy now. As society continues to fail miserably to implement necessary changes to allow creation to continue, maybe the best strategy to achieve global ecological sustainability is economic sabotage to hasten the day. It is more fragile than it looks.¶ Humanity is a marvelous creation. Yet her current dilemma is unprecedented. It is not yet known whether she is able to adapt, at some expense to her comfort and short-term well-being, to ensure survival. If she can, all futures of economic, social and ecological collapse can be avoided. If not it is better from a long-term biocentric viewpoint that the economic growth machine collapse now, bringing forth the necessary change, and offering hope for a planetary and human revival.¶ I wish no harm to anyone, and want desperately to avoid these prophesies foretold by ecological science. I speak for the Earth, for despite being the giver of life, her natural voice remains largely unheard over the tumult of the end of being.¶

Collapse Solves Better Than Tech

#### De-growth solves better than technology

Moriarty 10 (Patrick, Ph.D.1, Department of Design, Monash University and Damon Honnery Ph.D.2, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Monash University &#34;Why Technical Fixes Won’t Mitigate Climate Change&#34; Journal of Cosmology, 2010, Vol 8, 1921-1927. journalofcosmology.com/ClimateChange107.html)

We have argued so far that none of the various conventional approaches for climate mitigation will be effective, and that even in combination will prove to be ‘too little too late’ (Moriarty and Honnery 2010a). This conclusion is also reached by the rising numbers of researchers supporting—perhaps reluctantly—geoengineering, who usually view it as the sole remaining option.¶ But it is not; technical fixes such as those discussed do not exhaust the possibilities. In previous work, we’ve argued that the policy of continued economic growth should be abandoned for two reasons. First, as argued by Kitzes et al. (2009), the demand for ecosystem services may have already exceeded the sustainable biocapacity of Earth—we are in unsustainable overshoot, as Randers (2008) has stressed. Second, as a number of researchers, including Jackson (2009), van den Bergh (2009) and the editors of Nature (Anon. 2010) have argued, GDP per capita is no longer a reliable indicator of welfare, at least in the high-income countries. Globally, the rise in GDP in recent decades has been tightly linked to rise in global primary energy use (Moriarty and Honnery 2010a). As it presently measured, we probably can’t increase global GDP for very much longer, and we shouldn’t even try, given its decreasing relevance to global welfare. If we remove the artificial constraint of ever-rising GDP, we can focus on the global satisfaction of human needs.¶ All humans have a need for adequate provision of food, potable water, shelter, health and education services, as well as for sociality and so on. The UN has incorporated these human needs into its Millennnium Development Goals (Moriarty and Honnery 2010a). We propose that economies focus on these needs, attempting to satisfy them for all, with a minimum use of depletable resources and environmental damage. In a world with many resources yet to be exploited, the wealth of a minority would not be at the expense of the poor. But if resource use is already at or nearing unsustainable levels, our argument is that the only way the needs of an expanding population can be met is by abandoning global economic growth, and with it the high-energy lifestyles of the West. Rees (2008) argues that the West will need to cut ‘energy and material consumption by up to 80%’, with equity being an essential component of this challenge (Moriarty and Honnery 2010b). Social innovation, just as much as technical innovation in energy efficiency or renewable energy, is urgently needed for a just and sustainable future.¶

Collapse Causes Sustainable Shift

#### Collapse forces a sustainable shift to small communities

Lewis 98 (Chris, Ph.d in American Studies, The Paradox of Global Development and the Necessary Collapse of Modern Industrial Civilization, Part of The Coming Age of Scarcity, p44-45, http://books.google.com/books?id=Dx9nCcpQhegC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=true)

I will argue that we are witnessing the collapse of global industrial civilization. Driven by individualism, materialism, and the endless pursuit of wealth and power, the modern industrialized world’s efforts to modernize and integrate the world politically, economically, and culturally since World War II are only accelerating this global collapse. In the late-twentieth century, global development leaves 80 percent of the world’s population outside the industrialized nations’ progress and affluence (Wallimann 1994). When the modern industrialized world collapses, people in the underdeveloped world will continue their daily struggle for their dignity and survival at the margins of a moribund global industrial civilization. With the collapse of the modern world, smaller, autonomous, local and regional civilizations, cultures, and polities will emerge. We can reduce the threat of mass death and genocide that will surely accompany this collapse by encouraging the creation and growth of sustainable, self-sufficient regional polities. John Cobb has already made a case for how this may work in the United States and how it is working in Kerala, India. After the collapse of global civilization, modern peoples will not have the material resources, biological capital, and energy to reestablish global civilization. Forced by economic necessity to become dependent on local resources and ecosystems for their survival, peoples throughout the world will work to conserve and restore their environments. For the societies that destroy their local environments and economies, as modern people so often do, will themselves face collapse and ruin. Thus the rapid expansion of modern industrial civilization since the 1600s, which modern peoples understand as progress, is destroying the earth and threatening the human future (Hauchler and Kennedy 1994). Since the birth of the modern world, we have witnessed accelerating global population growth, air and water pollution, destruction of forests, farmland, and fisheries, depletion of nonrenewable natural resources, loss of biodiversity, and increasing poverty and misery throughout the nonmodern world (Brown and Kane 1994). In Worldwatch’s State of the World 1995, Hilary French (1995, 171) concludes: “The relentless pace of global ecological decline shows no signs of letting up. Carbon dioxide concentrations are mounting in the atmosphere, species loss continues to accelerate, fisheries are collapsing, land degradation frustrates efforts to feed hungry people, and the earth’s forest cover keeps shrinking.” And in his introduction to State of the World 1995, Lester Brown (1995) warns that eroding soils, shrinking forests, deteriorating rangelands, expanding deserts, acid rain, stratospheric ozone depletion, the buildup of greenhouse gases, air pollution, and the loss of biological diversity threatens global food production and future economic growth. How could this rapid growth in wealth, population, science and technology, and human control over the natural world have produced such catastrophic results?

#### Solid waste can be reused – this method of preparing for collapse is rising now

Nader 5/25 (Ralph, Princeton and Harvard grad, assistant professor of history and government at the University of Hartford, “The rise of re-use”, <http://transitionvoice.com/2012/05/the-rise-of-re-use/>, 5/25/12, JNP)

Last week I read that the glitzy world of virtual reality created instant multi-millionaires and several billionaires when Facebook went public selling shares.¶ Last week I also noted the important real world problem of some 250 million tons of solid waste a year in our country alone.¶ Guess which “world” gets the most investment, status, fame, klieg lights, and attention of the skilled classes and the power structure?¶ Guess which world is more important for our wellbeing and that of the planet?¶ You’ve heard of CEO Mark Zuckerberg and Facebook’s 900 users exchanging gossip and other personal pleasantries or worries through a medium that inflates narcissism.¶ The three Rs¶ You’ve probably not heard of Ben Rose of the New York City Materials Exchange Development Program (NYC MEDP) or the equivalent organizations in your communities providing services to thousands of charitable non-profit groups which promote the donating and reusing of materials to avoid incineration, landfilling and recycling.¶ To grasp the enormity of modern society’s waste products, Ann Leonard created a sparkling website, visited by millions of people (www.storyofstuff.org). She also published a recent popular book titled The Story of Stuff that details every aspect of your environment and physical being. Air, water, food, soil and even your genes absorb the byproducts of processing mountains of stuff. The results are not pretty.¶ While recycling efforts in cities like San Francisco, Vancouver and Los Angeles rise above 50 percent, New York City has been slipping behind its own 2002 level and is still struggling to reach 20 percent. New York City has been a leader in improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but it still has dreaded incinerators producing toxic air and toxic residues.¶ In the early 90s, pragmatic environmental scientist, Professor Barry Commoner demonstrated in two operational pilot projects that the city could reach a residential recycling level of nearly 100 percent. Unfortunately, New York City missed a chance to become a world leader in recycling when its leaders, beginning with Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, declined to establish a city-wide recycling program based on Professor Commoner’s model.¶ The New York City recycling challenge still hasn’t recovered from that devastatingly wrongheaded decision. Politicians and corporations cannot stop an even superior environmental cycle, presently driven by charitable associations, in Mr. Rose’s words, “nimbly accepting, exchanging and distributing thousands of tons of reusable material each year,” as they have done for generations, “all the while contributing to the social, economic and environmental fabric of New York City.” Over the decades, the recipients have been communities in need, such as homeless shelters and poor populations.¶ The NYC Materials Exchange Development Program now sees a great potential to “organize, grow and advocate for the practice of donating and reusing materials for the benefit of all New Yorkers,” creating local jobs and adding productivity without any tax dollars. They are rediscovering the past of a thrifty culture and expanding it mightily to contribute to the neighborhood and economic landscape.¶ Donating materials instead of trashing or recycling them enlarges the gifting culture and the beneficial human interactions that follow. As Ben Rose notes: “In contrast to recycling, where used materials are broken down into their raw elements to make new items, reuse takes useful products and exchanges them without reprocessing, thus saving time, money, energy and valuable resources.”¶ Battling manufactured obsolescence¶ The obstacles are obvious. First a throwaway economy of waste is profitable for sellers who want you to keep throwing away and buying. They plan product obsolescence and lure consumers with the convenience of disposable products. So we have to change habits: become more cunning about what manufacturers and vendors are up to and expand second hand, reuse and material exchange programs.¶ What are reusable materials? Just about everything you purchase that doesn’t spoil or perish. Clothing, furniture, books, bicycles, containers, computers, tools, surplus construction materials and things you buy or grow that you do not use. Reuse outlets include Goodwill or Thrift stores, charitable book and clothing drives, ecology centers and creative arts programs.¶ Nothing less than a “New Age” for a burgeoning sub-economy of reusable products and materials is being envisioned by the collaborative likes of the New York City Sanitation Department and the City College of New York’s Department of Civil Engineering. Collecting data which shows how much energy is saved, how many jobs can be created, how much better pricing systems can be, and how much solid waste can be prevented will elevate this subject and its social status within the “zero waste” movement. We should aspire to using resources, in the worlds of Paul Hawken, “10 to 100 times more productively.”¶ Other countries are advancing in the reuse sector in ways we can learn from immediately. Holland is starting numerous “Repair Cafes,” that are attracting increasing interest in “fixing” rather than dumping. These used to be called “Fix-It Shops” in the U.S. before the advent of our throw-away corporate culture.

#### Results in a stable economy

Monboit 11, Georges Monboit, English writer, “As the dream of economic growth dies, a new plan awaits testing” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/aug/22/economic-growth-environment>

It points out that the financial crisis was caused not by isolated malpractice but by the systematic deregulation of the banks by governments, in order to stimulate economic growth by issuing more debt. Growth and the need to encourage it is the problem, and in the rich world it no longer bears any relationship to prosperity.

Jackson accepts that material wellbeing is a crucial component of prosperity, and that growth is essential to the wellbeing of the poorest nations. But in countries such as the UK, continued growth and the policies which promote it undermine prosperity, which he defines as freedom from adversity or affliction. This means, among other blessings, health, happiness, good relationships, strong communities, confidence about the future, a sense of meaning and purpose. But how do you escape from growth without tanking the economy – and our prosperity? Under the current system, you can't: when growth stops, it collapses. So Jackson has begun developing a macroeconomic model which would allow economic output to be stabilised. He experiments with raising the ratio of investment to consumption, changing the nature and conditions of investment and shifting the balance from private to public spending, while staying within tight constraints on the use of resources. He finds that the redistribution of both income and employment (through shorter working hours) is essential to the project. So is re-regulation of the banks, enhanced taxation of resources and pollution and measures to discourage manic consumption, such as tighter restrictions on advertising. His system is not wholly different to today's: people will still spend and save, companies will still produce goods and services, governments will still raise taxes and spend money. It requires more government intervention than we're used to; but so does every option we face from now on, especially if we try to sustain the growth illusion. The results, though, are radically different: a stable, growthless economy which avoids both financial and ecological collapse.

AT No Mindset Shift

#### Your authors are all caught in a mindset of denial – the problem is so large that they don’t wish to acknowledge it – collapse is crucial

Farrel 11 (Paul B., PhD and writer for WSJ MarketWatch, I’m just as surprised as you are that WSJ came out with an article like this, “A ‘no-growth’ boom will follow 2012 global crash”, <http://articles.marketwatch.com/2011-08-23/commentary/30755764_1_catastrophe-global-economy-global-population>, 8/23/11, JNP)

“You really do have to wonder whether a few years from now we’ll look back at the first decade of the 21st century,” writes Thomas Friedman, a New York Times columnist and author of “Hot, Flat, Crowded,” “when food prices spiked, energy prices soared, world population surged, tornados plowed through cities, floods and droughts set records, populations were displaced and governments were threatened by the confluence of it all — and ask ourselves: What were we thinking? How did we not panic when the evidence was so obvious that we’d crossed some growth/climate/natural-resource/population redlines all at once?”¶ Friedman quotes Paul Gilding, the veteran Australian environmentalist-entrepreneur, who described this moment in a new book called “The Great Disruption: Why the Climate Crisis Will Bring On the End of Shopping and the Birth of a New World.”¶ “The only answer can be denial,” says Gilding. “When you are surrounded by something so big that requires you to change everything about the way you think and see the world, then denial is the natural response. But the longer we wait, the bigger the response required.” Forget global warming — it’s too late¶ Gilding’s “Great Disruption” is an eye-opener. But have no illusions that his or any book will be the wake-up call that will force us to plan ahead for a catastrophe. A former chief executive of Greenpeace, he admits screaming for 30 years to get the public’s attention. He now confesses that his efforts had little impact. Why? The world is too deep in denial.¶ So, finally, he gave up. Nothing was working: “We tried. We failed.” Today his message is simple and blunt: “It’s time to stop worrying about climate change. Instead we need to brace for impact.” Yes, an economic asteroid is closing fast.¶ What will trigger “The Crash” he sees coming? “If you grow an economy or any system up against its limits, it then stops growing and either changes form or breaks down … As our system hits its limits, the following pressures will combine, in varied and unpredictable ways, to trigger a system breakdown and a major economic crisis (or series of smaller crises) that will see us slide into a sustained economic downturn and a global emergency lasting decades.”

#### Transition possible

Bourke 12, SOE Scientific Briefing Paper, 3/7/12 “Degrowth as an Alternative to the Consumption Society,” <http://montreal2012.wordpress.com/2012/03/07/degrowth-as-an-alternative-to-the-consumption-society/>

The anglosaxon countries are a source of inspiration for their initiative of taking on practical experiences on the lines of degrowth. The Transition Towns movement, based on a network of community-level transformations towards sustainability. It emerged only 5 years ago in Totenes (UK) and Kinsealey (Ireland), and rapidly began to expand to other communities. Up to now more than 170 official initiatives have been created -without counting those which are still unofficial- expanding to Australia, New Zealand, US and Canada, and also in lesser extent to other countries such as Japan, Chile, Italy, Germany and Holland. (Del Río, 2010). Another noteworthy transition network based in Canada and the US is the Business Alliance for Living Local Economies, which involves about 26 states and provinces and 15.000 businesses to promote sustainable consumption. Also, the Post Carbon Institute, founded in 2003 in the US, supports the Relocalisation Network. This world-wide network is a strategy to build societies based on the local production of food, energy and goods, and the local development of currency, governance and culture. Although these transition movements differ somehow from degrowth organisations, they have a common objective in pursuing a sustainable future through re-locating our lifestyles. While degrowth would tend to focus on the criticism to the capitalist system as the cause for all sort of social and environmental problems, transition movements provide a great complement by having a more pragmatic approach by seeking for positive change and increasing coummunity level resilience.

#### Current mindset fails—stopping growth is necessary

Besch 12, Brianna L. Besch, Macalester College, 2/2/12, "The Steady-State Economy As A Solution to The World’s Problems: A Theoretical Examination of The Greatest Environmental Problem Facing Human Society," *The Macalester Review*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 6. <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=macreview>

Herman Daly describes the world’s greatest problem as growthmania, defined as “the paradigm¶ or mind-set that always puts growth in first place - the attitude that there is no such thing as enough,¶ that cannot conceive of too much of a good thing,” (1973, p. 149-150). Growthmania tells us we must¶ sustain constant growth to prosper, and that more growth is the solution to all of our problems.¶ Growthmania tells us poverty can be solved by economic growth which allows others to grow, that we¶ can surmount natural resource limits by growing to create better technology, to grow to afford the¶ cleanup of pollution we created by growing. All this growth is causing huge problems. As Daly puts it¶ “The fragmentation of knowledge and people by excessive specialization, the disequilibrium between the human economy and the natural eco-system, the congestion and pollution of our spatial dimensions of existence, the congestion and pollution of our temporal dimensions of existence with the resulting state of harried drivenness and stress- all of these evils and more are symptomatic of the basic malady of growthmania.” (1973, p. 149) The reason growthmania is the cause of so many world problems is its fundamental opposition to natural ecosystems. Natural systems exist in a steady-state, constantly recycling resources in closed loops without need for continued inputs. On the other hand, modern human systems built on growthmania adopt a cradle-to-grave model, requiring more inputs and more waste to sustain constant growth. These two systems are fundamentally at odds with each other: “The world is finite, the ecosystem is a steady-state. The human economy is a subsystem of the steady-state ecosystem. Therefore at some level and over some time period the subsystem must also become a steady-state, at least in its physical dimensions of people and physical wealth. The steady-state economy is therefore a¶ physical necessity.” (Daly, 1973, p. 153) It is impossible to maintain a system of growthmania, built on linear production system requiring constant inputs, under an overarching natural steady-state closed loop system. Eventually nature will win out, and humans will have to adapt to a steady-state way of life. “In sum the steady-state is necessary. It must be the norm,”

No Transition Wars

#### The descent has begun, but there’s no impact – it’s not hard to learn how to sustain yourself

Ackerman 7/5 (Sherry L., Ph.D., “The time for action”, <http://transitionvoice.com/2012/07/the-time-for-action/>, 7/5/12, JNP)

I don’t meet many people these days who still think that “things are fine” with the US economy — or that “recovery is right around the corner.” The light-bulbs are coming on for people and they’re beginning to realize that the current state of affairs is, as David Wann says, The New Normal. The Emperor really has no clothes. We’ve consumed our way past peak resources and the descent has begun.¶ On the other hand, I don’t meet many people who do much more about this than merely talk! I hear a lot of “oh, ain’t it awful” sagas without much accompanying action. And, frankly, the only thing that’s really going to move us into a more secure future is action.¶ The time for talking is over. We need to take action while we still have some choices left.¶ We can decide to make the descent in a controlled way, beginning now, or to cling to our current lifestyles and wait for the inevitable entropic free-fall. What we need to know to get by in a disintegrating industrial society is radically different from what we have needed to know to shop in malls, eat out, outsource our child-care, buy pre-packaged processed food and work out in a gym.¶ Additionally, many of the requirements of an age of decline come with prolonged learning curves and a high price for failure. Starting right away to re-skill to navigate a de-industrializing society offers the best hope of getting through the difficult years ahead with some degree of dignity and grace.¶ Action Jackson¶ Action is simple enough: figure out how you will be able to live after the next wave of crisis hits, and to the extent that you can, start living that way now:¶ Figure out how you will get by if your job goes away or down-sizes, and you have to make do on much less money; downsize¶ Get out of debt—all of it. Make paying off student loans, car loans, mortgages, and credit card balances a #1 priority¶ Re-skill. Learn to do all of the things that your Grandparents did as a matter of course.¶ If you need some ideas for how to gain traditional skills start with these easy basics:¶ Learn to grind wheat-berries into flour and bake bread.¶ Learn to cook and bake from scratch.¶ Use your clothesline instead of a dryer.¶ Learn to can vegetables and fruits.¶ Begin sun-drying herbs for teas and tinctures.¶ Learn jelly-making.¶ Learn how to care for livestock beginning with keeping laying hens.¶ Plant a garden and learn to care for it.¶ To begin altering some of the things you’re used to in modern, industrial life, and try on some of the new ideas circulating out there by trying these easy changes of habit:¶ Consolidate errands to reduce transportation needs.¶ Get to know your neighbors and begin to help one another — form support networks.¶ Develop barter and trade networks. Create or utilize an area Time Bank.¶ Spend less money. Stop buying stuff!¶ Start a compost bin and utilize your kitchen scraps and other waste.¶ Get fit so that you can bicycle or walk to local destinations.¶ Learn to do home repairs and have supplies and tools on hand.¶ It’s not sufficient to read and talk about this stuff. Experience is the ultimate teacher. We learn from our mistakes and it’s a whole lot smarter to make those mistakes when the stakes aren’t quite as high as they will be when the free-fall begins. Right now, if your garden fails, you can still go to the market. That option might not be as readily available in post-industrialism.¶ Ultimately, actions speak louder than words!

#### Humanity will be able to transition to a “gift economy” – one exists now

McPherson 7/17 (Guy, professor emeritus of natural resources and the environment at the University of Arizona, where he taught and conducted research for 20 years, “The gift liberation front”, <http://transitionvoice.com/2012/07/the-gift-liberation-front/>, 7/117/12, JNP)

I’m fussy about the words I use. For example, anarchy is not chaos, though you’d never be able to distinguish the two based on anything presented by the mainstream media.¶ As a further example, I’m averse to any form of the word sustain because we don’t and we can’t, if only because of the Strong Suggestions Laws of Thermodynamics. If the Laws of Thermodynamics aren’t compelling enough for you, consider this: Wal-Mart allegedly has poured more money into “sustainability” than any other institution on Earth.¶ In this brief essay, I’d like to take issue with a couple other terms. As I’ve pointed out recently, I’m a fan of the gift economy (which is not based on barter). I explain below. In addition, I differentiate between building social capital and contributing to a decent human community.¶ My customary gifts include hosting visitors at the mud hut, delivery of presentations for no charge, and copies of my latest book at my cost (or, to those interested in an electronic version of the page¶ proofs, no cost at all).¶ Here at the mud hut, I strive to promote and expand the extant gift economy. This approach makes perfect sense, considering how we began this relationship more than four years ago, when my partners on these 2.7 acres offered my partner and me the gift of an acre (we declined, and we now share the property and the attendant responsibilities).¶ In the name of comfort for our friends and neighbors, we barter, too, and sometimes work within the customary system of fiat currency. But I prefer an economy of gifts, which has been the prevailing model for most of our existence as human animals. Gifting removes the pressure associated with placing monetary value on the exchange of goods and services in a barter system. And, to me at least, it seems more compassionate and personal than other alternatives.¶ Many people believe they are doing themselves a favor by building social capital. I hear this phrase often, and I bristle every time. Employing the root word of a heinous system that developed as the industrial revolution began is hardly a sure-fire strategy for winning friends and (positively) influencing people. The process of “building social capital” equates connivance with decency. Analogous to use of a barter system, the act of building social capital suggests a deposit is being made, and will be drawn upon later, perhaps with interest (i.e., usury).¶ In contrast to developing social capital, I believe we can and should work to contribute to a decent human community. As an aside, I’m often asked why I use the phrase, “human community” instead of “community?” This is exactly the type of question I’ve come to expect from individuals who wrongly believe we are the most important species on Earth. We’re destroying virtually every aspect of the living planet, and yet we believe we’re the foundation on which robust ecosystems depend. Viewing your place in a human community, and your contribution to that human community, is analogous to development of a gift economy. By striving to contribute, instead of invest, I can focus on developing life-affirming ties instead of dreaming about the return on my investment. By serving my neighbors, rather than determining how my neighbors can serve me, I become an integral part of a valuable system. As such, the whole, holistic system becomes increasingly durable.¶ I’ve written often about the importance of a decent human community. I’ve hosted hundreds of visitors, and I’ve spoken and written often about this rock-pile in the desert as an example. In the remainder of this essay, I provide a brief summary of the ties that bind the members of this human community, with a focus on the few hundred people within five miles of the mud hut rather than the five-person community occupying this small property.¶ Love for this place¶ The humans here love this place. Consider the examples at either end of the fiat-currency continuum. There are several financially wealthy people here. They could live anywhere, but they choose to live here. The majority of my human neighbors, though, choose to live in financial poverty. A mile up the road is a land trust with 13 members who share life on 20 acres. They grow their food and share a common well near the center of the property. They could live in dire financial poverty anywhere, but they choose to live here.¶ This is not a bad spot. I’ve grown quite attached to it. The latest trailer for Mike Sosebee’s film reveals the perspective of one of my neighbors.¶ Respect for self-reliance¶ If you can’t fix it, learn how. If it’s an emergency, learn quickly. The preferred route is to teach yourself. If that doesn’t work, you’re encouraged to call one of the neighbors, most of whom have been pursuing self-reliance for many years. They know about building structures, installing electrical lines, repairing plumbing, changing the carburetor, growing food, tending animals, mending clothes, and mending fences.¶ I don’t recommend calling the expensive plumber in the town 30 miles away. Not when your neighbors need the work and appreciate the companionship and the Federal Reserve Notes. As John Steinbeck wrote in The Grapes of Wrath:¶ If you’re in trouble, or hurt, or need — go to the poor people. They’re the only ones that’ll help — the only ones.¶ Appreciation for diversity¶ Most of us claim to tolerate other races, creeds, and points of view. But that claim comes up well short, in many of my experiences.¶ And tolerance isn’t nearly as much fun as appreciation. Here, we appreciate diversity in its myriad forms. My favorite example is the combination New Year’s Eve and house-warming party I crashed a couple years ago. About 20 of us were attending another party. Two of party-goers had been invited to a party at the home of the financially wealthy literary agents up the road. So we all went.¶ We were welcomed, of course. The party was attended by 150 or more people. At one point during the festivities, I happened to notice one of the well-dressed hosts chatting with a cowboy from the cattle company. The cowboy was dressed to the proverbial nines, including the requisite felt hat, pearl-button cowboy shirt, vest, starched blue jeans, and ostrich-skin boots. I suspect you’d be hard pressed to find two people in this country with more disparate political views. They were joined by a man from the land trust. His dress and personal hygiene reflected his living arrangements, with limited access to fiat currency and water. The three men continued an animated, thoughtful conversation for 30 minutes or so, as if they care about each other. Which they do.¶ I’m not suggesting it’s all rainbows and butterflies here, much less that the years ahead will bring nothing but good times. We have our differences, thankfully, even here on this small patch of the desert.¶ There are many attributes that could keep us apart. But there are even more that can hold us together, if we allow. I’d like to believe the latter is stronger than the former, despite the tendency of civilized humans to find an “other” in our midst.¶ Sharing gifts to develop a durable set of living arrangements within a decent human community: If you can imagine a better goal, please let me know.

# Growth Bad

## Warming
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#### Growth causes warming- on brink now

UPI 12, United Press International, “Economic growth said driving warming trend”- Science News May 1, 2012

<http://www.upi.com/Science_News/2012/05/01/Economic-growth-said-driving-warming-trend/UPI-13501335907860/>

ANN ARBOR, Mich., May 1 (UPI) -- To slow climate change the world will either have to put the brakes on economic growth or change the way the world's economies work, U.S. scientists say.¶ A study by University of Michigan researchers assessed the effects of several factors on year-to-year changes in atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide.¶ Researchers looked at two natural phenomena believed to affect CO2 levels -- volcanic eruptions and the El Nino weather pattern -- and two human factors, world population and the world economy (as measured by worldwide gross domestic product.)¶ Of the factors, they said, growing global economies were the most likely to be linked with increases in greenhouse gases.¶ From 1958-2010, in every year of above-trend GDP, the researchers said there were greater increases in CO2 concentrations, a university release reported Tuesday.¶ To break the economic habits contributing to a rise in atmospheric CO2 levels and global warming, researcher Tapia Granados said, societies around the world would need to make enormous changes.¶ "If 'business as usual' conditions continue, economic contractions the size of the Great Recession or even bigger will be needed to reduce atmospheric levels of CO2," Granados, a researcher at the university's Institute for Social Research, said.¶ Concentrations of CO2 are estimated to have been between 200-300 parts per million during preindustrial times, are presently close to 400 ppm, and levels around 300 ppm are considered safe to keep a stable climate, the researchers said.¶ "Since the 1980s, scientists like James Hansen have been warning us about the effects global warming will have on the Earth," Granados said. "One solution that has promise is a carbon tax levied on any activity producing CO2 in order to create incentives to reduce emissions."

#### Extinction

Tickell 8 (Oliver, Climate Researcher and Author – Kyoto2, “On a Planet 4C Hotter, All We Can Prepare For is Extinction”, The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a [4C rise](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/07/carbonemissions.climatechange) is absurd and dangerous. [Global warming](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/climatechange) on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term [sea level rises](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/gallery/2007/dec/05/climatechange.flooding?picture=331454811) of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, [floods](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/08/climatechange.flooding) and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer [melting of the Arctic sea ice](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/10/climatechange.arctic). The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth. But what are we to do? All our policies to date to tackle global warming have been miserable failures. The Kyoto protocol has created a vast carbon market but done little to reduce emissions. The main effect of the EU's emissions trading scheme has been to transfer about €30bn or more from consumers to Europe's biggest polluters, the power companies. The EU and US foray into [biofuels](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/biofuels) has, at huge cost, increased greenhouse gas [emissions](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/carbonemissions) and created a world [food crisis](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/food), causing starvation in many poor countries. So are all our efforts doomed to failure? Yes, so long as our governments remain craven to special interests, whether [carbon traders](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/aug/10/emissionstrading.utilities) or fossil fuel companies. The carbon market is a valuable tool, but must be subordinate to climatic imperatives. The truth is that to prevent runaway greenhouse warming, we will have to leave most of the world's fossil fuels in the ground, especially carbon-heavy coal, oil shales and tar sands. The fossil fuel and power companies must be faced down. Global problems need global solutions, and we also need an effective replacement for the failed Kyoto protocol. The entire Kyoto system of national allocations is obsolete because of the huge volumes of [energy](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/energy) embodied in products traded across national boundaries. It also presents a major obstacle to any new agreement – as demonstrated by the 2008 [G8 meeting](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/jul/08/g8) in Japan that degenerated into a squabble over national emission rights.

Collapse Solves Warming

#### Econ collapse solves warming

**Science Daily** **5/1**/12 – “Global Warming: New Research Blames Economic Growth”, <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/05/120501134327.htm>, AP

It's a message no one wants to hear: To slow down global warming, we'll either have to put the brakes on economic growth or transform the way the world's economies work. That's the implication of an innovative University of Michigan study examining the most likely causes of global warming. The study, conducted by José Tapia Granados and Edward Ionides of U-M and Óscar Carpintero of the University of Valladolid in Spain, was published online in the peer-reviewed journal Environmental Science and Policy. It is the first analysis to use measurable levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide to assess fluctuations in the gas, rather than estimates of CO2 emissions, which are less accurate.¶ "If 'business as usual' conditions continue, economic contractions the size of the Great Recession or even bigger will be needed to reduce atmospheric levels of CO2," said Tapia Granados, who is a researcher at the U-M Institute for Social Research.¶ For the study, the researchers assessed the impact of four factors on short-run, year-to-year changes in atmospheric concentrations of CO2, widely considered the most important greenhouse gas. Those factors included two natural phenomena believed to affect CO2 levels -- volcanic eruptions and the El Niño Southern oscillation -- and also world population and the world economy, as measured by worldwide gross domestic product.¶ Tapia Granados and colleagues found no observable relation between short-term growth of world population and CO2 concentrations, and they show that incidents of volcanic activity coincide with global recessions, which may confound any slight volcanic effects on CO2.¶ With El Niño outside of human control, economic activity is the sole modifiable factor. In years of above-trend world GDP, from 1958 to 2010, the researchers found greater increases in CO2 concentrations. For every $10 trillion in U.S. dollars that the world GDP deviates from trend, CO2 levels deviate from trend about half a part per million, they found. Preindustrial concentrations are estimated to be 200-300 parts per million.¶ To break the economic habits contributing to a rise in atmospheric CO2 levels and global warming, Tapia Granados says that societies around the world would need to make enormous changes.¶ "Since the mid 1970s, scientists like James Hansen have been warning us about the effects global warming will have on the Earth," Tapia Granados said.

Growth Causes Warming

#### Econ growth causes warming

Roberta **Seldon** **5/2**/12 – Warming Analyst – Security & Sustainability Forum, “Global Warming Triggered by Economic Growth, Scientists Say”, <http://securityandsustainabilityforum.org/global-warming-triggered-by-economic-growth-scientists-say-2664>, AP

Economic growth is most likely to blame for increases in greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere, a study by the University of Michigan says.¶ According to UPI, researchers from the university assessed the effects of several factors on year-to-year changes in CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere. The team looked at both natural (eruptions and the El Nino weather pattern) and human factors (world population and the world economy). Of these four factors affecting CO2 concentrations, the researchers found that growing global economies were the most likely source of increases in greenhouse gas.¶ For every year between 1958 and 2010 that the worldwide gross domestic product was above average, there were greater increases in CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere, the researchers said in a university release reported Tuesday, according to UPI.¶ To put an end to this, the world’s economies would need to halt economic growth, Tapia Granados, a researcher at the university’s Institute for Social Research, said, according to UPI.¶ “Since the 1980s, scientists like James Hansen have been warning us about the effects global warming will have on the Earth,” Granados added. “One solution that has promise is a carbon tax levied on any activity producing CO2 in order to create incentives to reduce emissions.”¶ But “if ‘business as usual’ conditions continue, economic contractions the size of the Great Recession or even bigger will be needed to reduce atmospheric levels of CO2,” Granados said, according to UPI.

#### Economic growth leads to increased emissions

**People & Planet** **5/1**/12 – “Economic recovery brings return to growth of CO2 emissions”, <http://www.peopleandplanet.net/?lid=30297&section=36&topic=23>, AP

Although global emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) declined slightly in 2009, the beginnings of economic recovery led to an unprecedented emissions increase of 5.8 percent in 2010.¶ In 2011, global atmospheric levels of CO2 reached a high of 391.3 parts per million (ppm), up from 388.6 ppm in 2010 and 280 ppm in pre-industrial times. According to new research conducted by the Worldwatch Institute for its Vital Signs Online project, energy use represents the largest source of global CO2 emissions. More than 70 percent of CO2 emissions result from the burning of fossil fuels for energy use, such as electricity generation, transportation, manufacturing, and construction. In 2009, electricity generation and heating alone accounted for 41 percent of all energy related CO2 emissions.¶ The report highlights emissions increases in both industrialized and developing economies. Member states of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), a group of industrialized countries, increased their emissions by 3.4 percent in 2010, while countries outside the OECD saw an increase of 7.6 percent. Although China was the world’s largest overall emitter in 2010 (followed by the United States, India, and Russia), an examination of emissions per capita tells a different story. China ranks only 61st in terms of the CO2 emitted per person. In India—the world’s third largest emitter—emissions per capita rank far below the world average. The United States, in contrast, ranks second overall and 10th in per capita emissions.¶ The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has long stressed the urgent need for cuts in global greenhouse gas emissions. Unfortunately, according to the Worldwatch report, national governments have largely failed to bring about the needed reductions.¶ Global CO2 levels are now 45 percent above the 1990 level, which serves as the reference base year for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Several Annex I countries—including the United States, which signed but never ratified the Kyoto Protocol—will be unable to meet their original reductions targets. Since December 2011, Canada, Japan, and Russia, have chosen not to take on additional emissions targets within the second commitment period of Kyoto Protocol in the coming decade.

#### Carbon reductions trade off with economic growth – China proves

Lawrence **LeBlond 7/20**/12 – Environmental expert, Christian Brothers University Alumni, University of Tennessee student, RedOrbit Staff Writer – RedOrbit, “China’s Per Person Carbon Footprint Growing Rapidly”, <http://www.redorbit.com/news/science/1112660454/china%E2%80%99s-per-person-carbon-footprint-growing-rapidly/>, AP

China’s per capita carbon emissions are now on par with those of Europe as the country’s carbon footprint skyrocketed in 2011, rising by 9 percent, or the equivalent of an extra 6.5 tons of gas for each resident, according to data released on Wednesday.¶ China has long been a powerhouse when it comes to carbon emissions, becoming the largest emitter of CO2 in 2006. However, the per capita emissions have always remained lower than those in developed countries such as Europe and the US.¶ But a new report released by the PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (NEAA) and the European commission’s Joint Research Centre (JRC) shows that China’s per capita emissions are now only a fraction lower than the EU average of 6.8 tons.¶ And while the per capita emissions in the US are much higher — 15.7 tons — the Chinese CO2 emissions overall are as much as 80 percent higher than those of America, mostly due to China’s heavy reliance on coal; the US has seen a 2 percent decline in the reliance on coal.¶ Also, emissions have fallen in Europe by 3 percent, and in Japan by 2 percent. However, throughout much of the developing world, including India, which saw a 6 percent increase in emissions, the carbon footprint continues to rise.¶ As a result, developing nations under the Organization for Economic and Cooperation for Development (OECD) now account for a third of the global carbon footprint total.¶ China and other fast-growing economies are fearful that curbs on emissions would slow their growth and development, and have sought concessions in international climate deals. These developing nations argue that with their lower per capita emissions than the developed world, they should not be forced to adhere to the same CO2 restrictions as advanced economies are.¶ But as China is now on par with that of Europe, it will likely lose any fight it brings to the table. With emissions driven mainly by continued high economic growth and reliance on fossil fuels, China’s per capita footprint will likely sail past Europe and next approach the US. China, with coal imports surging to 10 percent, makes it the world’s largest coal importer.

**Carbon reductions trade off with economy-Chinese Ambassador agrees**

Gordon **Ettie** 4/28/**11** - President at Energy Scienomic, Inc., Executive Affliate at Hamilton Robinson LLC, Vice-President & General Manager at Hosokawa Micron International, CEO at AquaAir, Dartmouth College Alumni, University of Florida AlumniPrivate Equity participant with Hamilton Robinson LLC – Power Plug-In, <http://powerplug-in.com/does-chinas-economic-growth-mean-more-emissions/>, AP

With economic growth more energy is consumed per person. With China’s economic growth along with a very large population the trend for the future will be more energy use per person. This means that China already is and will become a very large energy user and will probably not have the pollution controls that we have established in the United States. This point was discussed in a speech by Ambassador Zhang Jun of China at Groningen University.

#### Growing economies cause major emissions-Chinese Ambassador agrees

Ambassador Zhang Jun 4/28/11 – Ambassador of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China – Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, “Keynote Speech of Ambassador Zhang Jun on the Issue of Energy at Groningen University”, <http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/wjb/zwjg/zwbd/t819382.htm>, AP

A comprehensive, objective and accurate judgment on the energy situation in China should be based on China's actual conditions, taking into account the general situation and environment the world is facing in its economic development. As a kind of important material for promoting human development, energy is closely connected with economic and social development. Accompanying its fast development, China does face growing energy challenges, among them the sharp increase of energy demand, irrational energy structure, low energy efficiency and increasing environmental pressure.¶ China has become the second largest energy producer and consumer immediately after the US and its energy demand is still going up. According to the Energy Outlook 2030 published by BP earlier this year, that in the next 20 years, energy consumption in the world will increase by 40%, the percentage of energy consumed by emerging economies will increase from the current 1/2 to 2/3 by 2030 and China's demand for energy will grow greatly.

#### Carbon reductions trade off with the economy-Worldwatch study proves

**OneWorld South Asia** **5/1**/12 – “Economic recovery brings return to growth of CO2 emissions”, <http://southasia.oneworld.net/press-release/economic-recovery-brings-return-to-growth-of-co2-emissions/>, AP

Although global emissions of CO2 declined slightly in 2009, the beginnings of economic recovery led to an unprecedented emissions increase of 5.8 per cent in 2010, highlights a new report published by Worldwatch Institute. The report also stresses upon the urgent need for cuts in global greenhouse gas emissions.¶ Washington, D.C: Although global emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) declined slightly in 2009, the beginnings of economic recovery led to an unprecedented emissions increase of 5.8 per cent in 2010. In 2011, global atmospheric levels of CO2 reached a high of 391.3 parts per million (ppm), up from 388.6 ppm in 2010 and 280 ppm in pre-industrial times. According to new research conducted by the Worldwatch Institute for its Vital Signs Online project, energy use represents the largest source of global CO2 emissions.¶ More than 70 per cent of CO2 emissions result from the burning of fossil fuels for energy use, such as electricity generation, transportation, manufacturing, and construction. In 2009, electricity generation and heating alone accounted for 41 per cent of all energy related CO2 emissions. "Unfortunately for the future of climate, the global economy remains tightly coupled to fossil fuel combustion and carbon dioxide emissions," said Worldwatch President Robert Engelman. "We gained a short respite from increases in CO2 emissions----but only at the cost of an economic downturn. Now we are rebounding economically----at the cost of once again accelerating the approach of a high-risk warming that the world's nations have so far been unable to address."¶ The report highlights emissions increases in both industrialized and developing economies. Member states of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), a group of industrialised countries, increased their emissions by 3.4 per cent in 2010, while countries outside the OECD saw an increase of 7.6 per cent.¶ Although China was the world's largest overall emitter in 2010 (followed by the United States, India, and Russia), an examination of emissions per capita tells a different story. China ranks only 61st in terms of the CO2 emitted per person. In India----the world's third largest emitter----emissions per capita rank far below the world average. The United States, in contrast, ranks second overall and 10th in per capita emissions. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has long stressed the urgent need for cuts in global greenhouse gas emissions. Unfortunately, according to the Worldwatch report, national governments have largely failed to bring about the needed reductions. ¶ ¶ "The Kyoto Protocol is an important achievement because it is the only international instrument that sets legally binding targets, yet it is increasingly becoming symbolic as it now only regulates around 15 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions," says author and Worldwatch's Climate and Energy Research Associate, Xing Fu-Bertaux. Global CO2 levels are now 45 per cent above the 1990 level, which serves as the reference base year for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Several Annex I countries----including the United States, which signed but never ratified the Kyoto Protocol----will be unable to meet their original reductions targets. Since December 2011, Canada, Japan, and Russia have chosen not to take on additional emissions targets within the second commitment period of Kyoto Protocol in the coming decade.

#### Economic growth leads to increased emissions-India proves-economic growth causes warming which, in turn, collapses the economy, causing both impacts

Ragsakthi S.S. **Sundarvel** 3/30/**04** – School of Ecology, Pondicherry University – Coal Info, “URBANIZATION AND METHANE EMISSIONS IN INDIA”, <http://www.coalinfo.net.cn/coalbed/meeting/2203/papers/economics/EC018.pdf>, AP

India is currently the sixth largest and second fastest growing greenhouse gas¶ contributor to climate change in the world. Also is the second most populous¶ country in the world. It forms a natural subcontinent with distinct climatic zones¶ covering an area of 328.7 million hectares and is inhabited by 853 million people¶ (as per the1991 census). Divided into 25 state and union territories, 80% of the¶ population still live in villages. However, with rapid industrialization, urbanization ¶ is accelerating in the four metropolitan cities of New Delhi, Calcutta, Mumbai, and¶ Chennai. The Himalayan range lies to the north and has a great bearing on the¶ climate of the country. The regions in the foothills of the Himalayas have thick¶ forests and a cold climate. On the east and west of the country lie two sections of¶ the Indian ocean, the Arabian sea and the Bay of Bengal, receiving the drainage of¶ some of the largest rivers, such as the Ganges, the Indus, and the Brahmaputra, ¶ which flow through the subcontinent. Much agricultural activity takes place on the¶ fertile alluvial soils of the Gangetic plains which extends from Punjab in the North¶ to West Bengal in the East. India’s climate ranges from temperate to tropical .¶ India is currently the sixth largest and second fastest growing GHG contributor to ¶ climate change in the world . Comparatively, the developed world is emitting 33¶ times more CO2emissions. In 1989, New Delhi hosted a conference on climate¶ change and shortly thereafter ,the Global Warming and Climate Change Institute ¶ was established through the Tattoo Energy Research Institute (TERI) to address¶ these problems in India. According to TERI, India’s carbon dioxide emissions have ¶ been increasing by 6% per year. Total emissions have increased tenfold since ¶ 1950. Emission levels follow economic growth, which has increased energy¶ consumption. Energy consumption has led to both economic development and to¶ the by-product of that development, environ-mental degradation. Industry, in turn,¶ may be vulnerable to climate change impacts . Factories along the coast are¶ vulnerable to sea-level rise and greater government limitations on GHG emissions and smog forming pollutants. In 1996, 595 Tg/yr of CO2emissions were from coal ¶ power generation alone. Power generation, as a GHG source , is the single biggest¶ source of carbon dioxide emissions in India. In 1997, total CO2emissions from¶ India contributed to 4% of the world’s carbon, or 237 million metric tons of carbon ¶ emissions .If coal continues to be used at today’s pace, emissions are projected to¶ increase to 775million metric tons per year, as compared to the billion metric tons¶ of power per year generated in the entire European Union . While per capita¶ emissions are low at .3metric tons of carbon per capita (compared to 6 metric tons¶ per capita in the U.S.) , cumulative CO2emissions are so compelling that the figure ¶ has drawn international attention. The high demand comes in large part from the¶ industrial sector rather than the residential sector. Because the industrial sector is¶ one of the largest consumers of power in India, it is clear that industry is¶ inextricably linked to rising greenhouse gas emissions levels in India .

Growth Causes Warming - Studies

#### Growth is the source of greenhouse gas emissions—scientists prove

Klimas—Liz, government contractor in DC, technology and science editor, Liz also has interned for the NOAA and the Association for Women in Science—“Study: Big Economic Downturn Needed to Slow Global Warming” TheBlaze— http://www.theblaze.com/stories/study-big-economic-downturn-needed-to-slow-global-warming/

Economic growth is most likely to blame for increases in greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere, a study by the University of Michigan says.¶ ¶ According to UPI, researchers from the university assessed the effects of several factors on year-to-year changes in CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere. The team looked at both natural (eruptions and the El Nino weather pattern) and human factors (world population and the world economy). Of these four factors affecting CO2 concentrations, the researchers found that growing global economies were the most likely source of increases in greenhouse gas.¶ ¶ For every year between 1958 and 2010 that the worldwide gross domestic product was above average, there were greater increases in CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere, the researchers said in a university release reported Tuesday, according to UPI.¶ ¶ To put an end to this, the world’s economies would need to halt economic growth, Tapia Granados, a researcher at the university’s Institute for Social Research, said, according to UPI.¶ ¶ “Since the 1980s, scientists like James Hansen have been warning us about the effects global warming will have on the Earth,” Granados added. “One solution that has promise is a carbon tax levied on any activity producing CO2 in order to create incentives to reduce emissions.”¶ ¶ But “if ‘business as usual’ conditions continue, economic contractions the size of the Great Recession or even bigger will be needed to reduce atmospheric levels of CO2,” Granados said, according to UPI.

## Environment
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#### Environment collapse causes extinction – degrowth solves

Wolff 10, Robert Wolff, American political philosopher and professor emeritus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, 8/18/10, “Is there an Alternative to Constant Economic Growth?” <http://www.opednews.com/articles/1/Is-there-an-alternative-to-by-robert-wolff-100818-489.html>

Our history is remarkably thin about how we used to live, but we know there were empires four or five thousand years ago. The latest empire, ours, seems to be trying to survive the usual few hundred years by at least a presence all over the world, guarding current and future resources we need to drive our extremely wasteful, unsustainable culture. Americans use twice as much electricity per person as, for instance, Europeans. Modern humankind uses five times what the planet can and does provide in the form of energy, food, water, breathable air. To continue our life style we would need five planets but we have only one. We badly need to ungrow, not grow. We need to live much simpler lives, smaller more efficient homes, no cars or much more efficient smaller cars. We need not only better health care, but more simple healthcare that can catch chronic diseases before they become chronic and then very expensive to treat. We need less rather than more. Somehow we must learn to adapt to what there is again. We knew how for thousands of years, now we think we must adapt the planet to our wants. Obviously a foolish impossibility. One of the peculiar aspects of American culture is our denial of other people's ways. There are quite a few countries in Europe, South America, Asia, that live very close to sustainably and yet have many of the gadgets we have, their people are happier than we are, live longer, healthier. Americans are so convinced of a sort of uniqueness that we look down on everyone who lives differently than we do. We refuse to learn from others, as we refuse to learn from our own yesterday's mistakes. And we are not aware, or don't want to acknowledge, that we have become alone in the world, waging unwinnable wars, spending half our national income (or worse, borrowed money) on wars and planning for ever more ruthless wars in the future. We the People cannot see, and are not being told, that without question we will get to a point where we either have to hugely cut our war budget and tax the rich in proportion to their wealth or cease to exist as a nation. And, of course, our economy is not the only aspect of our lives that is threatening our survival. More important perhaps is our continuing fouling of the air and water of the planet, and the plunder of our and other people's resources. In the last sixty years we have made more changes to the planet than were changed in the previous 200,000 years. Our western so-called civilization has so changed the planet that the climate is changing, and changing much more rapidly than we thought twenty years ago, more even than what scientists thought last year. A warmer world, a warmer, more acid ocean are dangers that effect all Life. Perhaps what is most dangerous is the increasing reduction of biodiversity, caused by our thoughtless destruction of rain forests, fouling rivers and the ocean, all of which threatens the planetary ecology. America now is perhaps the only country in the world where more than half of the people do not believe in global warming, climate change.

Econ=>Biodiversity Loss

#### Economic growth trades off with biodiversity

Shahid **Saleem** June **2010** – Pakistan Engineering Congress, Finance Officer for FIRMS project and Family Health International – Pakistan Engineering Congress, “BIODIVERSITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH”, <http://pecongress.org.pk/images/upload/books/Biodiversity%20and%20Economic%20Growth.pdf>, AP

Economic growth is a process whereby an economy’s real national ¶ income increases over a long period of time and if its rate of growth of national ¶ income is higher than its rate of growth of population, its per capita income also ¶ increases. In order to increase the national income the resources of the ¶ economy, that is the natural, human and the financial resources must be utilized¶ in the best possible way. However, during the process of production depletion of ¶ resources does take place. There is sufficient historical evidence to prove that ¶ economic growth results in greater levels of biodiversity loss and environmental ¶ degradation.

#### Laundry list of environmental consequences.

Geoff Riley 06, Head of Economics at Eton College, “Disadvantages of Economic Growth”- Tutor2U. September 2006; <http://tutor2u.net/economics/revision-notes/as-macro-economic-growth.html>

Environmental concerns: Growth cannot be separated from its environmental impact. Fast growth of production and consumption can create negative externalities (for example, increased noise and lower air quality arising from air pollution and road congestion, increased consumption of de-merit goods, the rapid growth of household and industrial waste and the pollution that comes from increased output in the energy sector) These externalities reduce social welfare and can lead to market failure. Growth that leads to environmental damage can have a negative effect on people’s quality of life and may also impede a country’s sustainable rate of growth. Examples include the destruction of rain forests, the over-exploitation of fish stocks and loss of natural habitat created through the construction of new roads, hotels, retail malls and industrial estates.

#### Growth destroys the environment- depletion of resources and degradation of ecosystems

Everett et al 10, Tim Everett, Mallika Ishwaran, Gian Paolo Ansaloni, Alex Rubin, “Economic Growth and the Environment”- Defra Evidence and Analysis Series Paper 2; March 2010 <http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/files/pb13390-economic-growth-100305.pdf>

While economic growth has produced many benefits – raising standards of living and improving¶ quality of life across the world – it has also resulted in the depletion of natural resources and the¶ degradation of ecosystems. There has been much debate over whether or not it is possible to¶ achieve economic growth without unsustainably degrading the environment, and a growing¶ realisation that economic growth at the current rate of depletion and degradation of environmental¶ assets cannot continue indefinitely.¶ For example, the increase in CO2¶ levels in the atmosphere as a result of human activity means that¶ the world is already locked into some climate change, and faces a major challenge to keep global¶ temperature rises to below two degrees. In the context of environmental resources more generally,¶ the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2003) found that 15 out of the 24 ecosystems services it¶ examined were being degraded or used unsustainably, and the use and consumption of natural¶ resources such as minerals and metals continues at an increasing pace.¶ Some take the view that the finite resources of the Earth place limits on the extent to which¶ economies can keep expanding in the long-term10¶ . Others believe that using environmental resources¶ sustainably is consistent with continued economic growth, with the costs of inaction likely to be far¶ greater than the cost of acting now.

Collapse Solves

#### De-growth key to saving ecosystems

Weyler 11, Rex Weyler, director of Greenpeace foundation, 7/5/11, “Why De-Growth? An interview,” <http://www.countercurrents.org/weyler050711.htm>

If our social, political, and economic planners actually understood ecosystems, we might avoid a lot of problems we face. But degrowth is not just a rallying cry or a trivial idea. Degrowth is an important, natural concept that our society needs to understand, whether we call it Degrowth, Limits to Growth, Costs of Complexity, Overshoot, Carrying Capacity, Metabolic Costs, Diminishing Returns on Innovation, Entropic Limits, “The Meek Shall inherit the Earth,” or “Richer lives, simpler means” as Arne Naess said. The problem for our society is not that these ideas are too complex or wrong, but that they are annoying and inconvenient for the wealthy and powerful. Everyone wants more. Millionaires want to be a billionaires. The more that individuals grab and horde, the less there is for everyone. On the other hand, as we learn to share and live modestly, our ecosystems can recover and provide us with nature’s bounty. The best way for poor nations to avoid deeper poverty is to protect their ecosystems from plunder. The Degrowth movement advocates richer, more rewarding lives with less material stuff. Our economic efforts should focus on providing basic needs to everyone in the human family, rather than enriching a few, while others starve. Beyond basic necessities, happiness does not come from consuming more stuff. Happiness comes from friends, family, community, creativity, leisure, love, companionship, and time spent in nature. These things can grow without much material throughput. These are the qualities of life we should be helping to grow. This may be the most important public dialogue of this century. And we better get this right, because humanity may not get many more chances.

#### The US must de-develop—key to environment

Neefus 9 Christopher Neefus, Professor of plant biology at University of New Hampshire, writer for cns news, 7/28/09, “White House Science Adviser Advocated 'De-Development' of the United States,” <http://cnsnews.com/news/article/white-house-science-adviser-advocated-de-development-united-states>

President Obama’s top science adviser, John P. Holdren, advocated the "de-development" of the United States in books he published in the 1970s."A massive campaign must be launched to restore a high-quality environment in North America and to de-develop the United States," Holdren wrote in a 1973 book he co-authored with Paul R. Ehrlch and Anne H. Ehrlich. "De-development means bringing our economic system (especially patterns of consumption) into line with the realities of ecology and the global resource situation." In the vision expressed by Holdren and his co-authors, the Ehrlichs, the need for "de-development" of the United States demanded a redistribtuion of wealth. "The need for de-development presents our economists with a major challenge," they wrote. "They must design a stable, low-consumption economy in which there is a much more equitable distribution of wealth than in the present one. Redistribution of wealth both within and among nations is absolutely essential, if a decent life is to be provided to every human being." Holdren, who is director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, made these comments in the 1973 book "Human Ecology," which he co-authored with the Ehrlichs, long-time advocates of curtailing population growth. Over the years, Holdren has co-authored or co-edited a number of books and articles with Paul Ehrlich. In the 1977 science textbook, "Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment," which Holdren also co-authored with the Ehrlichs, the authors again presented their idea for "de-development." The 1973 book, "Human Ecology," argued that humanity would face environmental calamity if population growth was not curbed. The authors' call "to de-develop the United States" came in the book's final chapter, under the heading, "Synthesis and Recommendations." In "Ecoscience," which was used as a college textbook, Holdren and his coauthors expanded on the notion of de-development. The book contains lengthy chapters on natural processes like nutrient cycles and energy consumption as well as information on global demographics and the nature and history of world hunger. There are also chapters detailing potential ways to remedy what the authors perceived as the problem of overpopulation, including restructuring American and international institutions. In a chapter entitled “Rich Nations, Poor Nations, and International Conflict,” Holdren and the Ehrlichs wrote: “The most critical change of all must be a change in goals; all people, rich and poor alike, must come to recognize that being a citizen of a giant, smoggy, freeway-strangled industrial state is not necessary to being a happy, healthy, fulfilled human being.” According to the authors, developed countries should not “train their own people to think of the power lawn mower and automatic icemaker as the finest achievements of humanity.” “It is therefore apparent,” they said, “that one key to saving world society lies in a measured and orderly retreat from overdevelopment in today’s ODCs (overdeveloped countries)--a process we will label, for want of a better word, de-development.”

AT Tech Solves

#### Tech optimism fails and media biased - DeDev only solution to save biodiversity

Ted Trainer - Dr.Ted Trainer is a Conjoint Lecturer in the School of Social Sciences, University of New South Wales and a contributing author at the Simplicity Institute. He has taught and written about sustainability and justice issues for many years. He is also developing Pigface Point, an alternative lifestyle educational site near Sydney, and a website for use by critical global educators: <http://socialsciences.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/-> 2012, “Simplicity Institute Report”, pg 4-5, http://simplicityinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/LimitsOfTechnologyTrainer.pdf

It should not be assumed that in general rapid, large or continuous technical gains are being routinely made, especially in crucial areas such as energy efficiency. Mackay (2008) argues that little gain can be expected for air transport, and Ayres notes that for many decades there have been plateaus for the efficiency of production of electricity and fuels, electric motors, ammonia and iron and steel production. The efficiency of electrical devices in general has actually changed little in a century (Ayres, 2009, Figs. 4.1and4.19, p. 127),‘…the energy efficiency of transportation probably peaked around 1960 (p. 126).’Ayres’ Fig. 4.21a shows no increase in the overall energy efficiency of The US economy since 1960 (p. 128). He notes that reports tend to publicize particular spectacular technical advances and this can be misleading regarding long term average trends across whole industries or economies. We tend not to hear about areas where technology is not solving problems, or appears to have been completely defeated. Not long ago everyone looked forward to super T sonic mass passenger flight, but with the

Demise of Concorde this goal has been abandoned. It’s just too difficult and costly, even without an energy crunch coming up. Sydney’s transport problems cannot be solved by more public transport; more rail and bus would improve things, but not much because the city has been built for the car on 50 years of cheap oil. Yes you could solve all its problems with buses and trains, but only at an infinite cost. The Murray T Darling river can only be saved by drastic reduction in the amount of water being taken out of it. The biodiversity holocaust taking place could only be avoided if humans stopped taking more and more of nature, and returned large areas of farmland and pasture to natural habitat.
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#### High levels of growth causes a decrease in democracy

Gang Guo 05, University of Rochester Political Science Professor , “Democracy or Non-Democracy- From the Perspective of Economic Development”; http://home.olemiss.edu/~gg/paperhtm/dmcrecnm.htm

Some authors hold that democracy and economic development have a reciprocal effect on each other. A classical example is Friedman, Justin's favorite. Friedman believes that more democratic political rights will reinforce economic rights and therefore will be beneficial to economic development; on the other hand, the assurance of the individual's economic freedom results in, and is predicted upon, the maintenance of a free-enterprise exchange economy that constitutes an ideal economic arrangement for a free society (Friedman 1962). Although he also stressed that some activities of the democratic government, such as income redistribution, would tend to retard economic development, these activities are not peculiar to democracies. In Friedman's opinion, what retards economic development is not democracy, but governmental interference. (I owe this point to Justin Fox).¶ Some scholars view the favorable effects between democracy and economic development as single-directional; that is, economic development leads to democracy, but democracy retards economic development. Therefore democracy would be directly related with economic level, but inversely related with economic growth, since wealthy countries might have reached high economic level for other reasons, but would slow down after democracy is established, while for poor countries economic development has not create a favorable environment for democracy but thus they would also enjoy economic growth not retarded by democracy. Almost all the advanced economies of the world, including the United States, Japan, Germany, Great Britain, Russia, etc., and also almost all the emerging economies in contemporary world, made their initial take-off and fastest growth under non-democracy, or at least not under the kind of democracy we have in mind today. This view can be stretched as far as stating that "dictatorships are needed to generate development" (Przeworski and Limongi 1997:177).¶ The third hypothesis is quite close to the second one, but in this hypothesis economic level is controlled for and the relationship between democracy and economic growth is non-linear, or curvilinear. That is, at lower stages of economic level, democracy would be unfavorable to economic development, while at the higher level, democracy would do a better job than non-democracy in encouraging economic development. Another way to put this curvilinear relationship is to control for level of democracy. As Barro concluded, "the middle level of democracy is most favorable to growth, the lowest level comes second, and the highest level comes third"(Barro 1996:14).

#### Extinction

Diamond 95 (Larry, Senior Fellow – Hoover Institution, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, December, http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm)

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

Growth =/> Democracy

#### Growth does not lead to Democracy- China and Russia Prove

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and George W. Downs 05, Chair of Department of Politics at NYU and Hoover Institution; Professor of Politics and Social Sciences at NYU, “Development and Democracy: Richer but not freer”- Foreign Affairs http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61023/bruce-bueno-de-mesquita-and-george-w-downs/development-and-democracy

RICHER BUT NOT FREER¶ Ever since Deng Xiaoping opened up China's economy more than 25 years ago, inaugurating an era of blistering growth, many in the West have assumed that political reform would follow. Economic liberalization, it was predicted, would lead to political liberalization and, eventually, democracy.¶ This prediction was not specific to China. Until quite recently, conventional wisdom has held that economic development, wherever it occurs, will lead inevitably -- and fairly quickly -- to democracy. The argument, in its simplest form, runs like this: economic growth produces an educated and entrepreneurial middle class that, sooner or later, begins to demand control over its own fate. Eventually, even repressive governments are forced to give in.¶ The fact that almost all of the richest countries in the world are democratic was long taken as iron-clad evidence of this progression. Recent history, however, has complicated matters. As events now suggest, the link between economic development and what is generally called liberal democracy is actually quite weak and may even be getting weaker. Although it remains true that among already established democracies, a high per capita income contributes to stability, the growing number of affluent authoritarian states suggests that greater wealth alone does not automatically lead to greater political freedom. Authoritarian regimes around the world are showing that they can reap the benefits of economic development while evading any pressure to relax their political control. Nowhere is this phenomenon more evident than in China and Russia. Although China's economy has grown explosively over the last 25 years, its politics have remained essentially stagnant. In Russia, meanwhile, the economy has recently improved even as the Kremlin has tightened the political reins.

## Resource Wars
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#### Growth makes Resource Wars Inevitable

Richard Heinberg 11, Senior Fellow-in-Residence at Post Carbon Institute, “The Shrinking Pie: Post-Growth Geopolitics”; June 17, 2011 http://www.countercurrents.org/heinberg170611.htm

As nations compete for currency advantages, they are also eyeing the world’s diminishing resources—fossil fuels, minerals, agricultural land, and water. Resource wars have been fought since the dawn of history, but today the competition is entering a new phase. Nations need increasing amounts of energy and materials to produce economic growth, but—as we have seen—the costs of supplying new increments of energy and materials are increasing. In many cases all that remains are lower-quality resources that have high extraction costs. In some instances, securing access to these resources requires military expenditures as well. Meanwhile the struggle for the control of resources is re-aligning political power balances throughout the world. The U.S., as the world’s superpower, has the most to lose from a reshuffling of alliances and resource flows. The nation’s leaders continue to play the game of geopolitics by 20th century rules: They are still obsessed with the Carter Doctrine and focused on petroleum as the world’s foremost resource prize (a situation largely necessitated by the country’s continuing overwhelming dependence on oil imports, due in turn to a series of short-sighted political decisions stretching back at least to the 1970s). The ongoing war in Afghanistan exemplifies U.S. inertia: Most experts agree that there is little to be gained from the conflict, but withdrawal of forces is politically unfeasible. The United States maintains a globe-spanning network of over 800 military bases that formerly represented tokens of security to regimes throughout the world—but that now increasingly only provoke resentment among the locals. This enormous military machine requires a vast supply system originating with American weapons manufacturers that in turn depend on a prodigious and ever-expanding torrent of funds from the Treasury. Indeed, the nation’s budget deficit largely stems from its trillion-dollar-per-year, first-priority commitment to continue growing its military-industrial complex. Yet despite the country’s gargantuan expenditures on high-tech weaponry, its armed forces appear to be stretched to their limits, fielding around 200,000 troops and even larger numbers of support personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan, where supply chains are both vulnerable and expensive to maintain. In short, the United States remains an enormously powerful nation militarily, with thousands of nuclear weapons in addition to its unparalleled conventional forces, yet it suffers from declining strategic flexibility. The European Union, traditionally allied with the U.S., is increasingly mapping its priorities independently—partly because of increased energy dependence on Russia, and partly because of economic rivalries and currency conflicts with America. Germany’s economy is one of the few to have emerged from the 2008 crisis relatively unscathed, but the country is faced with the problem of having to bail out more and more of its neighbors. The ongoing European serial sovereign debt crisis could eventually undermine the German economy and throw into doubt the long-term soundness of the euro and the E.U. itself.[1] The U.K. is a mere shadow of its former imperial self, with unsustainable levels of debt, declining military budgets, and falling oil production. Its foreign policy is still largely dictated in Washington, though many Britons are increasingly unhappy with this state of affairs. China is the rising power of the 21st century, according to many geopolitical pundits, with a surging military and lots of cash with which to buy access to resources (oil, coal, minerals, and farmland) around the planet. Yet while it is building an imperial-class navy that could eventually threaten America’s, Beijing suffers (as we have already seen) from domestic political and economic weaknesses that could make its turn at the center of the world stage a brief one. Japan, with the world’s third-largest national economy, is wary of China and increasingly uncertain of its protector, the U.S. The country is tentatively rebuilding its military so as to be able to defend its interests independently. Disputes with China over oil and gas deposits in the East China Sea are likely to worsen, as Japan has almost no domestic fossil fuel resources and needs secure access to supplies. Russia is a resource powerhouse but is also politically corrupt and remains economically crippled. With a residual military force at the ready, it vies with China and the U.S. for control of Caspian and Central Asian energy and mineral wealth through alliances with former Soviet states. It tends to strike tentative deals with China to counter American interests, but ultimately Beijing may be as much of a rival as Washington. Moscow uses its gas exports as a bargaining chip for influence in Europe. Meanwhile, little of the income from the country’s resource riches benefits the populace. The Russian people’s advantage in all this may be that they have recently been through one political-economic collapse and will therefore be relatively well-prepared to navigate another. Even as countries like Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua reject American foreign policy, the U.S. continues to exert enormous influence on resource-rich Latin America via North American-based corporations, which in some cases wield overwhelming influence over entire national economies. However, China is now actively contracting for access to energy and mineral resources throughout this region, which is resulting in a gradual shift in economic spheres of interest. Africa is a site of fast-growing U.S. investment in oil and other mineral extraction projects (as evidenced by the establishment in 2009 of Africom, a military strategic command center on par with Centcom, Eucom, Northcom, Pacom, and Southcom), but is also a target of Chinese and European resource acquisition efforts. Proxy conflicts there between and among these powers may intensify in the years ahead—in most instances, to the sad detriment of African peoples.[2] The Middle East maintains vast oil wealth (though reserves have been substantially overestimated due to rivalries inside OPEC), but is characterized by extreme economic inequality, high population growth rates, political instability, and the need for importation of non-energy resources (including food and water). The revolutions and protests in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Bahrain, and Yemen in early 2011 were interpreted by many observers as indicating the inability of the common people in Middle Eastern regimes to tolerate sharply rising food, water, and energy prices in the context of autocratic political regimes.[3]As economic conditions worsen, many more nations—including ones outside the Middle East—could become destabilized; the ultimate consequences are unknowable at this point, but could well be enormous. Like China, Saudi Arabia is buying farmland in Australia, New Zealand, and the U.S. Nations like Iraq and Iran need advanced technology with which to maintain an oil industry that is moving from easy plays to oilfields that are smaller, harder to access, and more expensive to produce, and both Chinese and U.S. companies stand ready to supply it. The deep oceans and the Arctic will be areas of growing resource interest, as long as the world’s wealthier nations are still capable of mounting increasingly expensive efforts to compete for and extract strategic materials in these extreme environments.[4] However, both military maneuvering and engineering-mining efforts will see diminishing returns as costs rise and payoffs diminish. Unfortunately, rising costs and flagging returns from resource conflicts will not guarantee world peace. History suggests that as nations become more desperate to maintain their relative positions of strength and advantage, they may lash out in ways that serve no rational purpose. Again, no crisis is imminent as long as cool heads prevail. But the world system is losing stability. Current economic and geopolitical conditions would appear to support a forecast not for increasing economic growth, democracy, and peace, but for more political volatility, and for greater government military mobilization justified under the banner of security.

#### Resource wars cause nuclear war and extinction

Woolridge 9 (Frosty, Former Officer – US Army Medical Service Corps, “America Galloping Toward Its Greatest Crisis in the 21st Century”, The Examiner, 5-22, http://www.examiner.com/examiner/x-3515-Denver-Political-Issues-Examiner~y2009m5d22-America-galloping-toward-its-greatest-crisis-in-the-21st-century)

“It is clear that most politicians and most citizens do not recognize that returning to “more of the same” is a recipe for promoting the first collapse of a global civilization. The required changes in energy technology, which would benefit not only the environment but also national security, public health, and the economy, would demand a World War II type mobilization -- and even that might not prevent a global climate disaster. Without transitioning away from use of fossil fuels, humanity will move further into an era of resource wars (remember, Africom has been added to the Pentagon’s structure -- and China has noticed), clearly with intent to protect US “interests” in petroleum reserves. The consequences of more resource wars, many likely triggered over water supplies stressed by climate disruption, are likely to include increased unrest in poor nations, a proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, widening inequity within and between nations, and in the worst (and not unlikely) case, a nuclear war ending civilization.

## Generic War

### Growth => War

Growth Causes Nationalism and War

Charles R. Boehmer. Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Texas at El Paso.2007. [“The Effects of Economic Crisis, Domestic Discord, and State Efficacy on the Decision to Initiate Interstate Conflict". Politics and Policy 35.4 774 -809.http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=charles\_boehmer

All leaders depend on a constituency of some sort (Bueno de¶ Mesquita et al. 1999) and always face potential opposition to their¶ policies (Hagan 1994; Heldt 1999; Miller 1995, 1999; Richards et al.¶ 1993). In democratic systems, opposition parties may seek to exploit¶ foreign policies that they will argue are not in the best interest of the¶ nation, resulting in higher constraints on such executives relative to¶ their authoritarian counterparts. However, during times of economic¶ prosperity, society is less likely to be influenced by the rhetoric of parties¶ and factions that stand in opposition to the leader. Assuming that¶ popularity ratings are higher than would be the case during economic¶ recession or depression, leaders should be more apt to initiate or join¶ foreign military actions. Economic growth should reduce societal¶ resistance to conflict. This may seem like a counterintuitive proposition¶ that people who are relatively better off and happy during periods of¶ prosperity would allow leaders to opt for foreign conflicts. However,¶ people may become more nationalistic during times of prosperity and¶ more optimistic that success could be achieved in foreign conflicts.¶ Accordingly, Blainey (1988) claims that anything that increases¶ optimism and state strength should be thought of as causes of war. It is¶ plausible that this effect heightens the risk of interstate conflict by¶ reducing constraints placed on executives. For example, would the¶ Clinton Administration have been able to commit U.S. troops to¶ conflicts in Bosnia and Kosovo—areas where U.S. interests were¶ debatable—without stauncher Republican resistance in Congress, if the¶ economy had not experienced prolonged prosperity and economic¶ growth?

### AT Diversionary Theory

Diversionary theory wrong – growth causes more war

O’neal & Tir 2006. John R. Oneal is Associate Professor and Director of International Studies at the University of Alabama. Jaroslav Tir is Assistant Professor in Political Science at the University of Georgia. [“Does the Diversionary Use of Force Threaten the Democratic Peace? Assessing the Effect of Economic Growth on Interstate Conflict” 1921–2001 International Studies Quarterly Volume 50, Issue 4, Pages 755-779 Wiley interscience]<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2006.00424.x/full>

Our analyses of five prominent, powerful democracies raise further doubts about the substantive importance of diversionary uses of force. Military action for political reasons is most feasible for the leaders of powerful democracies. Most previous research has focused on the United States, at least in part, for this reason, but the United States has been significantly more likely to initiate conflict when its economy was strong, not weak. The evidence regarding Britain is inconclusive, while India and France have also exhibited behavior inconsistent with theoretical expectations. Only Israeli leaders seem to have been susceptible to diversionary pressures (Barzilai and Russett 1990; Spracher and DeRouen 2002). Thus, there is little evidence in this important subset of cases that military force is used to divert attention away from a poor economy.

# Defense

### Decline =/> War

**Economic collapse doesn’t cause instability**

Fareed **Zakaria** was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability,” http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html

Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.

**93 crises prove no war**

Miller ‘00 (Morris, Economist, Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Administration – University of Ottawa, Former Executive Director and Senior Economist – World Bank, “Poverty as a Cause of Wars?”, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Winter, p. 273)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that  
exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

**No impact- econ decline doesn’t cause war**

Barnett ‘9 (Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis,” 8/25/2009)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security landscape. None of the more than three-dozen ongoing conflicts listed by GlobalSecurity.org can be clearly attributed to the global recession. Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: \* No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); \* The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); \* Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); \* No great improvement or disruption in great-power cooperation regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); \* A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and \* No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that's likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the friendly cooperation on such stimulus packaging was the most notable great-power dynamic caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major economies remain governed by center-left or center-right political factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed. Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order.

### AT History Proves

Economic collapse does not cause war—their historical arguments are wrong

FERGUSON 2006 (Niall, MA, D.Phil., is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University. He is a resident faculty member of the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies. He is also a Senior Reseach Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Senior Fellow of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

### Econ Resil

#### The economy is resilient

Washington Times 2008 - chief political correspondent of The Washington Times (7/28/08, Donald Lambro, The Washington Times, "Always darkest before dawn", lexis, WEA)

The doom-and-gloomers are still with us, of course, and they will go to their graves forecasting that life as we know it is coming to an end and that we are in for years of economic depression and recession. Last week, the New York Times ran a Page One story maintaining that Americans were saving less than ever, and that their debt burden had risen by an average of $117,951 per household. And the London Telegraph says there are even harder times ahead, comparing today's economy to the Great Depression of the 1930s. Wall Street economist David Malpass thinks that kind of fearmongering is filled with manipulated statistics that ignore long-term wealth creation in our country, as well as globally. Increasingly, people are investing "for the long run - for capital gains (not counted in savings) rather than current income - in preparation for retirement," he told his clients last week. Instead of a coming recession, "we think the U.S. is in gradual recovery after a sharp two-quarter slowdown, with consumer resilience more likely than the decades-old expectation of a consumer slump," Mr. Malpass said. "Fed data shows clearly that household savings of all types - liquid, financial and tangible - are still close to the record levels set in September. IMF data shows U.S. households holding more net financial savings than the rest of the world combined. Consumption has repeatedly outperformed expectations in recent quarters and year," he said. The American economy has been pounded by a lot of factors, including the housing collapse (a needed correction to bring home prices down to earth), the mortgage scandal and the meteoric rise in oil and gas prices. But this $14 trillion economy, though slowing down, continues to grow by about 1 percent on an annualized basis, confounding the pessimists who said we were plunging into a recession, defined by negative growth over two quarters. That has not happened - yet. Call me a cockeyed optimist, but I do not think we are heading into a recession. On the contrary, I'm more bullish than ever on our economy's long-term prospects.

### Decline => Cooperation

#### Global economic decline fosters international cooperation, not conflict.

Taylor, Fravel.M. Taylor Fravel is the Cecil and Ida Green Career Development Associate Professor of Political Science and member of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.2010. [“The Limits of Diversion: Rethinking Internal and External Conflict”. Security Studies. Volume 19, Issue 2 pages 307 – 341] [www.informaworld.com/.../ftinterface~content=a922422929~f](http://www.informaworld.com/.../ftinterface~content=a922422929~f)

The research inspiring the diversionary hypothesis is social-psychological, widely known¶ as the conflict-cohesion or ingroup/outgroup logic developed by Georg Simmel and Lewis¶ Coser.13 Within international relations, the diversionary hypothesis asserts that leaders recognize¶ that external conflict can increase societal cohesion and will pursue conflict abroad when¶ domestic political survival is at risk. Based on the conflict-cohesion logic, the first mechanism by¶ which leaders divert is to persuade the public to “rally around the flag,” setting aside parochial¶ interests to unite for the greater good of the nation.14 The rally effect is sometimes described as¶ scapegoating, where leaders justify a belligerent foreign policy by blaming internal difficulties¶ on foreign enemies.15 In either case, leaders initiate or use force in response to domestic threats¶ to deflect attention away from themselves and onto an external adversary, thereby using¶ symbolic politics to increase national unity and enhance their domestic political support.¶ Historical collapse of ancient states poses intriguing social-ecological questions, as well as potential applications to global change and¶ contemporary strategies for sustainability. Five Old World case studies are developed to identify interactive inputs, triggers, and feedbacks¶ in devolution. Collapse is multicausal and rarely abrupt. Political simplification undermines traditional structures of authority to favor¶ militarization, whereas disintegration is preconditioned or triggered by acute stress (insecurity, environmental or economic crises,¶ famine), with breakdown accompanied or followed by demographic decline. Undue attention to stressors risks underestimating the¶ intricate interplay of environmental, political, and sociocultural resilience in limiting the damages of collapse or in facilitating reconstruction.¶ The conceptual model emphasizes resilience, as well as the historical roles of leaders, elites, and ideology. However, a historical model¶ cannot simply be applied to contemporary problems of sustainability without adjustment for cumulative information and increasing¶ possibilities for popular participation. Between the 14th and 18th centuries, Western Europe responded to environmental crises by innovation¶ and intensification; such modernization was decentralized, protracted, flexible, and broadly based. Much of the current alarmist¶ literature that claims to draw from historical experience is poorly focused, simplistic, and unhelpful. It fails to appreciate that resilience and¶ readaptation depend on identified options, improved understanding, cultural solidarity, enlightened leadership, and opportunities¶ for participation and fresh ideas.¶ Duration of the processes¶ favoring decline or recovery helps to¶ identify the processes of devolution as well¶ as the elasticity of resilience. Drawing from¶ the experience of the historical case¶ studies, Fig. 1 suggests that a preconditioning¶ economic decline typically¶ spans decades or centuries. Contrary to¶ frequent claims of “abrupt” collapse, the¶ triggers that bring economic crisis are¶ more likely to operate at a multidecadal¶ scale. The first stage of stabilization or¶ instability may also be fairly rapid, whereas¶ a more complex reconstitution or complete¶ breakdown is likely to span a century¶ or more. Time frames would also be affected¶ by the absence of rapid or sustained¶ means of communication in earlier historical¶ eras.