### Neg Studies flawed

#### Studies that indict growth are flawed

**Friedman 06** (Benjamin Morton Friedman, a leading American political economist, is the William Joseph Maier Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University. “THE MORAL CONSEQUENCES OF ECONOMIC GROWTH” <http://www.springerlink.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/content/3q5kabxbuw28yql8/fulltext.pdf>(Pitman)

The root of the problem, 1 believe, is that our conventional thinking about economic growth fails to reflect the breadth of what growth, or its absence, means for a society. We recognize, of course, the advantages of a higher material standard of living, and we appreciate them. But moral thinking, in practically every known culture, enjoins us not to place undue emphasis on our material concerns. We are also increasingly aware that economic development--industrialization in particular, and more recently globalization---~ften brings undesirable side effects, like damage to the environment or the homogenization of what used to be distinctive cultures, and we have come to regard these matters, too, in moral terms. On both counts, we theretbre think of economic growth in terms of material considerations versus moral ones: Do we have the right to burden future generations, or even other species, tor our own material advantage? Will the emphasis we place on growth, or the actions we take to achieve it, compromise our moral integrity? We weigh material positives against moral negatives. I believe this thinking is seriously, in some circumstances dangerously, incomplete. The value of a rising standard of living lies not just in the concrete improvements it brings to how individuals live but in how it shapes the social, political and, ultimately, the moral character of a people. Economic growth--meaning a rising standard of living for the clear majority of citizens--more often than not fosters greater opportunity, tolerance of diversity, social mobility, commitment to fairness, and dedication to democracy. Ever since the Enlightenment, Western thinking has regarded each of these tendencies positively, and in explicitly moral terms.Even societies that have already made great advances in these very dimensions, for example, most of today's Western democracies, are more likely to make still further progress when their living standards rise. But when living standards stagnate or decline, most societies make little if any progress toward any of these goals, and in all too rnany instances they plainly retrogress. Many countries with highly developed economies, including the United States, have experienced alternating eras ofeconomic growth and stagnation in which their democratic values have strengthened or weakened accordingly. How the citizens of any country think about economic growth, and what actions they take in consequence, are therefore a matter of far broader importance than we conventionally assume. In many countries today, even the most basic qualities of any society-democracy or dictatorship, tolerance or ethnic hatred and violence, widespread opportunity or economic oligarchyremain in flux. In some countries where there is now a democracy, it is still new and therefore fragile. Because of the link between rising or falling living standards and just these aspects of social and political development, the absence of growth in so many of what we usually call "developing economies," even though many of them are not actually developing, threatens their prospects in ways that standard measures of national income do not even suggest. The same concern applies, albeit in a more subtle way, to mature democracies as well.

### Growth Solves Enviro

#### Growth that promotes the environment is a sustainable form

**Hindmarch, Harris, Cranfield** (Colin Hindmarch, Jim Harris and Joe Morris Cranfield University, UK “Growth and sustainability: integrating ecosystem services into economic

s” Volume 53 Number 3, June 2006 http://www.globalrestorationnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2007/01/growth-and-sustainability.pdf(Pitman)

It is increasingly understood that there may be limits to certain kinds of human economic development (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005). There are also worries that our environmental impacts may be exceeding critical thresholds, producing effects that portend rapid, unpredictable, and from a human standpoint, adverse change. Growing interest in applying the principles of sustainable development reflects this position. Although there are numerous definitions of sustainable development, it is generally taken to mean development that “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Brundtland, 1987). Like many broad definitions, this needs further clarification (sensu Spedding, 2005). In the context of this paper, sustainable development refers to the kind of human activity that maintains, or even augments, renewable resources rather than undermining their long-term productivity. Many traditional extensive farming systems conform to this model: although these continually adapt to change, they embrace a range of economic and environmental controls that limit adverse effects. Given these well-tried examples of sustainable management, it might seem reckless for large scale economic programmes to ignore the value of underpinning resources: just as it would be for farm management plansto neglect soil condition. Nonetheless, this is precisely what has been happening. Ecosystem services (Table 1) are fundamental to human life, but despite the growing enthusiasm for sustainable development they are rarely factored into development plans – indicating that these are flawed and incapable of meeting current environmental objectives or delivering sustainable outcomes.

**Econ Growth leads to innovation in the future that turns back all their arguments**

**Munier 05** (NOLBERTO MUNIER TEAMIC Internacional Canada-Spain “ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: COULD MULTICRITERIA ANALYSIS BE USED TO SOLVE THIS DICHOTOMY?” (Received 20 August 2004; Accepted 5 June 2005)http://www.springerlink.com/content/x1642757x4445651/fulltext.pdf (Pitman)

Economic growth and sustainable development are seen by many as two concepts that cannot take place at the same time. As in a coin, where it is either head or tails, they consider that both concepts cannot coexist and therefore, economic growth cannot be achieved without deterioration of the environment, and also many argue that the expression ‘‘sustainable development’’ involves opposite terms such as fire and water, or that it constitutes a metaphorical expression where antonyms terms are combined, as in ‘‘the sound of silence’’. If this is true, then, in the future, humankind can have a great economic growth but the environment as it is known now, will have changed for worse. The author does not think that this bleak scenario is realistic, and he cannot help but remember that something similar occurred in the XVIII century when the economist Thomas Malthus (1766–1834), developed his theory of Natural Selection, and predicted the end of the world because arable land was not keeping pace with population growth. Of course, at that time he could not have envisioned artificial irrigation, the use of fertilizers and advanced mechanical devices for farming.Some scholars believe that economic growth should take preference, while other see that sustainability must be a limiting factor for the economic growth, and one to which growth has to adhere. It is not known which if these criteria are right, and there is also a third line of thought that states than economic growth and sustainable development can co-exist. There are also two different approaches to this problem considering who is analyzing it. Environmental economists want to put a price (with market intervention and without it) to the environment, since they think it should be treated as a commodity, and also deem that some part of the natural world can be substituted by manmade options. This last statement has to be taken with caution since many ‘‘services’’ provided by the environment cannot be replicated by men, such as a beautiful sight, or the majesty of a snowed mountain, at least with today technologies. Environmentalists abhor the thought of treating the environment as a commodity (Bartelmus, 1999), and as a consequence they maintain that there is no price for the environment, being irrelevant if there is or not a market for it. It is argued that the environment has an ecological component and a social property that cannot be valued. In order to sustain their point of view they have developed indicators and concepts linked with the sustainability of the environment, such as for instance, its carrying capacity, that is the limit or threshold of stress in the environment that can still support population and ecosystems in a sustainable manner. It is obvious that any project, whatever its nature, is going to change the environment and perhaps its ecology. Consider for instance the state of the environment in the XVIII century – of course cities were dirty and unhealthy – but the air was clean, the water streams crystalline, the land uncontaminated and the sea completely unpolluted. People lived simpler and mostly in rural areas. Since the industrial revolution and when projects materialized in factories, steel works, railways, automobiles and chemical products, humankind has managed very efficiently in contaminating the air, the land and the water, in destroying forests, and even were careless enough as to change the world climate, so there is not doubt that economic growth brought a degradation to the environment, and which consequences are now humankind paying (the ozone hole, the melting of glaciers, etc.) Fortunately, and in many cases, economic growth really worked for the population well-being and was the engine of large benefits such as cheaper transportation, better education, improved standard of living, better housing, an impressive enhancement in public health, and the disappearance of child labor, just to mention a few. However, it also created a consumer market for a myriad of unnecessary things and triggered some very detrimental practices such as the indiscriminate use of fossil fuels, the excessive water consumption, and the burning of forests. These are just some examples confirming the complete lack of concern for the environment. If the condition of the environment about the first half of the XX century is considered, progress was synonymous with smokestacks belching dark fumes, with very busy and very dirty harbors, with rivers contaminated with sewage, with chloride compounds being daily spewed by the tons into the atmosphere, and with the sea being used as a dump site for domestic garbage.It appears that things have fortunately improved (or starting to improve), materialized in sound environmental polices and regulations such as treating waste, establishing a limit for air pollution produced by cars, the enforcement of recycling policies, improvement in energy efficiency, etc. Therefore, from this point of view, growth also brought positive changes in the environment, when related with the immediate past. As a matter a fact there is a curve, called the ‘‘Kuznet’s curve’’ which depicts environmental degradation in the vertical axis and economic growth, or may be its equivalent, income per capita, in the horizontal one. This curve has approximately the form on an inverted ‘‘U’’, which means that with increasing growth there is an escalation in the environmental degradation, which reaches a top limit and then begins to descend, suggesting that after a certain limit, increasing economic growth corresponds to a diminishing environmental degradation. There have been different explanations of why this could happen; especially considering that it appears that there is some empirical evidence supporting this curve, although some researches believe that there was not a decreasing in environment deterioration but a wrong interpretation of results. This apparent improvement in environment issues in relationship with economic growth can be somehow understood when one thinks that advanced nations, with a higher standard of living, also have more stringent environmental laws and because they have the economic means to do that (California and its laws about car emissions is an example), they exact very hefty penalties for contaminating water sources, or have very tough regulations regarding the execution of new projects. Besides, these countries, adducing economic reasons, are closing their manufacturing plants and establishing new ones in other regions, which is the case of Mexico, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, etc. So in reality they are exporting their contamination to other areas and thus not affecting their own territory, which without doubt improves their environment.

#### Growth does not harm the environment or endanger the economy

**Gage12** (Prepared by Alea Gage and Anthony LoPresti with Cecilia Estolano, Karen Chapple and Michelle Wilde Anderson, Berkely Law, University of California “The Sustainable Cities Conference Series: Urban Housing, Economy Transit. Sustainable Economic Development Policy Overview”. <http://iurd.berkeley.edu/publications/policyoverviews/IURD-PO-01-2012.pdf>)(Pitman)

On November 18, 2011, stakeholders in economic development from think tanks, government agencies, law firms, trade associations and universities around the state convened in a roundtable to discuss the topic of sustainable economic development in California. In order to start the conversation, participants identified a working definition. As put forth by UC Berkeley Emeritus Professor Michael Teitz, and modified in subsequent discussion, it read: Sustainable economic development enhances equitable local income and employment growth without endangering local fiscal stability, degrading the natural environment, or contributing to global climate change. It challenges the model of growth based on pure consumption rather than human happiness, takes into account long-term goals as well as short-term needs and is sensitive to local context and history.

### Growth K2 VTL

#### Economic growth is key to value to life studies prove

**Wilkinson 06** (a research fellow at the Cato Institute where he worked on a variety of issues including Social Security reform and, most notably, the policy implications of happiness research “Growth Is Good” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/growth-is-good>(Pitman)

However, Cameron's contrast implies that increased GWB might have to come at the expense of GDP growth and economic liberalisation. Yet if you really profess to care about happiness, you must care about economic freedom and economic growth too. Our happiness depends on them more than almost anything else. So-called "happiness research" is conducted mostly with surveys that simply ask people how happy they are, and those answers are related to others about income, family situation, jobs and more. The most widely reported result is this: although average real income has more than doubled in developed countries since mid-century, average self-reported happiness has barely budged. Yet despite the flat happiness trend over decades, at any given time the wealthy are more likely than others to report themselves "very happy," which has led a number of researchers to conclude that people care more about their relative position on the income ladder than their absolute level of wealth. Since the heartless laws of mathematics guarantee that no more than 20 per cent of the population can squeeze inside the top quintile of the income distribution, no matter how large the economy, it is tempting to think that the size of the economy, or its growth, don't matter.

### Growth Solves Opop/Tech

#### Growth solves overpopulation and leads to technological innovation

**Galor 11** (Oded Galor Oded Galor is Herbert H. Goldberger Professor of Economics at Brown University. “Unified Growth Theory” <http://ws1.ad.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/laibson/files/galor%2Bpreface%2B%2Bchap%2B11.pdf(Pitman)>

The transition from an epoch of stagnation to an era of sustained economic growth has marked the onset of one of the most remarkable transformations in the course of human history. While living standards in the world economy stagnated during the millennia preceding the Industrial Revolution, income per capita has undergone an unprecedented tenfold increase over the past two centuries, profoundly altering the level and distribution of education, health, and wealth across the globe. The rise in the standard of living has not been universally shared among societies. Variation in the timing of the take-off from stagnation to growth has led to a vast worldwide divergence in income per capita. Inequality, which had been modest until the nineteenth century, has widened considerably, and the ratio of income per capita between the richest and the poorest regions of the world has been magnified from a moderate 3:1 ratio in 1820 to a staggering 18:1 ratio in 2000 (Figure 1.1). An equally striking development has emerged in the world distribution of population. The decline in population growth in Europe and North America toward the end of the nineteenth century and the long delay in the onset of a corresponding demographic transition in less developed regions, well into the second half of the twentieth century, have generated significant bifurcation in the global distribution of population. The share of world population that resides in the prosperous region of Europe has declined by nearly one-half over the past century, whereas the fraction of the human population that lives in the impoverished regions of Africa and Latin America has doubled.Throughout most of human existence, the process of development was marked by Malthusian stagnation: resources generated by technological progress and land expansion were channeled primarily toward an increase in the size of the population, providing only a glacial contribution to the level of income per capita in the long run. While cross-country variations in technology and land productivity were reflected in differing population densities, their effect on variation in living standards was merely transitory.In contrast, over the past two centuries, various regions of the world have departed from the Malthusian trap and have witnessed a considerable increase in growth rates of income per capita. The decline in population growth over the course of the demographic transition has liberated productivity gains from the counterbalancing effect of population growth and enabled technological progress and human capital formation to pave the way for the emergence of an era of sustained economic growth.