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## ---1NC---

Due to intricate systems our society is unsustainable – collapse of transportation infrastructure allows for de-development

Hanson 07 [Robin Hanson – professor of economics at George Mason University, August 2007, “Catastrophe, Social Collapse, and Human Extinction”, <http://hanson.gmu.edu/collapse.pdf> ]

Social productivity ﬂuctuates constantly in response to various disturbances, such as changesin weather, technology, or politics. Most such disturbances are small, and so induce onlyminor social changes, but the few largest disturbances can induce great social change. The historical record shows at least a few occasions where social productivity fell rapidly by¶ a large enough degree to be worthy of the phrase “social collapse.” For example, there¶ have been famous and dramatic declines, with varying speeds, among ancient Sumeria, the¶ Roman empire, and the Pueblo peoples. A century of reduced rain, including three droughts,apparently drove the Mayans from their cities and dramatically reduced their population,even though the Maya had great expertise and experience with irrigation and droughts (?;Haug, Gnther, Peterson, Sigman, Hughen, & Aeschlimann, 2003).Some have explained these historical episodes of collapse as due to a predictable internal tendency of societies to overshoot ecological capacity (Diamond, 2005), or to create top heavy social structures (Tainter, 1988). Other analysis, however, suggests that most known¶ ancient collapses were initiated by external climate change (Weiss & Bradley, 2001; deMenocal, 2001). The magnitude of the social impact, however, often seems out of proportion to ¶ the external disturbance. Similarly in recent years relatively minor external problems often¶ translate into much larger reductions in economic growth (Rodrik, 1999). This disproportionate response is of great concern; what causes it?¶ One obvious explanation is that the intricate coordination that makes a society more ¶ productive also makes it more vulnerable to disruptions. For example, productivity in our society requires continued inputs from a large number of specialized systems, such as for electricity, water, food, heat, transportation, communication, medicine, defense, training,¶ and sewage. Failure of any one of these systems for an extended period can destroy the¶ entire system. And since geographic regions often specialize in supplying particular inputs,disruption of one geographic region can have a disproportionate eﬀect on a larger society.Transportation disruptions can also reduce the beneﬁts of scale societies enjoy.

Economic growth outweighs and causes extinction

Barry 08 [Dr. Glen Barry – PhD in Land Resources from Wisconsin-Madison University, January 14, 2008, “Economic Collapse and Global Ecology”, http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm]

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.

## 2NC – Growth Bad

Economic Growth makes Human Extinction inevitable – Only a collapse now solves

**Barry 08** (Dr. Glen Barry, Ph.D. in Land Resources from UW-Madison and President and Founder of Ecological Internet; 1/14/2008; “Economic Collapse and Global Ecology”; <http://www.countercurrents.org/barry140108.htm>)

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.

## 2NC – Warming

Growth necessitates the overconsumption of energy and resources – intensifying warming

Czech 2000 [Brian Czech - conservation biologist with the US Fish and Wildlife Service, adjunct professor at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, “Shoveling Fuel for a Runaway Train”, 2000, pp. 86-87]

Global warming is a topic in which few of us have formal train­ing. But just like much of economics is a matter of common sense, which we all share by definition, global warming has some traits that we can all grasp quite readily. First, we all know that warm­ing means more heat, which is just a form of energy. We know that the sun is the major source of energy, and therefore heat, on Earth. We know that, currently, a major share of the sunlight reaching the Earth is reflected back into space. Now I’m no brain surgeon, but doesn’t it stand to reason that f we capture more of this energy for use on Earth, the temperature of our atmosphere will rise? In statistical jargon, the only doubt is whether or not the rise will be “significant.” Well let’s see.. . seems like the more that’s captured, the more likely it is to be significant! So if neo­classical growth theory stakes a claim on perpetually increased so­lar capture, won’t it succumb to the fact that the economy’s par­ticipants are gonna fry? And why shouldn’t we expand this common sense to include economic growth as a whole, with or without a dependence on so­lar power? During the early stages of this manuscript, I was rent­ing a room in a house. The landlord, who also lived in the house, was a bright fellow who worked as an insurance adjuster. He had taken business and economics courses in college, although he hadn’t studied the natural sciences. One evening we were watching the national news, which featured a long segment about how the economy, though still growing, showed many signs of labor­ing. Doomsayers were predicting a downturn, maybe even all the way to a shrinking economy! Panic on Wall Street, sadness all about. Next, they had an equally long segment on global warming. They provided some of the earlier data from the National Cli­matic Data Center, and I was surprised that they basically came out and said, “It [is] really happening, folks.” But they said little about the causes. They showed factories spewing out pollutants, presumably alluding to the warming effect of greenhouse gases. To me it looked like a lot of those stacks were just pumping out steam, and I remembered a study that showed how warming due to waste heat emission exceeded global warming, at least within urban areas (Viterito 1991). I said to my landlord, “Look at all that heat coming out of there. Doesn’t it seem like the economic activity they were rooting for in the last segment might be con­tributing to the warming, at least in those cities where they all seem to live?” The landlord thought for a minute and said, “Gee, I would have never thought about it like that. That’s interest­ing. Yeah, I see what you mean.” Common sense. Yet people who downplay the merits of common sense propose “orbiting giant mirrors that would reflect sunlight onto the night side of the Earth and thereby increase growing time” (see chapter 4).

**It’s anthropogenic and risks extinction**

DEIBEL ‘7 (Terry L. Deibel, professor of IR at National War College, Foreign Affairs Strategy, “Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today Anthropogenic – caused by CO2”)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, **and what was once a mere possibility has passed** through probability **to near certainty.** Indeed **not one of more than 900 articles** **on climate change published in refereed scientific journals** from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually **impossible to find evidence of disagreement** over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to het the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possible end life on this planet. **Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically** run it puts dangers form terrorism and traditional military challenges to **shame**. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

### Warming Turns Economy

Climate change will prevent economic growth – affects cash flow and induces risk in investors

Balvers et al. 12 [Ronald Balvers – Division in Economics and Finance from West Virginia University, Ding Du - The W. A. Franke College of Business, Xiaoping Zhao - Ding Du

The W. A. Franke College of Business, June 5, 2012, “The Adverse Impact of Gradual Temperature Change on Capital Investment” http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/124676/2/paper-final.pdf]

In brief, global warming (negatively) affects cash flows of firms in an uncertain ¶ fashion, acting as a (negative) supply shock. This shock should affect firms and economy ¶ not only by its impact on the level of cash flows, but also by its impact on the risk or ¶ uncertainty of cash flows and therefore the cost of capital. Global warming (as a supply shock) introduces a new risk factor into the economy. As a result, investors demand ¶ higher returns on risky assets such as stocks and corporate bonds. Higher returns ¶ represent a higher cost of capital to firms, which can have a profound and adverse impact ¶ on capital investment and economic growth. The negative link between the cost of capital ¶ and economic growth is well documented in the economics literature (see for instance Henry, 2003). Thus, ignoring global warming’s impact on the cost of capital may ¶ significantly understate its economic impact. Yet a review of the literature shows that there has been no research concerning the impact of global warming on the cost of capital.5 We explore here in detail the cost-of-capital link.A related objective is to provide a detached assessment of possible costs of global warming. Roll (1984) showed that financial markets may be more reliable indicators of future events influencing cash flows than the pronouncements of specialized forecasters: orange juice futures prices have forecasting power for weather conditions (involving frost) beyond the forecasts of the National Weather Service. Since the scientific literature is notdefinitive concerning the magnitude of the welfare effects of global warming, the observable financial market impact of changes in the likelihood of global warming, likewise, may provide an objective measure of the collective perception of some of the economic damages from global warming.If global warming is economically important, the risk premium and loadings associated with the global-warming factor should be significantly different from zero. In particular, if climate-change impacts are generally adverse (losses due to extreme events and/or adjustment costs), we expect to see a negative premium, because (1) if climate change impacts are adverse, increases in temperature should for typical firms lead to ¶ lower returns, and so the loadings on the global-warming factor should be generally ¶ negative; (2) to compensate for the additional risk, the equilibrium return should be higher, and with negative loadings this can only be achieved by a negative risk premium. In essence we conjecture that global warming is a risk factor that is priced because it ¶ affects investment opportunities in the sense of Merton (1973).

# ---------------------------------

## \*\*\*Uniqueness\*\*\*

### Transition Now

Smart investments from the private sector are causing a transition to a steady state economy

Sanquiche 11 [Rosalinda Sanquiche – masters in Environmental and Resource Policy as a George Washington Fellow at George Washington University in D.C. - author for the Daily News, February 2011, “The Green Transition Scoreboard: How to Invest for a Steady State Economy”, http://steadystate.org/the-green-transition-scoreboard/]

We must take some critical steps if we want to build a truly green economy — a steady state that meets global needs without undermining the life-support systems of the planet. Clearly we need to move beyond fossil fuels. We need to scale back the amount of energy and materials we’re consuming, especially in OECD countries. We need to build a durable infrastructure, supportive of a low-carbon future. One way to take these critical steps is through smart investments. With governments stubbornly open to dangerous Industrial Era methods like nuclear power, despite the crisis in Japan, smart investments must come from the private sector. The good news is that private investors are taking a strong lead, as demonstrated by the most recent update of the Green Transition Scoreboard® (GTS).The GTS is a tool for tracking private investments in green markets, and the February 2011 update reveals an encouraging $2 trillion worth of investments in the green economy since 2007. This amount is significant because many studies, computer models and reports indicate that investing $1 trillion annually between now and 2020 can ramp up material and energy efficiencies; reduce the costs of wind, solar and geothermal energy; increase sustainable land use and forestry; and support smart infrastructure, transport, building and urban re-design, all of which are necessary to achieve the green transition to a steady state economy.The updated numbers for 2010 put global private sector investors on track to reach $10 trillion in investments by 2020! How can more investments support a steady state? The key is to spur substantial investment in the right sectors. It’s a winning proposition, as smart investing can help societies use fewer energy and material resources and provide needed employment opportunities.The GTS tracks five sectors:¶ Renewable Energy;¶ Efficiency and Green Construction;¶ Cleantech;¶ Smart Grid; and¶ Corporate R&D.Renewable Energy includes private technology development, equipment manufacturing, and project finance. The Efficiency and Green Construction sector includes new building construction and existing building retrofits. Cleantech is a broad sector, encompassing agriculture, air and environment, energy efficiency, infrastructure and storage, materials, recycling and waste reduction, transportation and water/wastewater. Smart Grid includes companies actually putting smart grids in place, building the infrastructure rather than designing the technology. Together, these first four sectors account for over $1.8 trillion in investments since 2007.

Countries are transitioning to a steady-state economy

O’Neil 11 [Daniel W. O’Neill – Ph.D. from the School of Sustainability, June 2011, “Measuring progress in the degrowth transition to a steady state economy”, http://degrowth.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/oneill\_degrowth-transition-to-a-steady-state-economy.pdf]

This paper proposes a common information system to measure what is meant by both regrowth and a steady state economy. In doing so it builds on Kushner’s (2010) work showing the complementary nature of the two ideas. The strength of the steady state concept is its focus on the biophysical resources that the economy depends on, and therefore the biophysical indicators proposed are largely drawn from the deﬁnition of a steady state economy. The strength of regrowth is its focus on social objectives, in particular human well-being and social equity. Hence the social indicators proposed are largely based on the stated goals of the degrowth movement. If wealthy nations change their goal from economic growth to steady state economy, then they will also need to change the way they measure progress, abandoning GDP and replacing it with more relevant information. The indicator framework that I have proposed would help guide any country that decided to pursue such a transition. But there is also value in applying the indicators to other countries, regardless of their economic goals. The biophysical indicators could be used to determine which national economies are growing, which are degrowing, and which are closest to the steady state. Some countries are undoubtedly closer to a steady state economy than others, even if it is not their objective. Some may even be degrowing. Do these countries perform better or worse on the social indicators than their growing counterparts? To answer this question, I am working on translating the idealized indicators proposed in this paper into measurable quantities, to create what might be termed the “Degrowth Accounts”. Such information will contribute to a better understanding of economic systems, and could provide valuable insights into the reforms needed to achieve – not just a biophysical steady state economy – but one that is socially sustainable as well.

## \*\*\*Links\*\*\*

### Transportation Links

The transportation sector prevents a steady state economy

Blackwelder 10 [Brent Blackwelder – President of Friends of Earth and Founder of American Rivers, August 2010, “Steady State Transportation: Closing the Door on the Dirty Oil Era”, <http://steadystate.org/steady-state-transportation-closing-the-door-on-the-dirty-oil-era/>]

To achieve optimal economic scale and a true balance with nature in a steady state economy (i.e., healthy ecosystems and a healthy economy), boldness is required, and the transportation sector is a good place to start. Ending the use of oil to power vehicles, from planes to trains to automobiles, is a must. But the power of the highway lobby and the momentum of the global jet-setting economy’s demands make this objective appear improbable. Some encouraging signs of change, however, provide the basis for making big demands on Congress, state legislatures, and the executive branch. For example, public support for spending the preponderance of federal transportation dollars on road construction (instead of public transportation) may be cracking significantly. On July 25th the Chicago Tribune reported that for the first time, both suburban and urban citizens in the Chicago metro area think that more money ought to be spent on transit than on highways. Another promising sign is the growth in U.S. transit ridership. Since 1996 transit ridership has increased by an average of 2.6% annually, including a 3.3% increase in 2009.Recent economic analyses highlight the costliness of oil and automobile usage, and evidence from these analyses can drive big shifts in policy. For instance, the U.K. Department of Transport has found that for each British pound spent to reduce car usage, there are £10 of benefits in the economy from fuel savings, reduced congestion costs, and lower pollution levels. But America lags far behind other nations in rethinking transportation systems – a quick comparison of Atlanta to Amsterdam demonstrates the gap. In Atlanta 95% of residents commute to work by car. In Amsterdam 40% commute by car, 35% bike or walk, and 25% go by transit. The series of oil spills in the U.S. this year should energize efforts in city after city to revamp transportation and breathe new life into automobile alternatives.

Transportation infrastructure is the bloodline of economic growth

Banister et al. 11 [David Banister - Professor of Transport Studies at the School of Geography and the Environment & fellow and tutor at Oxford University, Karen Anderton – M.S. in Environment and Development from the University of Reading, David Bonilla – Senior Research Fellow in Transport, Energy Economics, Dr. Moshe Givoni - Senior Researcher in Transport Policy and Economics, July 6, 2011, “Transportation and the Environment”, <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-environ-032310-112100>]

The transport sector has been described as the blood system of society (1) and one that has metaphorically contracted the planet (2). Over the past century, the transport of people, goods, and information has increased enormously, reﬂecting the clear economic and societal beneﬁts of transport. The global economy functions through (international) travel and trade, and there exist important positive feedback loops between transport and the economy, as growth of one stimulates the other (3). As well as allowing other economic sectors to function, transportation (i.e., the infrastructure

Transportation infrastructure promotes unsustainability – de-development is necessary for stable modes of mobility

Barrett 08 [Mark Barrett – degree in Economics from the University of Wisconsin & Master of Arts in Environment and Management, “Development”, October 2008, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/39295156/Barrett-DeDev>]

It is becoming more and more apparent that the massive energy, transportation, industry, and waste management infrastructure supporting an unsustainable way of life will have to be dismantled, and local decentralized, self-sustaining, integrated models developed (Doyle et al., 2008). At the same time the dismantling of infrastructure will provide an opportunity to restore ecological systems (Doyle et al., 2008). The availability of cheap fossils fuels has meant cheap transportation and enabled globalization but as fossil fuels become more expensive to extract and experience extreme price escalations, transportation, trade, and tourism will decline, and with them, a globalized economy. The creation of different ideas and models arising from the redevelopment of transportation, one of the most significant elements of western industrial civilization, will radically alter societies and social organization. The task of dismantling and recycling vehicles and transportation infrastructure alone will be an enormous challenge

Transportation infrastructure and economic growth require eachother

Moctezuma 08 [Manuel Moctezuma, October 23, 2008, “Development of Transportation Infrastructure in the Context of Economic Growth”, http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/ECG/target-seminars/ecg\_08/Moctezuma.pdf]

Developed road infrastructure is an essential factor facilitating and accelerating economic growth, which will in turn enable the addition of more¶ roads. At the same time, the marginal benefit of adding roads to a large stock of existing capacity might be diminishing. It is thus evident that the¶ co-evolution of economic output and road infrastructure is rather intricate¶ and deserves special attention. The model developed in this paper therefore investigates the interdependency between a country's economic growth and¶ the development of transportation infrastructure in this country. To this end, a co-evolutionary perspective is developed, where the mutual influence of the rate of economic growth and the capacity of transportation infrastructure are explicitly taken into account. This approach enables us to set up an optimal control problem, where the optimal investment rate is determined considering the co-evolutionary dynamics of GDP growth and capacity expansion. This model forms a comprehensive framework for understanding the underlying dynamics and the patterns of economic growth in relation to transport infrastructure.

They affect the rate of growth of eachother

Moctezuma 08 [Manuel Moctezuma, October 23, 2008, “Development of Transportation Infrastructure in the Context of Economic Growth”, http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/ECG/target-seminars/ecg\_08/Moctezuma.pdf]

The model presented here is essentially based on the assumption that there is¶ a strong interdependency between the capacity of transportation infrastructure and economic growth. Adopting this assumption we introduce a model¶ of coevolutionary dynamics that qualitatively describes how the development of transportation infrastructure aects the rate of economic growth¶ and vice versa. The qualitative coevolutionary model is in turn used to¶ construct a control model of development of transportation infrastructure in¶ the context of economic growth

Growth in transportation infrastructure is unsustainable

Banister et al. 11 [David Banister - Professor of Transport Studies at the School of Geography and the Environment & fellow and tutor at Oxford University, Karen Anderton – M.S. in Environment and Development from the University of Reading, David Bonilla – Senior Research Fellow in Transport, Energy Economics, Dr. Moshe Givoni - Senior Researcher in Transport Policy and Economics, July 6, 2011, “Transportation and the Environment”, <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-environ-032310-112100>]

The growth of CO2-intensive transport, mobility and the impact of transport on the environment are reviewed. The recent global exponential growth in transport is unsustainable and must end unless the transport sector can decarbonize. The paper examines solutions for low-carbon transport systems; the behavioral options; possible demand reduction; the role of innovative technologies; and the means by which international agreements on pricing, standards, and regulations can be effectively used. Transport brings enormous beneﬁts to society, and it has been instrumental in the globalization of the world economy, with substantial capital investments in its material infrastructure. Transport¶ governance also needs rethinking to understand the major challenges,¶ to implement major policy changes, and to address the problems of fragmented decision making. Holistic approaches, using ideas from transition management and niche development, are proposed as a framework within which both technological innovation and new patterns of travel and trade can be brought about.

Transportation and sustainability are incompatible

Kassens 09 [Eva Kassens – professor of Urban and Transport Planning at Michigan State, July 31, 2009, “SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE”, <http://web.mit.edu/dusp/dusp_extension_unsec/projections/issue_9/issue_9_kassens.pdf>]

The need to plan for sustainable transport is evident. Global warming poses significant challenges for cities. The transport sector alone, according to the World Resources Institute (2005), accounts for 24.1% of CO¶ 2¶ emissions worldwide, yet its importance in local commuting, linking the global system of cities, and stimulating economic interactions is crucial. “The solution” for keeping up international, national, regional, and local interactions while fostering sustainable development has yet to be found; no strategy for sustainable transportation systems agreed to by all stakeholders across countries so far exists.

A steady state economy doesn’t include private vehicles and endorses cycling or public transit

CASSE No date [Center for the Advancement of a Steady State Economy, “Transportation”, <http://steadystate.org/discover/envisioning-the-good-life/transportation/>

Transportation is all about the ability to move people and stuff relatively quickly from one place to another in safety and, in the case of people, comfort. In a steady state economy, citizens select from an efficient menu of transportation choices. Cycling, the most efficient form of transportation invented by humans, is emphasized. Smoothly operated mass transit systems carry people to and fro in urban centers. Private motorized vehicles are de-emphasized, but are used to provide necessary transport services. Goods are shipped by modes of transportation that require less energy per unit shipped, resulting in less long-haul trucking and more train service.

Transportation improvements delay the economic collapse but ensure it

CASSE No date [Center for the Advancement of a Steady State Economy, “Transportation”, <http://steadystate.org/discover/envisioning-the-good-life/transportation/>]

Transportation systems have a difficult time keeping up with the demands of growth. Governments struggle to fund and maintain a growing transportation infrastructure, resulting in more dangerous conditions for people using transportation networks. As congestion increases from more people accessing roads, mass transit, and other parts of the transportation infrastructure, governing bodies have to impose more and more rules and restrictions. Supplying the energy to run an ever-increasing transportation network also becomes problematic, if not impossible. Congestion, brutal competition for energy resources, delays, breakdowns, and safety hazards are the norm in the transportation network when perpetual growth is the goal.

## \*\*\*Impacts\*\*\*

### Laundry List Impacts

Economic Growth will destroy civilization

Trainer, ’11 [Ted Trainer, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of New South Wales “The radical implications of a zero growth economy”, real-world economics review, issue no. 57, 6 September 2011, pp. 71-82, http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue57/Trainer57.pdf]

The planet is now racing into many massive problems, any one of which could bring about the collapse of civilization before long. The most serious are the destruction of the environment, the deprivation of the Third World, resource depletion, conflict and war, and the breakdown of social cohesion. The main cause of all these problems is over-production and over-consumption – people are trying to live at levels of affluence that are far too high to be sustained or for all to share.

Our society is grossly unsustainable – the levels of consumption, resource use and ecological impact we have in rich countries like Australia are far beyond levels that could be kept up for long or extended to all people. Yet almost everyone’s supreme goal is to increase material living standards and the GDP and production and consumption, investment, trade, etc., as fast as possible and without any limit in sight. There is no element in our suicidal condition that is more important than this mindless obsession with accelerating the main factor causing the condition.

Economic growth is the root cause to major global problems

Trainer, ’11[Ted Trainer, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of New South Wales “The radical implications of a zero growth economy”, real-world economics review, issue no. 57, 6 September 2011, pp. 71-82, http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue57/Trainer57.pdf]

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.

### Warming 2NC

Growth will eliminate the human race through climate change

Gray 11 [Louise Gray – environment correspondent for the Daily Telegraph, September 8, 2011, “Prince Charles warns of human extinction”, Lexis Nexis]

Referring to himself as "an endangered species", he warned that the world is already in the "sixth extinction event", with species dying out at a much faster rate than at any time since the death of most of the dinosaurs 65 million years ago. Despite campaigning for years on global warming, he said climate change was not the only problem but merely speeding up the "rapacious" destruction of natural resources like water, land and food that humans need to survive. The Prince said if the world carries on "business as usual" then the human race itself could be wiped out. “We are, of course, witnessing what some people call the sixth great extinction event - the continued erosion of much of the Earth's vital biodiversity caused by a whole host of pressures, from the rising demand for land to the corrosive effects of all kinds of pollution," he said. “This is an important point that needs to be stressed more than it is, because its ultimate impact is plainly not at all clear to most people - without the biodiversity that is so threatened, we won't be able to survive ourselves. “Alluding to his "spiritual connection to nature", the Prince said mankind must also protect other species from extinction. “It may not seem to make much difference economically if the swallows, swifts and house martins no longer turn up each spring, but what would life be like if we just accepted their extinction because their habitats have been destroyed? “The Prince follows in the footsteps of his father the Duke of Edinburgh who was President of the UK arm of WWF UK before taking on the top role of the international organization. The Royal joked that as a "rare species" himself, he has always felt a close connection to the work of WWF. "Perhaps I warmed to your work from such an early age because, from the outset, you stood up for endangered species!"The WWF was set up 50 years ago to protect endangered species like the panda but Prince Charles said that the challenge today is far greater.He said the only way to protect wildlife and ultimately the humans who rely on these 'ecosystem services' is to transform the world economy so that growth is not at the expense of nature.¶ He referred to a "sustainability revolution" that would force people to change their lifestyles so they consume less petrol, food and other resources.¶ "History will not judge us by how much economic growth we achieve in the immediate years ahead, nor by how much we expand material consumption, but by the legacy for our grandchildren and their grandchildren," he said. "We are consuming what is rightfully theirs by sacrificing long-term progress on the altar of immediate satisfaction. That is hardly responsible behaviour. There is an urgent need for all of us to concentrate our efforts on sustaining, nurturing and protecting the Earth's natural capital and, moreover, reshaping our economic system so that Nature sits at the very heart of our thinking."

Warming causes biodiversity loss and extinction

Hansen 2011 (James Hansen, member of the National Academy of Sciences, professor in the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences at Columbia University and at Columbia’s Earth Institute, and director of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies; “Storms of my Grandchildren: The Truth about the Coming Climate Catastrophe and Our Last Chance to Save Humanity”; 2011; http://books.google.com/books?id=zB7VvLoeLD4C&printsec=frontcover&dq=storms+of+my+grandchildren&source=bl&ots=2Kk248c6lA&sig=NP4AwrGZH4cRXd8EtsXO63\_k90w&hl=en&sa=X&ei=3E0MUMiyLca1rQGNhvmxCg&ved=0CC4Q6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=storms%20of%20my%20grandchildren&f=false)

As long as the total movement of isotherms toward the poles is much smaller than the size of the habitat, or the ranges in which the animals live, the effect on species is limited. But now the move­ment is inexorably toward the poles and totals more than one hun­dred miles over the past several decades. If greenhouse gases continue to increase at business-as-usual rates, then the rate of isotherm movement will double in this century to at least seventy miles per decade. Species at the most immediate risk are those in polar climates and the biologically diverse slopes of alpine regions. Polar animals, in effect, will be pushed off the planet. Alpine species will be pushed toward higher altitudes, and toward smaller, rockier areas with thinner air; thus, in effect, they will also be pushed off the planet. A few such species, such as polar bears, no doubt will be "rescued" by human beings, but survival in zoos or managed animal reserves will be small consolation to bears or nature lovers. Earth's history provides an invaluable perspective about what is possible. Fossils in the geologic record reveal that there have been five mass extinctions during the past five hundred million years— geologically brief periods in which about half or more of the species on Earth disappeared forever. In each case, life survived and new species developed over hundreds of thousands and millions of years. All these mass extinctions were associated with large and relatively rapid changes of atmospheric composition and climate. In the most extreme extinction, the "end-Permian" event, dividing the Permian Triassic periods 251 million years ago, nearly all life on Earth— more than 90 percent of terrestrial and marine species—was exterminated. None of the extinction events is understood in full. Research is active, as increasingly powerful methods of "reading the rocks" are being developed. Yet enough is now known to provide an invalu­able perspective for what is already being called the sixth mass ex­tinction, the human-caused destruction of species. Knowledge of past extinction events can inform us about potential paths for the future and perhaps help guide our actions, as our single powerful species threatens all others, and our own. We do not know how many animal, plant, insect, and microbe species exist today. Nor do we know the rate we are driving species to extinction. About two million species—half of them being insects, including butterflies—have been cataloged, but more are dis­covered every day. The order of magnitude for the total is perhaps ten million. Some biologists estimate that when all the microbes, fungi, and parasites are counted, there may be one hundred million species. Bird species are documented better than most. Everybody has heard of the dodo, the passenger pigeon, the ivory-billed woodpecker—all are gone—and the whooping crane, which, so far, we have just barely "saved." We are still losing one or two bird species per year. In total about 1 percent of bird species have disap­peared over the past several centuries. If the loss of birds is repre­sentative of other species, several thousand species are becoming extinct each year. The current extinction rate is at least one hundred times greater than the average natural rate. So the concern that humans may have initiated the sixth mass extinction is easy to understand. However, the outcome is still very much up in the air, and human-made cli­mate change is likely to be the determining factor. I will argue that if we continue on a business-as-usual path, with a global warming of several degrees Celsius, then we will drive a large fraction of species, conceivably all species, to extinction. On the other hand, just as in the case of ice sheet stability, if we bring atmospheric composition under control in the near future, it is still possible to keep human-caus ed extinctions to a moderate level.

### ---XT- IL Climate Change

Economic Growth makes extinction probable

Simms 10 (Andrew Simms, London School of Economics, International Institute for Environment and Development, Board member of Greenpeace UK and The Energy and Resources Institute Europe; “Growth Isn’t Possible”; NEF; January 2010; http://neweconomics.org/sites/neweconomics.org/files/Growth\_Isnt\_Possible.pdf)

Since our main work was completed, Professor Kevin Anderson of the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research at Manchester University also looked at a range of scenarios for growth, greenhouse gas concentration levels and global warming.217 Assuming that growth continued, he looked at the rate of emissions reductions that would be needed to achieve greenhouse gas concentration levels commensurate with a 2, 3 or 4°C temperature rise. Most, of course, agree that temperature rise above two degrees represents unacceptable, dangerous warming. Anderson’s conclusion was stark: ‘Economic growth in the OECD cannot be reconciled with a 2, 3 or even 4°C characterization of dangerous climate change.’218

### **---XT- Climate = War**

Nuclear War

Scheffran 09 (Jurgen Scheffran, Chair of Research Group on Climate Change and Security for the World Future Council; Professor at University of Hamburg; “ Climate Change, Nuclear Risks, and Nuclear Disarmament: From Security Threats to Sustainable Peace; November 2009; http://www.worldfuturecouncil.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/PDF/110517\_WFC\_Scheffran\_Report.pdf)

In the future, nuclear and climate risks may interfere with each other in a mutually enforcing way. Conflicts induced by climate change could contribute to global insecurity and create more incentives for states to rely on military force, including nuclear weapons. Rather than being a direct cause of war, climate change significantly affects the delicate balance between social and environmental systems in a way that could undermine human security and societal stability with potentially grave consequences for international security. Increased reliance on nuclear energy to reduce carbon emissions will contribute to the risks of nuclear proliferation. A renewed nuclear arms race would consume considerable resources and undermine the conditions for tackling the problem of climate change in a cooperative manner. Nuclear war itself would severely destabilize human societies and the environment, not to speak of the possibility of a nuclear winter that would disrupt the atmosphere.

Climate Change causes war – destablilizes social systems and multiplies threats

Scheffran 09 (Jurgen Scheffran, Chair of Research Group on Climate Change and Security for the World Future Council; Professor at University of Hamburg; “ Climate Change, Nuclear Risks, and Nuclear Disarmament: From Security Threats to Sustainable Peace; November 2009; http://www.worldfuturecouncil.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/PDF/110517\_WFC\_Scheffran\_Report.pdf)

Not less dramatic are the risks of global warming, caused by the emissions of carbon dioxide and other green- house gases. The fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC 2007) has drawn a dire picture. Climate change endangers ecosystems and social systems all over the world. The degradation of natural re- sources, the decline of water and food supplies, forced migration, and more frequent and intense disasters will greatly affect population clusters, big and small. Climate-related shocks will add stress to the world’s existing conflicts and act as a threat multiplier in already fragile regions. This could contribute to a decline of international stability and trigger hostility between people and nations.

### **---XT- Climate = extinction**

Warming causes Extinction

Stein 11 (David Stein, Science editor; “Scientists say Humanity ignores Antartic melting and Greenhouse gas time-bombs with the price of Mass-Extinction”; 6/26/2011; http://www.agoracosmopolitan.com/home/Frontpage/2007/02/26/01381.html)

"The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction", reported Bill Henderson in *CrossCurrents.*If strict global environmental security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of humankind's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.

Outweighs War

Scheffran 09 (Jurgen Scheffran, Chair of Research Group on Climate Change and Security for the World Future Council; Professor at University of Hamburg; “ Climate Change, Nuclear Risks, and Nuclear Disarmament: From Security Threats to Sustainable Peace; November 2009; http://www.worldfuturecouncil.org/fileadmin/user\_upload/PDF/110517\_WFC\_Scheffran\_Report.pdf)

Following hurricane Katrina in 2005 and the IPCC reports in 2007, attention increasingly shifted to the security risks of global warming (see the discussion in WBGU 2007, Scheffran 2008, 2009). There was growing concern about large-scale cascading events in the climate system that could lead to international instability and become as devastating as a nuclear disaster. Among the potential tipping elements are the loss of the South Asian monsoon and the Amazon rainforest, the breakdown of the North Atlantic thermohaline circulation, polar ice melting and global sea-level rise (Schellnhuber, et al. 2006). UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon warned that climate change may pose as much of a danger to the world as war. In April 2007, the UN Security Council held its first debate on climate change indicating that global warming has elevated to the top of the international security agenda, rivaling the threat of war. Initiated by the United Kingdom, Margaret Beckett compared emerging climate change to the gathering storm before World War II: ―An unstable climate risks some of the drivers of conflict – such as migratory pressures and competition for resources – getting worse (Beckett 2007b). In Spring 2008, the European Commission issued a report stating that climate change ―is already having profound consequences for international security which are not just of a ―humanitarian nature‖ but include political and security risks that directly affect European interests. It held that, ―Climate change is best viewed as a threat multiplier which exacerbates existing trends, tensions and instability. The core challenge is that climate change threatens to over- burden states and regions which are already fragile and conflict prone.

### Environment 2NC

Unsustainable consumption levels create a cycle of positive feedback loops -- causes environmental collapse and extinction.

Spratt et al. 10 **(**Stephen Spratt, BA from the University of East Anglia, an MSc from the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London, and a DPhil from the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex; “The Great Transition”; NEF; June 2010; <http://neweconomics.org/sites/neweconomics.org/files/Great_Transition_0.pdf)//sjl>)

Our environmental challenges extend well beyond carbon however; Earth’s life support processes depend on the optimal functioning of ecosystems. Human life is dependent on the regular availability of food, water, shelter, optimal atmospheric conditions and nutrient recycling systems. It is this interaction of biological, physical and chemical elements that guarantees the provision of everything humankind needs to thrive on earth. The natural world is also key to mental and physical well-being – a large body of research from Europe and North America shows that people and in particular children derive significant psychological benefits through exposure to nature and that exercise in a natural environment is more beneficial than in urban environments.19,20 Yet forests, food supplies, water, marine life and many other natural resources are under threat from over-consumption by those in developed countries (Box 1). For everyone to live at the current European average level of consumption, we would need more than double the biocapacity actually available – the equivalent of 2.1 planet Earths – to sustain us. If everyone consumed at the US rate, we would require nearly five. Neither of these is a viable option: consumption in the developed world must be cut back to preserve the ecosystem and enable growth of living standards in the developing world. Of course, the pressures we place on environmental resources through consumption often have what scientists term – without intentional irony – ‘positive feedback’ loops. Consider soya. In 2005, the UK imported 774,623 tonnes of soya into the UK, with around two-thirds coming from Brazil.21 Much of it goes into animal feed to support our relatively new-found habit of having plenty of meat and dairy products in our daily diet. But soya production is one of the key pressures that, along with forest fires, drought, deforestation and climate change, could push the Amazon rainforest over a tipping point where, rather than being a store of carbon dioxide, it begins to release it. With the Amazon estimated to store 120 billion tonnes (± 30 billion) in biomass carbon,24 scientists have said this switch could trigger ‘runaway climate change’.25,26 If the environment is at breaking point, and with time running out, what about the economy?

### ---XT- Environment

Growth makes ecological collapse inevitable - decrease of consumption key

Trainer 10- ( Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales; "The Limits to Growth Perspective: A Summary”; 10/20/10,  <http://socialsciences.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/Limits.Shrt.html>)

Our society's most fundamental mistake is our commitment to affluent-industrial-consumer lifestyles and to an economy that must have constant and limitless growth in output, on a planet whose limited resources make these impossible goals. Our way of life is grossly unsustainable. Our levels of production and consumption are far too high. We can only achieve them because we few in rich countries are grabbing most of the resources produced and therefore depriving most of the world's people of a fair share, and because we are depleting stocks faster than they can regenerate. Because we consume so much we are rapidly using up resources and causing huge ecological damage. It would be impossible for all the world's people to rise to our rich world per capita levels of consumption. Most people have no idea how far we are beyond sustainable levels. Although present levels of production, consumption, resource use and environmental impact are unsustainable we are obsessed with economic growth, i.e., with increasing production and consumption, as much as possible and without limit! Most of the major global problems we face, especially environment, Third World poverty, conflict and social breakdown are primarily due to this limits problem; i.e., to over-consumption.  (This does not mean over-population is not a serious problem.) Following are some of the main facts and arguments that support the limits to growth position. 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 15-20 times that of the poorest half of the world's people. World population will probably stabilize around 9 billion, somewhere after 2060. If all those people were to have present Australian per capita resource consumption, then rates of production of resources would have to be 5 to 10 times as great as they are now. If we tried to rise to those levels of resource output we would completely exhaust all probably recoverable resources of coal, oil, natural gas, tar sand oil, shale oil and uranium (assuming the present "burner" reactors) well before 2050. We would also have exhausted potentially recoverable resources for one third of the mineral items by then. Petroleum is especially limited.  World oil supply will probably peak between 2005 and 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 US diet, which takes about .5 ha of land to produce, we would need 4.5 billion ha of food producing land. But there is only 1.4 billion ha of cropland in use today and this is likely to decrease. Recent "Footprint" analysis estimates that it takes about 8 ha of productive land to provide water, energy settlement area and food for one person living in an Australian world city.  So if 9 billion people were to live as we do in rich world cities we would need about 72 billion ha of productive land. But that is 10 times all the productive land on the planet. (Note that a number of other factors could be added to the footprint calculation, such as the land needed to absorb pollution.)  Even though only one-fifth of the world’s people are resource-affluent, we are using resources at rate that would take 1.4 planet earths to provide sustainably, (because we are consuming stocks such as forests faster than they can reproduce.) The biological diversity and resilience of the planet is deteriorating alarmingly.   There are serious problems of water, food scarcity, forest and soil loss, decline of fish stocks, loss or coral reefs and tropical forests and mangroves and grasslands.  We are heading into an era of massive species extinction.  The cause of these problems is the fact that humans are taking so much from nature and dumping so many wastes back into nature. It will probably soon be generally accepted that we must totally eliminate all CO2 emissions to the atmosphere by 2050. (Hansen, 2008, Meinshausen et al, 2009.)  There is a strong case that it will not be possible to do this while maintaining consumer-capitalist society.  Firstly it will not be possible to burn coal and sequester the resulting CO2 because only 80-90% of it can be captured for storage, and because the 50% of emissions from non-stationary sources cannot be captured.  Secondly there is a strong case that it will not be possible to substitute alternative energy sources for carbon emitting fuels on the scale required.  (Trainer, 2008.)

### Poverty 2NC

Economic growth promotes poverty

Trainer, ’11[Ted Trainer, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of New South Wales “The radical implications of a zero growth economy”, real-world economics review, issue no. 57, 6 September 2011, pp. 71-82, <http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue57/Trainer57.pdf>]

The gross unsustainability of consumer-capitalist society is only the first of two crushing arguments against its acceptability. The other is to do with the extreme and brutal injustice built into the global economy, and without which we in rich countries could not have such high material living standards.¶ The global economy delivers most of the world’s resource wealth, e.g., oil, to the rich countries. It does this simply because it is a market system and in a market most scarce and valuable things go to the rich, because they can pay most for resources and goods.¶ The same principle ensures that the development taking place in the Third World is little more than development that will enrich the corporations from the rich countries, Third World elites and the people who shop in rich world supermarkets.¶ The global economy totally ignores the needs and the rights of people and ecosystems. It allows, guarantees, that 850 million people starve while 600 million tonnes of grain are fed to animals in rich countries every year and most of the best land in many hungry countries is devoted to export crops. Conventional development, i.e., development determined by market forces and profit, is therefore clearly a form of plunder – it puts the productive capacity of the Third World into enriching us not them.

### Terrorism 2NC

Economic growth creates the biggest risk for large scale terrorist attacks—empirics

Radu 02 [PhD in International Relations @ Columbia University, Senior Fellow @ the Foreign Policy Research Institute, Co-Chairman of the FPRI Center for Terrorism, National Policy Fellow @ the Hoover Institution, American Diplomacy: Commentary and Analysis, “The futile search for “root causes” of Terrorism,” 9/16/2002, http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/archives\_roll/2002\_07-09/radu\_futile/radu\_futile.html]

Those who hold to "poverty as the root cause" do so even though the data does not fit their model. Even leaving aside multimillionaire Osama bin Laden, the backgrounds of the September 11 killers indicates that they were without exception scions of privilege: all were either affluent Saudis and Egyptians, citizens of the wealthy Gulf statelets, or rich sons of Lebanon, trained in and familiar with the ways of the West—not exactly the victims of poverty in Muslim dictatorships. Many poor Egyptians, Moroccans, and Palestinians may support terrorists, but they do not—and cannot—provide them with recruits. In fact, Al Qaeda has no use for illiterate peasants. They cannot participate in World Trade Center-like attacks, unable as they are to make themselves inconspicuous in the West and lacking the education and training terrorist operatives need.

Nuclear terrorism is an existential threat—it escalates to nuclear war with Russia and China.

Ayson, 10 [Robert Ayson, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld]

A terrorist nuclear attack, and even the use of nuclear weapons in response by the country attacked in the first place, would not necessarily represent the worst of the nuclear worlds imaginable. Indeed, there are reasons to wonder whether nuclear terrorism should ever be regarded as belonging in the category of truly existential threats. A contrast can be drawn here with the global catastrophe that would come from a massive nuclear exchange between two or more of the sovereign states that possess these weapons in significant numbers. Even the worst terrorism that the twenty-first century might bring would fade into insignificance alongside considerations of what a general nuclear war would have wrought in the Cold War period. And it must be admitted that as long as the major nuclear weapons states have hundreds and even thousands of nuclear weapons at their disposal, there is always the possibility of a truly awful nuclear exchange taking place precipitated entirely by state possessors themselves.But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem.It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well.Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability?If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint.

Terrorism causes extinction

Morgan 09[Professor @ Hankuk University of Foreign Studies [Dennis, South Korea, “World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race,” Futures, November, Science Direct]

In a remarkable website on nuclear war, Carol Moore asks the question ‘‘Is Nuclear War Inevitable??’’ [10].4 In Section 1, Moore points out what most terrorists obviously already know about the nuclear tensions between powerful countries. No doubt, they’ve figured out that the best way to escalate these tensions into nuclear war is to set off a nuclear exchange. As Moore points out, all that militant terrorists would have to do is get their hands on one small nuclear bomb and explode it on either Moscow or Israel. Because of the Russian ‘‘dead hand’’ system, ‘‘where regional nuclear commanders would be given full powers should Moscow be destroyed,’’ it is likely that any attack would be blamed on the United States’’ [10]. Israeli leaders and Zionist supporters have, likewise, stated for years that if Israel were to suffer a nuclear attack, whether from terrorists or a nation state, it would retaliate with the suicidal ‘‘Samson option’’ against all major Muslim cities in the Middle East. Furthermore, the Israeli Samson option would also include attacks on Russia and even ‘‘anti-Semitic’’ European cities [10]. In that case, of course, Russia would retaliate, and the U.S. would then retaliate against Russia. China would probably be involved as well, as thousands, if not tens of thousands, of nuclear warheads, many of them much more powerful than those used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, would rain upon most of the major cities in the Northern Hemisphere. Afterwards, for years to come, massive radioactive clouds would drift throughout the Earth in the nuclear fallout, bringing death or else radiation disease that would be genetically transmitted to future generations in a nuclear winter that could last as long as a 100 years, taking a savage toll upon the environment and fragile ecosphere as well. And what many people fail to realize is what a precarious, hair-trigger basis the nuclear web rests on. Any accident, mistaken communication, false signal or ‘‘lone wolf’ act of sabotage or treason could, in a matter of a few minutes, unleash the use of nuclear weapons, and once a weapon is used, then the likelihood of a rapid escalation of nuclear attacks is quite high while the likelihood of a limited nuclear war is actually less probable since each country would act under the ‘‘use them or lose them’’ strategy and psychology; restraint by one power would be interpreted as a weakness by the other, which could be exploited as a window of opportunity to ‘‘win’’ the war. In other words, once Pandora’s Box is opened, it will spread quickly, as it will be the signal for permission for anyone to use them. Moore compares swift nuclear escalation to a room full of people embarrassed to cough. Once one does, however, ‘‘everyone else feels free to do so. The bottom line is that as long as large nation states use internal and external war to keep their disparate factions glued together and to satisfy elites’ needs for power and plunder, these nations will attempt to obtain, keep, and inevitably use nuclear weapons. And as long as large nations oppress groups who seek self-determination, some of those groups will look for any means to fight their oppressors’’ [10]. In other words, as long as war and aggression are backed up by the implicit threat of nuclear arms, it is only a matter of time before the escalation of violent conflict leads to the actual use of nuclear weapons, and once even just one is used, it is very likely that many, if not all, will be used, leading to horrific scenarios of global death and the destruction of much of human civilization while condemning a mutant human remnant, if there is such a remnant, to a life of unimaginable misery and suffering in a nuclear winter.

### ---Terrorism Economy Impact

A terrorist attack would destroy the economy through a shutdown of borders and commerce—leads to retaliation and destroys standard of living

Saga Foundation 08 (Non-partisan, Non-profit for Nuclear Safety, July 2008, “Nuclear Terrorism: Local Effects, Global Consequences” http://www.sagafoundation.org/SagaFoundationWhitePaperSAGAMARK7282008.pdf)

Our principal conclusion is that the economic aftershocks flowing not only from a nuclear terrorist attack itself but from a predictable set of decisions a U.S. president could be expected to make in the wake of such an attack would inflict extraordinary economic damage on the nation stretching far beyond the point of attack. Beyond responding with aid to the scene of an attack, the first order of business for a president following a nuclear terrorist strike would be to determine if another strike was about to occur and to do everything possible to prevent it. Virtually all the important presidential decisions in the wake of the September 11 attacks – the suspension of all air travel; mandates to secure cockpit doors; the redesign of airport security; the dispatch of U.S. forces to Afghanistan; the institution of surveillance of terror suspects – were designed to prevent follow-on attacks. Punishing the aggressors was an important but secondary issue. In a nuclear attack scenario, presidential decisions revolving around this imperative would be taken regardless of whether another attack was planned or actually took place. Among the post-attack presidential decisions we deem highly likely: • Shutdown of freight commerce/border closures. The likelihood that a nuclear weapon would be clandestinely brought into our country would in all likelihood prompt a national initiative to seal the borders and freeze and search virtually all freight conveyances, whether trucks, ships or planes, delivering a major shock to the economy and bringing home to the entire populace the enormity of what has occurred, as stocks of basic supplies vanished almost overnight. Retaliation. The president would be under enormous pressure to respond swiftly and forcefully to such an attack, even if the geographic or geo-political point of origin was uncertain. The science of ‘nuclear forensics,’ which can enable specialists to identify the source of nuclear material used in a bomb even post-explosion, would provide some key clues as to the source of the attack. As a consequence, there would be tremendous pressure to hold someone—terror groups and their state sponsors— responsible, engendering immediate and forceful retaliation. • Suspension of civil liberties. Extraordinary concern about further nuclear attacks following an initial attack would drive a series of decisions restricting freedom of movement and conferring extraordinary powers on government agencies charged with preventing another strike. The point cannot be emphasized enough: Not the attack itself but the fear of a follow-on attack and the response to that fear would drive a set of decisions that would almost certainly bring all freight traffic to a halt, shut down the nation’s ports, empty the nation’s grocery shelves, and bring most manufacturing to a virtual standstill. Even if this shut-down were temporary, our economic system of “just-in-time inventory” would mean that basic staples would very quickly become unavailable, delivering a psychological blow to the populace and a devastating shock to national and international financial markets. We live with the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack today, but the possibility of a future attack once the first attack occurred would be deemed so much greater as to create an entirely new reality in terms of the political and economic functioning of the nation. Although preparation for disaster is an important part of any homeland security plan, we contend that the point of studying and understanding the full range of consequences of an act of nuclear terrorism is to motivate the government and the people to ensure that such an attack never happens. We are not seeking a better civil defense plan or trying to revive a “duck and cover” strategy. We are trying to clearly lay out the consequences of failure so that the necessary steps are taken with the necessary energy and urgency.

Nuclear terrorist attack destroys the world economy and causes retaliation leading to global war

Diamond, ’08 (John, Washington fellow of the Saga Foundation, 10/9/08, “A financial apocalypse isn't nearly as scary as a nuclear one,” http://blogs.usatoday.com/oped/2008/10/a-financial-apo.html)

The aftershocks As the Saga Foundation — a non-profit organization focused on the threat of terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction — argued in a recent white paper, the vast damage at and around a nuclear ground zero would be dwarfed in scope by the national and global economic aftershocks. These aftershocks would stem not only from the explosion itself but also from a predictable set of decisions a president would almost certainly have to make in grappling with the possibility of a follow-on attack. Assuming, as the experts believe likely, that such a weapon would have to be smuggled into the country, the president could be expected to close the nation's borders, halt all freight commerce and direct a search of virtually any moving conveyance that could transport a nuclear weapon. Most manufacturing would then cease. In a nation that lives on just-in-time inventory, these developments could empty the nation's shelves in days. The effects of post-attack decision-making go far beyond this example. If U.S. intelligence determined that one or more countries had somehow aided and abetted the attack, we would face the prospect of full-scale war. Even short of that, the nation would demand, and the president would almost certainly order, a level of retaliation at the suspected locus of the attacking group that would dwarf the post-9/11 military response. The possibility of follow-on attacks could transform our notions of civil liberties and freedom forever. And as former 9/11 Commission co-chairman Lee Hamilton has pointed out, a nuclear terrorist attack would prompt a collapse in public faith in the government's ability to protect the American people. Think your 401(k) hurts now? The presidential nominees, and the American people, should reconsider the tendency to view these two issues — economic crisis and the threat of catastrophic terrorism — as separate problems. A nuclear attack on a U.S. city would not only devastate the target and kill possibly hundreds of thousands, it would also create instantaneous national and global economic ripple effects with incalculable consequences. To put it in personal terms, if you think things are tough in the nation's financial sector now, imagine what your 401(k) — or your paycheck — might look like six months after a nuclear detonation in Lower Manhattan or downtown Washington. Saga's study merely began what must become a much larger-scale effort to understand in the fullest detail possible the consequences of an act of nuclear terrorism, not only the attack itself but also the decisions that would almost certainly follow. The idea is not to depress people but to motivate them. While some of the consequences are obvious, others are not, and it is the less understood aftershocks that could damage our world as well as transform it — and not for the better.

Terrorist attack would bring the global economy to a standstill

Saga Foundation 08 (Non-partisan, Non-profit for Nuclear Safety, July 2008, “Nuclear Terrorism: Local Effects, Global Consequences” http://www.sagafoundation.org/SagaFoundationWhitePaperSAGAMARK7282008.pdf)

Localizing these nuclear terror scenarios helps people envision and comprehend the unthinkable but it also creates a misleading perception that the damage from such an attack would be confined to the site of the attack itself. In considering these scenarios, former Senator Sam Nunn, who has worked for two decades to secure the world’s nuclear material, has observed that these ground- zero narratives provide only the physical impact of nuclear terrorism. If you were trying to draw a circle to mark the overall impact of the blast – in social, economic, and security terms -- the circle would be the equator itself. No part of the planet would escape the impact. People everywhere would fear another blast. Travel, international trade, capital flows, commerce would initially stop, and many freedoms we have come to take for granted would quickly be eroded in the name of security. The confidence of America and the world would be shaken to the core.

Terrorists cannot be deterred, an attack would destroy the global economy

Ferguson 06(Charles D., March 2006, “Preventing Catastrophic Nuclear Terrorism,” Council On Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/NucTerrCSR.pdf)

The threat of a nuclear attack by terrorists has never been greater. Over the past two decades, terrorist violence and destructiveness have grown. As the September 11, 2001, attacks demonstrated, al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda–inspired terrorists desire to inflict mass casualties. Al-Qaeda and other terrorist organizations have expressed interest in and searched for unconventional means of attack, such as chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons. Of these weapons, only a nuclear detonation will guarantee immediate massive destruction. A nuclear explosion would immediately devastate the heart of a city and could kill hundreds of thousands of people. In the longer term, hundreds of thousands more could suffer from radiation sickness and cancer, and thousands of square miles of property would experience radioactive contamination requiring several years and billions of dollars to decontaminate. The broader economic costs of the attack could soar into the trillions of dollars, potentially threatening the national economy and even disrupting the global economy. The probability of nuclear attack has increased because traditional deterrence— threatening assured destruction against a valued asset such as a national territory—does not work against the terrorist groups most likely to covet nuclear weapons. Such groups are usually not tied to a particular geographic location. Moreover, these terrorist organizations are often guided by religious, quasi-religious, or cult leaders who align themselves with a supreme being rather than with a nation-state that needs protection.

### **Resource Wars 2NC**

Economic growth causes resource wars

Sachs 08 [Director of The Earth Institute, Quetelet Professor of Sustainable Development, and Professor of Health Policy and Management @ Columbia University, Special Advisor to the United Nations General Jeffrey, The National Interest, A User’s Guide to the Century, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=18682]

THE NEW world order is therefore crisis prone. The existence of rapidly emerging regional powers, including Brazil, China and India, can potentially give rise to conflicts with the United States and Europe. The combination of rapid technological diffusion and therefore convergent economic growth, coupled with the natural-resource constraints of the Anthropocene, could trigger regional-scale or global-scale tensions and conflicts. China’s rapid economic growth could turn into a strenuous, even hot, competition with the United States over increasingly scarce hydrocarbons in the Middle East, Africa and Central Asia. Conflicts over water flow in major and already-contested watersheds (among India, Bangladesh and Pakistan; China and Southeast Asia; Turkey, Israel, Iraq and Jordan; the countries of the Nile basin; and many others) could erupt into regional conflicts. Disagreements over management of the global commons—including ocean fisheries, greenhouse gases, the Arctic’s newly accessible resources.

Resource wars cause global nuclear war

Lendman ’07 (Stephen Lendman is a renowned author and Research Associate of the Center for Research on Globalization. Rense.com. “Resource Wars - Can We Survive Them?” http://www.rense.com/general76/-resrouce.htm, July 2007, JGR)

With the world's energy supplies finite, the US heavily dependent on imports, and "peak oil" near or approaching, "security" for America means assuring a sustainable supply of what we can't do without. It includes waging wars to get it, protect it, and defend the maritime trade routes over which it travels. That means energy's partnered with predatory New World Order globalization, militarism, wars, ecological recklessness, and now an extremist US administration willing to risk Armageddon for world dominance. Central to its plan is first controlling essential resources everywhere, at any cost, starting with oil and where most of it is located in the Middle East and Central Asia. The New "Great Game" and Perils From It The new "Great Game's" begun, but this time the stakes are greater than ever as explained above. The old one lasted nearly 100 years pitting the British empire against Tsarist Russia when the issue wasn't oil. This time, it's the US with help from Israel, Britain, the West, and satellite states like Japan, South Korea and Taiwan challenging Russia and China with today's weapons and technology on both sides making earlier ones look like toys. At stake is more than oil. It's planet earth with survival of all life on it issue number one twice over. Resources and wars for them means militarism is increasing, peace declining, and the planet's ability to sustain life front and center, if anyone's paying attention. They'd better be because beyond the point of no return, there's no second chance the way Einstein explained after the atom was split. His famous quote on future wars was : "I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones." Under a worst case scenario, it's more dire than that. There may be nothing left but resilient beetles and bacteria in the wake of a nuclear holocaust meaning even a new stone age is way in the future, if at all. The threat is real and once nearly happened during the Cuban Missile Crisis in October, 1962. We later learned a miracle saved us at the 40th anniversary October, 2002 summit meeting in Havana attended by the US and Russia along with host country Cuba. For the first time, we were told how close we came to nuclear Armageddon. Devastation was avoided only because Soviet submarine captain Vasily Arkhipov countermanded his order to fire nuclear-tipped torpedos when Russian submarines were attacked by US destroyers near Kennedy's "quarantine" line. Had he done it, only our imagination can speculate what might have followed and whether planet earth, or at least a big part of it, would have survived.

### ---XT- Resource Wars

Specifically—climate change induces resource wars causing extinction

Wooldridge 09[lecturer @ Cornell University, University of Colorado, University of Denver, Regis University, and Michigan State University, Writes for the Smart Earth Institute, staff writer @ the Examiner, BA in Journalism @ Michigan State University Frosty, the Smarter Earth Institute, “America galloping toward its greatest crisis in the 21st century,” May 22, 2009, http://www.smarterearth.org/content/america-galloping-toward-its-greatest-crisis-21st-century, DKP]

“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.

Economic growth will lead to resource wars—seriously hindering US

Heinberg 11 (Richard Heinberg is a Senior Fellow-in-Residence at Post Carbon Institute. OilPrice. “Resource Wars: Geopolitics in a World of Dwindling Energy Supplies.” http://oilprice.com/Geo-Politics/International/Resource-Wars-Geopolitics-in-a-World-of-Dwindling-Energy-Supplies.html, 20 June 2011, JGR)

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.

### ---China War

Resource Wars are likely to ignite conflict between China and the US

Curran, ‘11 (Enda Curran quoting the Lowy Institute, an international think tank based in Sydney. Wall Street Journal. “Australian Think Tank Warns Of China War Threat At Sea” http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20110627-714166.html, 27 June 2011, JGR)

SYDNEY (Dow Jones)--There are growing risks of war in Asia's seas stemming from a clash with China as governments in the region bristle over territorial waters rich with oil and gas reserves, Australian think tank The Lowy Institute said in a report Tuesday. Much of the tension is based in the South and East China seas, with the former claimed in whole or part by China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Taiwan, Brunei and Malaysia. On Monday, Beijing said it had reached a deal over its dispute with Vietnam, though Vietnamese officials didn't comment on the announcement. If a war did erupt it could quickly draw in the U.S. and other powers and spread across the wider Indo-Pacific region, the Lowy report warned. The U.S. navy is active in Asia's seas and is scheduled to hold naval exercises with both the Vietnam and the Philippines, having recently conducted exercises with Australia. Pressure on resources, sovereignty disputes, nationalism and tensions between the U.S. and Chinese militaries are at the core of the troubled outlook, according to the Lowy report which was based on consultations with security experts and practitioners in China, Japan, the U.S. and India.

## \*\*\*AT’s\*\*\*

### AT: Growth Sustainable

Economic growth forever is impossible – advocates fail to acknowledge the facts

Daly 09 [Dr. Herman Daly - professor at the School of Public Policy of University of Maryland, June 05, 2009, “From a Failed Growth Economy to a Steady-State Economy”, http://www.eoearth.org/article/From\_a\_Failed\_Growth\_Economy\_to\_a\_Steady-State\_Economy]

We have many problems (poverty, [unemployment](http://www.eoearth.org/article/Employment,_unemployment,_and_well-being), environmental destruction, budget deficit, trade deficit, bailouts, bankruptcy, foreclosures, etc.), but apparently only one solution: [economic growth](http://www.eoearth.org/article/Economic_growth), or as the pundits now like to say, “to grow the economy”-- as if it were a potted plant with healing leaves, like aloe vera or marijuana.¶ But let us stop right there and ask two questions that all students should put to their economics professors.¶ First, there is a deep theorem in mathematics that says when something grows it gets bigger! So, when the economy grows it too gets bigger. How big can the economy be, Professor? How big is it now? How big should it be? Have economists ever considered these questions? And most pointedly, what makes them think that growth (i.e., physical expansion of the economic subsystem into the finite containing biosphere), is not already increasing environmental and social costs faster than production benefits, thereby becoming uneconomic growth, making us poorer, not richer? After all, real GDP, the measure of “economic” growth so-called, does not separate costs from benefits, but conflates them as “economic” activity. How would we know when growth became uneconomic? Remedial and defensive activity becomes ever greater as we grow from an “empty-world” to a “full-world” economy, characterized by congestion, interference, displacement, depletion and pollution. The defensive expenditures induced by these negatives are all added to GDP, not subtracted. Be prepared, students, for some hand waving, throat clearing, and subject changing. But don’t be bluffed.¶ Second question; do you then, Professor, see growth as a continuing process, desirable in itself-- or as a temporary process required to reach a sufficient level of wealth which would thereafter be maintained more or less in a steady state? At least 99% of modern neoclassical economists hold the growth forever view. We have to go back to [John Stuart Mill](http://www.eoearth.org/article/Mill,_John_Stuart) and the earlier Classical Economists to find serious treatment of the idea of a non-growing economy, the Stationary State. What makes modern economists so sure that the Classical Economists were wrong? Just dropping history of economic thought from the curriculum is not a refutation!¶ Here are some reasons to think that the Classical Economists are right.¶ A long run norm of continuous growth could make sense, only if one of the three following conditions were true:¶ if the economy were not an open subsystem of a finite and non-growing biophysical system, ¶ if the economy were growing in a non-physical dimension, or¶ if the [laws of thermodynamics](http://www.eoearth.org/article/Laws_of_thermodynamics) did not hold.

#### **Growth is unsustainable – it makes every single resource finite**

Brent 11 [Jason Brent – author for countercurrents.org and expert on population growth, July 18, 2011, “Cessation Of Growth: Voluntary And Coercive Population Control”, <http://www.countercurrents.org/brent180711.htm> ]

Since compound/exponential growth is so powerful, both the economy and the population of the world must cease their growth in the very near future. I can state with almost absolute certainty that if either were to grow at the compound rate of one percent per year growth will cease no later than 140 years from today as such a growth rate would cause both of them to increase by a factor of four and the Earth could not support a population four times as great as the present population or a world economy four times as great as the current world economy.

7. The resources used by humanity can be divided into two groups, nonrenewable and renewable. By definition nonrenewable resources are finite and will eventually be used up by humanity. Many, if not most, renewable resources are being used up by humanity faster than nature can replace them and, therefore, they also must be considered nonrenewable.

8. Recycling, substitution of one resource for another resource, new technologies, environmentalism, and any other action taken by humanity will not permit continuous compound economic and/or population growth. Alternative energy resources will not permit continuous compound population and/or economic growth. Humanity has withdrawn from the Earth the most easily accessible resources which the Earth can provide. In the future resources will become more expensive and difficult to obtain as they will be substantially less accessible and will be more difficult to process into usable a form.

9. The concept of obtaining resources from extraterrestrial planets or transferring part of humanity to extraterrestrial planets is a non-workable fallacy.

We are consuming too fast – continuing growth is gambling our survival

Brent 11 [Jason Brent – author for countercurrents.org and expert on population growth, January 09, 2011, “Billions of Humans Will Die Horribly”, [http://www.countercurrents.org/brent090111.htm](http://www.countercurrents.org/brent180711.htm)l]

Now let us consider population growth during the same period, 1950-2050. The best estimates/projections/predictions (medium) for the year 2050 are, assuming no intervening major catastrophes, the UN 9.15 billion, the US Census Bureau 9.28 billion, and the Population Reference Bureau 9.48 billion. These estimates take into consideration AIDS, the fact that some industrialized countries have low birth rates and every other factor necessary to make the best estimates. For the purpose of this essay I will use 9.2 billion. 9.2 billion is 3.68 times larger than the population of 2.5 billion in 1950.We can now combine the increase in population with the increase in per capita usage of resources--3.68 times 4.57 equals 16.82. In very simple terms, 16.82 represents the increase in resources the earth will have to provide to humanity in the year 2050 when compared with the year 1950. While that number cannot be applied to every single resource, it can be applied to the overall usage of resources. A skeptic may argue that due to environmentalism, recycling, new technologies and efficiencies less resources will be needed in 2050 when compared to 1950 to produce a unit of economic output and the skeptic may be correct. To be very, very conservative let us assume a 100% increase in efficiency---instead of 20 mpg we assume 40 mpg, instead of using two tons of iron ore to produce something only one ton is used, instead of ten tons of water to grow one ton of grain only five tons of water is needed, garbage and human waste for each person on the planet is reduced from two tons to one ton, etc. Based on that very, very conservative assumption, the earth will still have to provide in 2050 8.41 times the resources it provided in 1950.¶ The simple questions become can the earth provide those resources to humanity in 2050 when the resources used between 1950 and 2050 are taken into consideration and if the earth can provide the resources for how long can they be provided? While no one can provide an absolute answers to those questions, it would be the height of folly for humanity to gamble its survival on the ability for the earth to provide in 2050 8.41 times the resources it provided in 1950 and it would be extremely foolish for humanity to gamble its survival that the earth could continue providing those resources for any length of time. Humanity has two choices---reduce population or reduce the per capita usage of resources, There are no other choices. If humanity does not reduce population and/or reduce per capita usage of resources, the earth will be unable to supply the resources civilization needs to function and the population will be reduced by nature--by war, starvation, disease, ethnic cleansing and other horrors.

#### Economic growth unsustainable-collapse inevitable

Avery, 7-14[John Scales Avery, Theoretical chemist noted for his research publications in quantum chemistry, thermodynamics, evolution, and history of science. Since the early 1990s, Avery has been an active World peace activist. During these years, he was part of a group associated with the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs. In 1995, this group received the Nobel Peace Prize for their efforts. Presently, he is an Associate Professor in quantum chemistry at the University of Copenhagen, “Limits To Growth And Climate Change,” 7-14-2012, http://www.countercurrents.org/avery140712.htm]

However, it is obvious that on a finite Earth, neither population growth nor resource-using and pollution-generating economic growth can continue indefinitely. A “healthy" economic growth rate of 4 percent per year corresponds to an increase by a factor of 50 in a century. (The reader is invited to calculate the factor of increase in five centuries. The answer is 312,500,000!) No one can maintain that this type of growth is sustainable except by refusing to look more than a short distance into the future. Sooner or later (perhaps surprisingly soon) an entirely new form of economics will be needed - not the empty-world economics of Adam Smith, but what might be called “full-world economics", or “steady-state economics".

#### Ecological and economical collapse is now—2012 proves

Barry, 7-16 [Dr. Glen Barry, President and Founder of Ecological Internet, Ph.D. in Land Resources from U-Wisconsin-Madison, “U.S. Abrupt Climate Change 2012,” 7-16-2012, <http://www.countercurrents.org/barry160712.htm>]

During 2012, the United States of America, with an extreme lack of winter, spring tornadoes, summer wildfires, droughts, massive storms, heat waves, and other weather “weirding”, is witnessing an unprecedented break down in North American climate and ecosystems. Lack of reliable atmospheric patterns threatens water, food, livelihoods, security and general well-being as never before.¶ All industry’s well-financed climate and ecological denial in the world can’t undermine the truthful scientific fact that global ecosystems’ bio-geochemical processes are failing.¶ Global, regional, and local ecosystems are literally falling apart — witness climate, drought, and wildfire impacted Southwestern United States — land normally so arid few should live there, and which is on the verge of becoming uninhabitable. Everywhere you look, we see it again and again: No ecology, no economy, nothing forever. U.S. Western wild fires and epic drought, the record smashing heat wave, and concurrent extreme weather mayhem from the United Kingdom to Russia, show the consequences of abrupt climate change, water and land mismanagement, and over-population and inequitable consumption; and foreshadow all our futures as ecosystems collapse. Soon, barring major actions to sustain ecosystems, America and the world’s food, water, ecosystems, and security will be further threatened as such global ecological collapse intensifies.

#### Transition is inevitable – the underpinnings of our economy are collapsing

Wallerstein 11 – \*senior research scholar at Yale (Immanuel, “The Global Economy Won’t Recover, Now or Ever,” January-February 2011, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional_wisdom?page=0,9>)

Virtually everyone everywhere-economists, politicians, pundits -- agrees that the world has been in some kind of economic trouble since at least 2008. And virtually everyone seems to believe that in the next few years the world will somehow "recover" from these difficulties. After all, upturns always occur after downturns. The remedies recommended vary considerably, but the idea that the system shall continue in its essential features is a deeply rooted faith. But it is wrong. All systems have lives. When their processes move too far from equilibrium, they fluctuate chaotically and bifurcate. Our existing system, what I call a capitalist world-economy, has been in existence for some 500 years and has for at least a century encompassed the entire globe. It has functioned remarkably well. But like all systems, it has moved steadily further and further from equilibrium. For a while now, it has moved too far from equilibrium, such that it is today in structural crisis. The problem is that the basic costs of all production have risen remarkably. There are the personnel expenses of all kinds -- for unskilled workers, for cadres, for top-level management. There are the costs incurred as producers pass on the costs of their production to the rest of us -- for detoxification, for renewal of resources, for infrastructure. And the democratization of the world has led to demands for more and more education, more and more health provisions, and more and more guarantees of lifetime income. To meet these demands, there has been a significant increase in taxation of all kinds. Together, these costs have risen beyond the point that permits serious capital accumulation. Why not then simply raise prices? Because there are limits beyond which one cannot push their level. It is called the elasticity of demand. The result is a growing profit squeeze, which is reaching a point where the game is not worth the candle. What we are witnessing as a result is chaotic fluctuations of all kinds -- economic, political, sociocultural. These fluctuations cannot easily be controlled by public policy. The result is ever greater uncertainty about all kinds of short-term decision-making, as well as frantic realignments of every variety. Doubt feeds on itself as we search for ways out of the menacing uncertainty posed by terrorism, climate change, pandemics, and nuclear proliferation. The only sure thing is that the present system cannot continue. The fundamental political struggle is over what kind of system will replace capitalism, not whether it should survive. The choice is between a new system that replicates some of the present system's essential features of hierarchy and polarization and one that is relatively democratic and egalitarian. The extraordinary expansion of the world-economy in the postwar years (more or less 1945 to 1970) has been followed by a long period of economic stagnation in which the basic source of gain has been rank speculation sustained by successive indebtednesses. The latest financial crisis didn't bring down this system; it merely exposed it as hollow. Our recent "difficulties" are merely the next-to-last bubble in a process of boom and bust the world-system has been undergoing since around 1970. The last bubble will be state indebtednesses, including in the so-called emerging economies, leading to bankruptcies. Most people do not recognize -- or refuse to recognize -- these realities. It is wrenching to accept that the historical system in which we are living is in structural crisis and will not survive. Meanwhile, the system proceeds by its accepted rules. We meet at G-20 sessions and seek a futile consensus. We speculate on the markets. We "develop" our economies in whatever way we can. All this activity simply accentuates the structural crisis. The real action, the struggle over what new system will be created, is elsewhere.

#### The economy will collapse now—shift now key to solve the impact

Dufrechou 09(Stephen, professor @ Southwest Tennessee Community College and significant writer on capitalism, 2009, http://newsjunkiepost.com/2009/11/25/is-capitalism-at-a-breaking-point/, AD: 11/17/10)

The study also states that “the world’s economic system has failed to live up to its promises”. It then cites Japan’s recently-elected center-left Prime Minister, Yukio Hatoyama, who called for a global “fraternity” of livable societies. “It is self-evident,” Hatoyama said, “that free economic activity in markets invigorates society … But it is also obvious that the idea of letting markets decide everything for the survival of the strongest, or the idea of economic rationalism at the expense of people’s lives, does not hold true anymore.” The bottom line is that capitalism must radically change if it wishes to survive. In fact, it must change to such an extreme degree that it looks drastically different from “capitalism” of the past. If it does not do so, revolutions are going to occur globally. The Coming Social Implosion in America All of these facts, regarding capitalism’s innate, inhumane flaws, are lost on most Americans—even as directly they suffer from them, bizarrely enough.  This is largely because information like this, when it does break in the media, is automatically dismissed by many US citizens. Thus, this crucial information also becomes “invisible”, both to the government and the citizenry. It becomes “invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see” it. After five decades of ideological indoctrination and institutional miseducation, a sweeping majority of Americans are left psychologically unable to accept anything which does not fit with their ideological programming. Thus, they fail to understand the causes of their grim social reality, even when faced with the naked truth. But as the corporate media and US politicians continually offer platitudes, while sweeping the facts of reality under the rug, the “invisible” in America are growing in number—and growing enraged at this state of affairs, even if they can’t fully comprehend the nature of those affairs. The rage, one way or another, will ignite. As Joan Didion once said of the 1960’s, “The center was not holding”. The center is not holding today, either. Governments cannot expect to maintain such inhuman conditions for long. But what will (sadly, horrifically) separate the protests of the 60′s from coming revolts today is crucial: the 60′s movements were driven by philosophically-based, humanist ethics; today—though there will be some intellectual-minded groups—the coming revolt will be largely void of such substance. Of the 1960′s protesters, the civil rights movement was fueled by such moral thinkers as Martin Buber and St. Augustine; the second-wave feminist movement was driven by critics like Simone de Beauvoir and Betty Friedan; the anti-war movement was influenced by a wide range of philosophers, from Karl Marx to Mahatma Gandhi. But if the French suburban riots of autumn 2005 are any indication of where protest is today, then America is in grave trouble. Philosopher Slavoj Zizek notes in his book, “Violence”: “the 2005 revolt [in France] was just an outburst with no pretense to [philosophical] vision … There were no particular demands made by the protesters in the Paris suburbs. There was only an insistence on *recognition*,based on a vague, unarticulated *resentment*… In a weird self-referential short circuit, they were protesting against the very reaction to their protests. “Populist reason” here encounters its irrational limit: what we have is a zero-level protest, a violent protest act which demands nothing.” Given the lack of education and psychological stability in the US, the coming American revolt will likely be more “irrational”, even more at the “zero-level” of violence, which “demands nothing” of substance, than the French riots were. The “populist reason”, here, is fueled by nothing but fifty years of irrational consumer psychology, by infantile fantasies of wish-fulfillments. No logic, no moral philosophy, no humanist idealism will be trumpeted—just violent demands to be “*recognized*“. Such events could easily turn the US into a genuine police state. Nevertheless, soon the “invisible” will explode into “visible” revolt. Then, no one will be able to ignore the giant bulge of facts, which had been swept under the ideological rug.  Americans, indeed, are in for a turbulent coming decade. Brace yourself now. The facts will explode. History, itself, is moving again.

#### **Empirics prove**

Bardi 11 **–** professor of Physical Chemistry at the University of Florence in Italy (Ugo, *The Limits to Growth Revisited* pg 1-2)

The results of the study were far from optimistic. The simulations showed that, in a “business as usual” set of assumptions, economic growth could not be maintained throughout the twenty-first century. In the model, the gradual depletion of nonrenewable resources, coupled with increasing pollution and population growth, resulted in the peaking and the subsequent decline of the world’s industrial and agricultural production. That was followed, later on, by the decline of population as a consequence of the reduced availability of food and services. The “base case” scenario of the study, the model that used parameters based on the best, generated the start of the collapse of industrial and agricultural production sometime during the second decade of the twenty-first century. Scenarios based on more optimistic assumptions on the availability of natural resources could only postpone the collapse, but not avoid it. Only specific interventions to curb economic growth and reduce the consumption of natural resources could put humankind on a sustainable path and avoid collapse.

### AT: Technology Solves

False – that only closes the window for ANY recovery

Barry 11 [Dr. Glen Barry – PhD in Land Resources from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, July 25, 2011, “EARTH MEANDERS: Ecology Bubble Bursts”, <http://www.ecoearth.info/blog/2011/07/earth_meanders_ecology_bubble.asp> ]

Hubristic faith in technological solutions to Earth being beyond its carrying capacity is fanatical madness. Continued technological reliance to “solve” Earth’s ecological carrying capacity problem will only inflate the bubble further and result in a bigger bursting, and less remnants from which to try to reconstitute an ecologically based future. Inane techno-optimism such as geo-engineering is ecocide right up to the end – pushing Earth to the wall, raping her, before killing her. It is far preferable to begin to adjust human demands upon ecology to reasonable limits. Not only is ecology truth, and you cannot eat money, but collapsing ecosystems are not substitutable with technology.What to do? We need knowledge based solutions to sustaining global ecology that are also just, equitable and enhance human dignity - not superstitious, illogical, greedy, and ignorant responses of god's self-chosen ruling elites.It is too late to stop the global ecology bubble from bursting. Yet a short window exists, perhaps, to lessen the impact of the ecology bubble burst, and provide for some manner of decent existence and potential for restoration and regeneration of a new human/nature project post-collapse. But if we continue to do nothing, or next to nothing, the cumulative impacts of global ecological collapse will intensify and prove to be unrecoverable, unless met with opposing force to end the ecocidal activities surpassing ecology's limits.It is time for us to return to the land, air, water and oceans and fight for their and our protection and restoration. Simply we must embrace ecological restoration, ecosystem protection, industrial power down, escalating protest and a people’s power Earth Revolution. For continued shared survival the human family must protect and restore natural ecosystems as the keystone response to biodiversity, ecosystem, climate, food, water, poverty and rights crises. Few are doing so as rigorously as is necessary.

Technical advances can’t solve—overshoot to big

Trainer, ’11[Ted Trainer, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of New South Wales “The radical implications of a zero growth economy”, real-world economics review, issue no. 57, 6 September 2011, pp. 71-82, <http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue57/Trainer57.pdf>]

We come now to the crucial assumption most people make, i.e., that there is no need to even think about questioning growth, let alone reducing consumption or economic output, let alone cutting GDP by a factor of 5 to 10. The generally assumed view is, “We will all be able to go on buying lots of goods, living in gigantic houses, driving long distances, going away for holidays, jetting around the world, having elaborate wardrobes etc., and increasing our consumption of those things every year – because our wizard technologists will find ways of producing goods and running cars etc. without causing significant problems. Indeed the technologies already exist; it’s just that our dull-witted politicians have failed to implement them.”¶ However, the overshoot is far too great for any plausible technical advances to be able to reduce the problems to tolerable proportions. Perhaps the best known "technical fix" optimist, Amory Lovins, claims that we could at least double global output while halving the resource and environmental impacts, i.e., we could achieve a "Factor Four" reduction. (Von Weisacher and Lovins, 1997. More recently a Factor Five reduction is argued.) But this would be nowhere near enough to solve the problems.¶ Let us assume that present global resource and ecological impacts must be halved. It has been explained that if we in rich countries average 3% growth, and 9 billion rose to the living standards we would then have by 2050, total world output would be almost 20 times as great as it is today. It is highly implausible that technical advance will make it possible to multiply total world economic output by 20 while halving impacts, i.e., to enable a Factor 40 reduction?

### AT: No Transition

There is a transition movement that is working now and is key to solving extinction

Trainer 8 [Ted Trainer - Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, September 14, 2008, “The Simpler Way: Working for Transition from Consumer Society to a Simpler more Cooperative, Just and Ecologically Sustainable Society”, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/]

The alternative is about ensuring a very high quality of life for all without anywhere near as much production, consumption, exporting, investment, resource use, environmental damage, work etc. as our present society involves. The important point is that there are many rich alternative sources of satisfaction other than material acquisition and consuming. Consider having much time for arts and crafts and personal growth, living in a rich and supportive community, having to go to work for money only two days a week, living in a diverse and productive leisure-rich landscape, having socially worthwhile and enjoyable work with no fear of unemployment...and knowing you are not contributing to global problems. Many people now accept this view of our situation and the solution, and are working for transition to the alternative way. There is now a Global Alternative Society Movement building new settlements and systems of the required kind. The fate of the planet depends on whether this Movement can provide many impressive examples of sustainable, just and pleasant ways showing people in consumer society that there is a better way.

Trends prove that transition is possible

**Soper 08** [Kate Soper – philosopher at London Metropolitan University, October 18, 2008, “The Good Life”, New Scientist, Lexis]

BACK in the 1970s, few people listened to scientists' warnings about global warming. Even fewer heeded calls to curb economic growth so we could protect the environment. Today, these ideas are starting to be appreciated. We are hearing ever more about the contradiction between hanging on to a habitable planet and the expansionary demands of the global market

The Earth is dying – we must act now to prevent human extinction

Barry 11 [Dr. Glen Barry – PhD in Land Resources from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, July 25, 2011, “EARTH MEANDERS: Ecology Bubble Bursts”, <http://www.ecoearth.info/blog/2011/07/earth_meanders_ecology_bubble.asp>]

Ever since the human family embraced a growth based mentality and obsequious faith in liberal economics, we have witnessed a series of bubbles. The most recent boom-bust cycle has been the still unresolved financial and mortgage bubbles, but bubbles go as far back as the Dutch tulip mania of 1637. Exuberant yet clearly unsustainable growth, or inversely destruction, appears to be inherent to industrial, speculative, and growth obsessed capitalism. Bubbles represent the human proclivity for greed, to grow too fast, overshooting demand, while often exhausting key resources.Global ecology, the biggest bubble of all, is now collapsing and will soon burst. Voracious economic and human growth have raged for three centuries upon the back of dismantling ecosystems globally. Humanity’s economic outputs have been over-valued relative to the ecologically mediated resources incautiously razed for their production. Earth’s carrying capacity - meaning ecology's finite ability to provide ecosystem services and absorb pollution – has been surpassed. Having grown beyond what Earth can bear, the human family is said to be in "overshoot", which can only lead to collapse. Earth is a living being and like all life can die. Earth is dying now as virus-like humanity destroys its host's ecosystem organs. Every day we scrape Earth of its plants and animals, dig and drill into toxic “resources” not meant to be unearthed, and crap our wastes into air, land and water. Systems biology tells us an exponentially growing system in positive feedback – such as the super-sized economy feasting upon finite and precious global ecology – always eventually destroys itself. This is particularly so given perilous lag times of many ecosystem processes and losses.The ecological systems underlying human existence are beginning to burst like bubbles. Virtually every type of ecosystem and their output – fish, food, water, air, climate, forests, land, wetlands, soil, etc – are now collapsing locally and regionally. We are witnessing this steady biological impoverishment, of virtually every life-giving ecosystem, aggregate to the whole biosphere – the thin mantle of life surrounding an otherwise lifeless Earth. When speaking of a biosphere bubble burst it is accurate to say Earth is dying. And that it need not be that way, if only we were able to change to maintain ecosystems that foster all human and life’s being.Ecology has provided a constant stream of services to humanity and other life, making Earth habitable, for what seems like eternity. Food offers one illustrative example of humanity’s utter dependence upon ecology: sun, water, soil, climate, seeds and healthy agro-ecological systems are where food comes from - not grocery stores and mini-marts. That we need air, water, soil and other ecosystems are demonstrable truths – unlike beliefs in unknowable ancient messiahs, which have guided so much of Earth ecology’s destruction.Industrial capitalism is dependent upon destroying ecosystems as resources for temporary increases in the well-being of some. While climate change is one of several global ecosystems that are collapsing due to human over-use, it is important to remember there are other collapsing ecological systems – including soil, water, forest, wetland, nitrogen, ocean, toxic, ecosystem, poverty, food and others - that singly and together threaten continued human and ecological being. It is these potentially cumulative impacts of several assaults upon key global ecosystems that are most problematic and potentially chaotic. And it’s not even done fairly, as 2.5 billion live on under $2 a day.

A revolution over transportation is required to halt unsustainable growth

Blackwelder 10 [Brent Blackwelder – President of Friends of Earth and Founder of American Rivers, August 2010, “Steady State Transportation: Closing the Door on the Dirty Oil Era”, <http://steadystate.org/steady-state-transportation-closing-the-door-on-the-dirty-oil-era/>]

If human civilization is to make the move to a steady state economy that provides prosperity without growth, it must meet people’s basic mobility needs without reliance on fossil fuels. The U.S. requires a revolutionary transformation of its transportation systems, and recent experience with the downsides of oil provides a potent political push to overcome inertia.

Perception of Rejection key

Nickerson 09 (Mike Nickerson, Co-director of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Evolution, Executive Director of the Sustainability Project;2009; “LIfe, Money and Illusion: Living on Earth as if We Want to Stay”; New Society Publishers; http://newsociety.com/var/storage/blurbs/9780865716599\_excerpt.pdf)

No person provides directly for all of his or her own needs. The economy is the process by which people exchange one sort of help goods they make or services they perform — for those of others. Economic exchange need not be based on selfishness or exploitation. When two people love one another, the help they provide each other is a basic form of economics. While economic exchange is the foundation of human communities, we are stuck in a model that is on a collision course with planetary limits. To adopt another model, we have to overcome the perception that the present structure is the only form possible. The human family has come to what is probably the most critical choice we will ever make. It is now necessary to question what we are trying to accomplish.

Now is key

Li 11 (Dr. Minqi Li, Assistant Professor Department of Economics, University of Utah; “The 21st Century: Is There an Alternative (to Socialism)?”; March 2011)

Finally, suppose the world starts to immediately reduce carbon dioxide emissions and maintains an average annual reduction rate of 4 percent for the rest of the 21st century, then the cumulative carbon dioxides emissions over the 21st century will amount to about one trillion metric tons. This is likely to lead to a 2°C warming by the end of the 21st century and a long-term equilibrium warming of about 4°C. Even though this scenario would still carry some significant risk of runaway global warming, under the current circumstances this is the only scenario that promises the preservation of the human civilization as we know it.

### AT: Infinite Resources

Even if resources become infinite – collapse is inevitable

Bardi 11 [Ugo Bardi- professor of Physical Chemistry at the University of Florence in Italy, “The Limits to Growth Revisited “ pg 43-44, dml]

The first set of possibilities, different parameters in input, deals mainly with the exploration of the hypothesis “What if nonrenewable resources are more abundant than assumed in the base case scenario?” However, larger initial stocks of resources do not change the basic behavior of the model. With more natural resources, industrial and agricultural production grow to higher levels than in the “standard run,” but collapse takes place anyway, although later in time, being generated either by depletion or by the effect of unchecked pollution (or both effects at the same time). The model can also to deal with technological innovation, although somewhat indirectly. The model does not have an explicit “progress” parameter, but it is possible to model innovation in terms of its effects on other parameters. For instance, a breakthrough in energy production would manifest itself in the availability of more abundant nonrenewable resources, since with more energy we would be able to exploit lower grade mineral ores (Bardi 2008a). Other breakthroughs might involve more efficient agricultural techniques that would appear in the model as a higher yield in food production. These and other possibilities, however, do not qualitatively change the results of the simulations. Collapse still arrives, although later in comparison to the base case scenario. Even for the case of “infinite mineral resources” (simulated as an ever-increasing technological efficiency in recovering them), collapse is the eventual result of uncontrolled pollution and the lowering of agricultural yields.

### **AT: No Mindset Shift**

Economic collapse forces people to realize they need to transition away from the growth-centered model

Trainer 6 [Ted Trainer - Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, June 2006, “On Eco-villages and the Transition, The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY”, vol.2, no.3 http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol2/vol2\_no3\_Trainer\_eco-villages\_PRINTABLE.htm]

There is no possibility of achieving significant change in this massively complacent society before the crises impact. While the supermarkets are stacked and the share prices are high, there will be no interest in change from the pursuit of affluence and growth. The probability of a severe petroleum supply crisis impacting within ten years, possibly accompanied by a collapse of the global financial house of cards, will concentrate minds wonderfully. We will then get our chance. People will realise with a jolt that the old system cannot provide for them and they will be forced to turn to local economic development. Governments will not be able or willing to run things for us so local systems will emerge, run by local people or they will not survive. There is a good chance however that the window of opportunity will soon be closed by chaotic failure to reorganise in sensible ways, or a knee-jerk response from the ruling class and the public in general to grab more oilfields.

# Aff Answers

## Growth Good

### Conflict

#### Growth solves conflict

Marquardt, 5 (Michael J., Professor of Human Resource Development and International Affairs, George Washington University, Globalization: The Pathway to Prosperity, Freedom and Peace,” http://org8220renner.alliant.wikispaces.net/file/view/Marquardt.pdfHuman Resource pg. 127-129, 2005)

Perhaps the greatest value of globalization is its potential for creating a world of peace. Economic growth has been identiﬁed as one of the strongest forces that turn people away from conﬂict and wars among groups, tribes, and nations. Global companies strongly discourage governments from warring against countries in which they have investments. Focusing on economic growth encourages cooperation and living in relative peace.

#### Studies show economic growth lessens that chance for conflicts

Hupreys 03 (Macartan Huphreys is a Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Columbia University And Director, Center for the Study of Development Strategies “Economics and Violent Conflict” <http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/Peace_and_Business/Economics_and_Violent_Conflict.pdf>, 2003)

One might expect rich nations to be more violent than poor ones because the rich ones have more to fight over. 10 The econometric evidence however suggests the opposite. Most research shows that wealth reduces the likelihood of civil war, 11 and that economic growth also reduces risks while recessions worsen them. Figures derived from World Bank econometric models (Figure 1) show a striking relationship between the wealth of a nation and its chances of having a civil war. 12 The figure suggests that differences in wealth are most relevant among poorer countries. A country with GDP per person of just $250 has a predicted probability of war onset (at some point over the next five years) of 15%, even if it is otherwise considered an “average” country. This probability of war reduces by half for a country with GDP of just $600 per person and is reduced by half again to below 4% for a country with income of $1250. Countries with income per person over $5000 have a less than 1% chance of experiencing civil conflicts, all else being equal. There are various explanations for why this is so. But so far little work has been undertaken to distinguish between them. The most common is that wealthier societies are better able to protect assets, thus making violence less attractive for would-be rebels. 13 Another explanation, given by political scientist Thomas Homer Dixon argues that poverty causes violence, and points to cases where scarcity leads to migrations that result in conflicts between identity groups over resources. Alternatively, the relationship could be spurious in the sense that there are other features of a country, such as a democratic culture, that make it at once more prosperous and less violent. And causality may in fact run in the opposite direction: rich countries may be rich in part because they have had little civil conflict in their recent past. 14 Whatever the reason, the figures suggest that growth oriented initiatives and conflict prevention initiatives are mutually reinforcing. And the figures provide a rationale for those who say that it is in the interest of wealthy nations to promote economic growth in poor countries in order to avoid the spillover effects of likely conflicts there. In terms of policy implications, the analysis suggests that the greatest gains in conflict prevention are to be made by focusing development efforts on the very poor rather than on countries of intermediate wealth.

#### Economic growth is key to prevent conflict

Bernauera et al 10(Climate Change, Economic Growth, and Conflict Thomas Bernauera, Anna Kalbhenna, Vally Koubia,b and Gabriele Ruoffa a ETH Zurich Center for Comparative and International Studies (CIS) and Institute for Environmental Decisions (IED) and b University of Bern Department of Economics and Oeschger Institute for Climate Change Research;<http://ncgg.princeton.edu/IPES/2010/papers/S1115_paper1.pdf> 2010)

Economic growth and conflict

Previous research has shown that reduced levels of domestic economic activity tend to create incentives for increased conflict.6 Drawing on this research, we posit that climate change, by reducing economic growth (that is, reducing the ability of the economy to grow), affects the utility of individuals and groups to engage in civil conflict. It does so in two ways. First, negative climatic conditions, via their negative effect on economic growth, can reduce resources available to the government (e.g. by reducing tax revenue). The government thus has fewer resources to “invest in people”, for instance to provide better nutrition, schooling, and on-the-job training that would lead to improved living conditions. It also has fewer resources to “provide for the people” in terms of sustaining peace through the maintenance of law and order – the latter, for instance, lowers the probability of rebel victory by increasing the cost of rebellion. Second, climate related phenomena such as lower precipitation, higher temperature, and extreme weather events lead to lower personal income from production and also decrease the opportunity for future employment. Consequently, the opportunity cost of rebellion decreases because the expected returns from peaceful employment, say farming, compared to joining criminal and insurgent groups are lower. In situations like these, when individuals expect to earn more from criminal or insurgent activity than from lawful and peaceful activity, predatory behavior becomes more likely. The latter implicates conditions in which each individual or group’s effort to increase its own welfare reduces the welfare of others and also increases the probability of mutual attacks (Jervis & Snyder, 1999). The argument that poverty breeds conflict and war is supported by several empirical studies (e.g. Hidalgo et al., 2010; Dube & Vargas, 2008; Hegre & Sambanis, 2006; Collier & Hoeffler, 2004; Fearon & Laitin, 2003). For example, Collier and Hoeffler (2004) find that low economic growth, which is a proxy for foregone earnings, has considerable explanatory power in their intrastate conflict regression. They conclude that rapid economic growth reduces the risk of conflict. Dube and Vargas (2008) examine whether violent actions in Colombia in the 1994-2005 period are linked to low opportunity costs of agricultural labor, using crop prices as a proxy for such costs. They show that a drop in the price of coffee substantially increased the incidence and intensity of intrastate conflict in coffee-intensive areas. They attribute this result to the lowering of opportunity costs of joining a rebel movement (via depressed wages) in coffee growing areas. Hidalgo et al. (2010), using a panel data set with over 50,000 municipality-year observations, show that land invasions by the rural poor in Brazil occur immediately after adverse economic shocks, which in the statistical analysis are instrumented by rainfall. Consequently, our argument that reduced economic growth can impact on the likelihood of civil conflict is well supported by the existing literature.

### Warming

Growth is critical to solve warming -- IPCC reports.

Worstall, 11 – contributor @ Forbes (Tim, “Solving Climate Change” 8/10, http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2011/08/10/solving-climate-change/)//AH

The IPCC process has just released their first update to these models since 2000. The overview paper is here. I’m not going to delve into all of the details (for which readers will no doubt thank me) I just wanted to make a few general points with the use of a couple of their graphs. As a handy guide, “RCPnumber” should be interpreted thusly: the higher the number after the RCP the closer we are to boiling Flipper as the last humans fight on the desert shores of Antarctica. The lower the number the more we can say, “Phew, we dodged the problem”. More specifically, RCP2.6 means CO2 peaks out at 490 ppm and then declines. RCP8.5 means it gets to 1370 ppm and perhaps keeps going leading to that dolphin BBQ. Note please that I don’t have to believe these numbers, you don’t, no one has to believe any of this at all. However, we do need to realise that these are the numbers which are being fed into the climate change models (perhaps more accurately, that these are the numbers that will be) and thus produce those IPCC reports. Which means that anyone taking the outputs of those IPCC reports seriously needs to take these inputs seriously. My general points can be made quite simply with the aid of two of their charts. We know very well that there’s a connection between economic growth and population size. Richer countries on average have lower fertility rates so as the world becomes richer fewer children are born. So more economic growth leading to peaking and declining population really isn’t a surprise at all. However, look at that light green line. The RCP 2.6 one, the “whew, we dodged it” one. The highest economic growth model leads to the lowest level of emissions considered. Less economic growth leads to higher emissions. Note again that these are not my assumptions. They are those of the IPCC process. Which is something of a body blow to those telling us that we must cease economic growth if calamity is to be averted: the very assumptions built into the whole proof that climate change is something we should worry about say exactly the opposite. Economic growth is the way out, not the problem. By the way, the assumption there about the rate of economic growth, from a roughly $50 trillion global economy in 2000 to a roughly $300 trillion one in 2100. That’s not all that far off the growth rate we had in the 20th century. The second chart: This is how much energy we’re going to use and where we’re going to get it from. We need to be more parsimonious in our use of energy, yes. We need to use less of it per unit of GDP (which is known as “energy intensity” and their desired decrease in that isn’t far off what the advanced economies already manage) but we don’t actually need to use less of it overall. Less oil, yes, but we can near double our energy consumption and still hit that “we missed the problem” sweet spot. It’s also amusing to note what a small role for solar and wind power is necessary to hit that target. Again, I want to point out that these aren’t my assumptions, they’re not made up out of whole cloth by some denialist, these are the assumptions which the very scientists who tell us about climate change themselves think are the driving forces and likely outcomes. Which leads to a very interesting conclusion indeed. We don’t have to stop economic growth at all, we can quite happily have around the same amount of it that we had in the 20 th century. So that’s a large number of the Green Miserablists shown to be wrong. We don’t have to reduce or even severely limit our energy consumption: we just have to get the growth in our consumption from other than the usual sources. A large number of the Energy Miserablists shown to be wrong there too. Or, to boil it right down, the IPCC is telling us that the solution to climate change is economic growth and low-carbon energy generation. That’s absolutely all we have to do. Or as I pointed out at book length recently, a globalised market economy with a carbon tax will do just fine.

Growth solves warming—wealth ensures clean tech

Panayotou 3, (Environmental Lecturer at Harvard, Director of the Environment and Sustainable Development Program, “Economic Growth and The Environment, Chapter 2” http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/ead/pub/032/032\_c2.pdf)

At the other extreme, are those who argue that the fastest road to environmental improvement is along the path of economic growth: with higher incomes comes increased demand for goods and services that are less material intensive, as well as demand for improved environmental quality that leads to the adoption of environmental protection measures. As Beckerman puts it, “The strong correlation between incomes, and the extent to which environmental protection measures are adopted, demonstrates that in the longer run, the surest way to improve your environment is to become rich”.**58** Some went as far as claiming that environmental regulation, by reducing economic growth, may actually reduce environmental quality.**59**¶

Growth solves warming, at the very least there is not impact—Kuznets Curve proves

Panayotou 3, (Envioronmental Lecuturer at Hardvard, Director of the Environment and Sustainable Devlopment Program, “Economic Growht and The Environment, Chapter 2” <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/ead/pub/032/032_c2.pdf>)

Y et, others**60** have hypothesized that the relationship between economic growth and environmental quality, whether positive or negative, is not fixed along a country’s development path; indeed it may change sign from positive to negative as a country reaches a level of income at which people demand and afford more efficient infrastructure and a cleaner environment. The implied inverted-U relationship between environmental degradation and economic growth came to be known as the “environmental Kuznets curve,” by analogy with the income- inequality relationship postulated by Kuznets.**61** At low levels of development, both the quantity and the intensity of environmental degradation are limited to the impacts of subsistence economic activity on the resource base and to limited quantities of biodegradable wastes. As agriculture and resource extraction intensify and industrialization takes off, both resource depletion and waste generation accelerate. At higher levels of development, structural change towards information-based industries and services, more efficient technologies, and increased demand for environmental quality result in levelling-off and a steady decline of environmental degradation,**62** as seen in chart 2.1.1.

### Environment

Trends are reversing – Kuznets curve theory means growth helps the environment

Sari and Soytas, 9 (Ramazan and Ugur, Dept. of Business Administration, Middle East Technical University, “Are global warming and economic growth compatible? Evidence from ﬁve OPEC countries?,” Applied Energy, Volume 86, pg. 1887-1893, ScienceDirect, Tashma, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261908003267>, 2009)

The recent studies on the other hand improved our understanding in at least two ways. Firstly, the empirical studies may be suffering from omitted variables bias that may yield spurious causality test results. Hence, a multivariate approach should be preferred over bi-variate approaches. Secondly, the temporal relationship between energy use and income may be depending on country speciﬁc factors. Furthermore, depending on the nature of the link in concern, alternative policy options may be available to policy makers in different countries. Therefore, studying countries individually may be necessary. There is an abundance of studies that test the environmental Kuznets curve (EKC) hypothesis (see [6,45] for a review) which relate environmental degradation to economic growth. The hypothesis states that as economies grow pollution also grows, but after an income level is reached economic growth is associated with a decline in pollution. As Rothman and de Bruyn [35] suggest if the hypothesis holds economic growth can gradually become a solution to environmental problems and no policy action is necessary.

Growth improves the environment

Bhagwati, 4 (Jagdish N., Columbia University, Economics Department, “In Defense of Globalization,” Oxford University Press, pg. 144-145, Tashma, <http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/transcripts/5046.html/_res/id%3Dsa_File1/In_Defense_of_Globalization.pdf>, 2004)

In fact, as development occurs, economies typically shift from primary production, which is often pollution intensive, to manufactures, which are often less so, and then to traded services, which are currently even less pollution-intensive. This natural evolution itself could then reduce the pollution-intensity of income as development proceeds. Then again, the available technology used, and technology newly invented, may become more environment-friendly over time. Both phenomena constitute an ongoing, observed process. The shift to environment-friendly technology can occur naturally as households, for example, become less poor and shift away from indoor cooking with smoke-causing coal-based fires to stoves using fuels that cause little smoke.19 But this shift is often a result also of environment-friendly technological innovation prompted by regulation. Thus, restrictions on allowable fuel efficiency have promoted research by the car firms to produce engines that yield more miles per gallon. But these regulations are created by increased environmental consciousness, for which the environmental groups can take credit. And the rise of these environmental groups is, in turn, associated with increased incomes. Also, revelations about the astonishing environmental degradation in the Soviet Union and its satellites underline how the absence of democratic feedback and controls is a surefire recipe for environmental neglect. The fact that economic growth generally promotes democracy, as discussed in Chapter 8, is yet another way in which rising income creates a better environment. In all these ways, then, increasing incomes can reduce rather than increase pollution. In fact, for several pollutants, empirical studies have found a bell-shaped curve: pollution levels first rise with income but then fall with it.20 The economists Gene Grossman and Alan Krueger, who estimated the levels of different pollutants such as sulfur dioxide in several cities worldwide, were among the first to show this, estimating that for sulfur dioxide levels, the peak occurred in their sample at per capita incomes of $5,000–6,000.21 Several historical examples can also be adduced: the reduction in smog today compared to what the industrial revolution produced in European cities in the nineteenth century, and the reduced deforestation of United States compared to a century ago.22 The only value of these examples is in their refutation of the simplistic notions that pollution will rise with income. They should not be used to argue that growth will automatically take care of pollution regardless of environmental policy. Grossman and Krueger told me that their finding of the bell-shaped curve had led to a huge demand for offprints of their article from anti-environmentalists who wanted to say that “natural forces” would take care of environmental degradation and that environmental regulation was unnecessary; the economists were somewhat aghast at this erroneous, ideological interpretation of their research findings.

Reducing Consumption Doesn’t Solve

Van de Bergh, 10 (Jeroen, PhD in Economics from VU University Amsterdam Professor of Environmental Economics and Professor of ´Nature, Water and Space at VU University Amsterdam, and Member of the Energy Council of the Netherlands, A criticism of “degrowth” and a plea for “a-growth”, <http://degrowth.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/van-den-bergh_degrowth-and-a-growth.pdf>, 2010)

The second interpretation of degrowth means striving for a reduction in the amount of consumption, however measured. Such a strategy is then hoped to translate into less resource use and less pollution. This is, however, not sure to be an effective approach to environmental regulation, while it is certain to be a very inefficient one.

## Sustainable

Complexity is sustainable – allows for technology and energy innovation to solve societal problems – alternatives are short term solutions

Tainter 09 [Joseph Tainter - Professor in the Department of Environment and Society at Utah State University, September 09, 2009, “Human Resource Use: Timing and Implications for Sustainability”, http://www.theoildrum.com/node/5745]

In conclusion, sustainability is not the achievement of stasis. It is not a passive consequence of having fewer humans who consume more limited resources. One must work at being sustainable. The challenges that any society (or other institution) might confront are, for practical purposes, endless in number and infinite in variety. This being so, sustainability is a matter of solving problems.¶ in the conventional view, complexity follows energy. If so, then we should be able to forego complexity voluntarily and reduce our consumption of the resources that it requires. This approach to sustainability implicitly sees the future as a condition of stasis with no challenges.¶ in actuality, major infusions of surplus energy are rare in human history. More commonly, complexity increases in response to problems. Complexity emerging through problem solving typically precedes the availability of energy, and compels increases in its production. Complexity is not something that we can ordinarily choose to forego.¶ Applying this understanding leads to two conclusions. The first is that the solutions commonly recommended to promote sustainability–conservation, simplification, pricing, and innovation–can do so only in the short term. Secondly, long-term sustainability depends on solving major societal problems that will converge in coming decades, and this will require increasing complexity and energy production. Sustainability is not a condition of stasis. It is, rather, a process of continuous adaptation, of perpetually addressing new or ongoing problems and securing the resources to do so.¶ It is useful to think of sustainability in the metaphor of an athletic game: It is possible to “lose”–that is, to become unsustainable, as happened to the Western Roman Empire. But the converse does not hold. Because we continually confront challenges, there is no point at which a society has “won”–become sustainable in perpetuity, or at least for a very long time. Success, rather, consists of staying in the game.

Growth is sustainable -- resource scarcity can be corrected by technology.

Haynes 2008 (Beth Haynes, Professor of Economics at Brigham Young University-Hawaii, “Finite Resources vs. Infinite Resourcefulness”, 8/19/08 http://wealthisnottheproblem.blogspot.com/2008/08/finite-resources-vs-infinite.html//Mkoo)

Our consumption is excessive. If we continue to consume our natural resources, there will be nothing left for the future. Use less. Do it for the children! Limit. Limit. Limit. Do it for the poor! A significant number of environmental concerns center on this fear of using up some important resource: oil, rainforest, fresh water, open space, biodiversity. The concern is genuine. The fears are real. People then work to pass laws which intentionally slow production and hinder (even prevent) consumption. The express purpose is to make us poorer in the short run with the hope of preventing poverty in the long run. It’s common sense. Save today in order to have some available tomorrow. It’s how our bank accounts work, so it seems logical to apply the same reasoning to resource use. But there is a catch. All of economic history, up to and including today, demonstrates that the more we exploit our natural resources, the more available they become. (3-7) How can this possibly be? If we use our “limited, non-renewable resources” we have to end up with less, right? Actually, no. And here is why. We don’t simply “use up” existing resources; we constantly create them. We continually invent new processes, discover new sources, improve the efficiency of both use and extraction, while at the same time we discover cheaper, better alternatives. The fact that a particular physical substance is finite is irrelevant. What is relevant is the process of finding ways to meet human needs and desires. The solutions, and thus what we consider resources, are constantly changing. Oil was a nuisance, not a resource, until humans discovered a use for it. In order to survive and flourish, human beings must succeed at fulfilling certain needs and desires. This can be accomplished in a multitude of ways using a multitude of materials. The requirements of life set the goals. How these goals are met does not depend on the existence or the availability of any particular material. Limits are placed not by the finiteness of a physical substance, but by the extent of our knowledge, of our wealth, and of our freedom. Knowledge. Wealth. Freedom. These are the factors which are essential to solving the problems we face. “The Stone Age didn’t end because we ran out of stones.” (8) Think for a minute about how we have solved the problem of meeting basic needs throughout history: Transportation: from walking to landing on the moon Communication: from face-to-face conversations to the World Wide Web. Food: from hunting and gathering to intravenous feeding and hydroponics. Shelter: from finding a cave to building skyscrapers Health care: from shamans to MRIs and neurosurgery. How does progress happen? A synopsis of the process is provided by the main theme of Julian Simon’s book, The Ultimate Resource 2: More people, and increased income, cause resources to become more scarce in the short run. Heightened scarcity causes prices to rise. The higher prices present opportunity and prompt inventors and entrepreneurs to search for solutions. Many fail in the search, at cost to themselves. But in a free society, solutions are eventually found. And in the long run, the new developments leave us better off than if the problems had not arisen, that is, prices eventually become lower than before the scarcity occurred. (9) This idea is not just theory. Economists and statisticians have long been analyzing the massive amounts of data collected on resource availability. The conclusion: our ability to solve the problems of human existence is ever-expanding. Resources have become less scarce and the world is a better place to live for more and more people. (3-7) Overall, we create more than we destroy as evidenced by the steady progress in human well being and there is no evidence for concluding that this trend can't and won't continue. Doomsday predictions have been with us since ancient times and they have consistently been proven wrong.

## Collapse -> Trans Wars

The attempt for transition would be a blood bath

Barnhizer 6 [David Barnhizer – Professor of Law at Cleveland State University, Summer 2006, ‘Waking from Sustainability's "Impossible Dream”,’ Georgetown International Environmental Law Review, Lexis]

The scale of social needs, including the need for expanded productive activity, has grown so large that it cannot be shut off at all, and certainly not abruptly. It cannot even be ratcheted down in any significant fashion without producing serious harms to human societies and hundreds of millions of people. Even if it were possible to shift back to systems of local self-sufficiency, the consequences of the transition process would be catastrophic for many people and even deadly to the point of continual conflict, resource wars, increased poverty, and strife. What are needed are concrete, workable, and pragmatic strategies that produce effective and intelligently designed economic activity in specific contexts and, while seeking efficiency and conservation, place economic and social justice high on a list of priorities. n60 The imperative of economic growth applies not only to the needs and expectations of people in economically developed societies but also to people living in nations that are currently economically underdeveloped. Opportunities must be created, jobs must be generated in huge numbers, and economic resources expanded to address the tragedies of poverty and inequality. Unfortunately, natural systems must be exploited to achieve this; we cannot return to Eden. The question is not how to achieve a static state but how to achieve what is needed to advance social justice while avoiding and mitigating the most destructive consequences of our behavior.

Disruptions to growth in the status quo causes countries to lash out

**Aligica 3** (Paul, Fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University and Adjunct Fellow at the Hudson Institute, “The Great Transition and the Social Limits to Growth: Herman Kahn on Social Change and Global Economic Development”, April 21, <http://www.hudson.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication_details&id=2827>)

Stopping things would mean if not to engage in an experiment to change the human nature, at least in an equally difficult experiment in altering powerful cultural forces: "We firmly believe that despite the arguments put forward by people who would like to 'stop the earth and get off,' it is simply impractical to do so. Propensity to change may not be inherent in human nature, but it is firmly embedded in most contemporary cultures. People have almost everywhere become curious, future oriented, and dissatisfied with their conditions. They want more material goods and covet higher status and greater control of nature. Despite much propaganda to the contrary, they believe in progress and future" (Kahn, 1976, 164). As regarding the critics of growth that stressed the issue of the gap between rich and poor countries and the issue of redistribution, Kahn noted that what most people everywhere want was visible, rapid improvement in their economic status and living standards, and not a closing of the gap (Kahn, 1976, 165). The people from poor countries have as a basic goal the transition from poor to middle class. The other implications of social change are secondary for them. Thus a crucial factor to be taken into account is that while the zero-growth advocates and their followers may be satisfied to stop at the present point, most others are not. Any serious attempt to frustrate these expectations or desires of that majority is likely to fail and/or create disastrous counter reactions. Kahn was convinced that "any concerted attempt to stop or even slow 'progress' appreciably (that is, to be satisfied with the moment) is catastrophe-prone". At the minimum, "it would probably require the creation of extraordinarily repressive governments or movements-and probably a repressive international system" (Kahn, 1976, 165; 1979, 140-153). The pressures of overpopulation, national security challenges and poverty as well as the revolution of rising expectations could be solved only in a continuing growth environment. Kahn rejected the idea that continuous growth would generate political repression and absolute poverty. On the contrary, it is the limits-to-growth position "which creates low morale, destroys assurance, undermines the legitimacy of governments everywhere, erodes personal and group commitment to constructive activities and encourages obstructiveness to reasonable policies and hopes". Hence this position "increases enormously the costs of creating the resources needed for expansion, makes more likely misleading debate and misformulation of the issues, and make less likely constructive and creative lives". Ultimately "it is precisely this position the one that increases the potential for the kinds of disasters which most at its advocates are trying to avoid" (Kahn, 1976, 210; 1984).

## Transition Fails

De-development is worse for mindset shifting:

Monbiot 9 [George Monbiot - columnist for The Guardian, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London (environmental science, August 17, 2009, “Is there any point in fighting to stave off industrial apocalypse?,” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change>]

From the second and third observations, this follows: instead of gathering as free collectives of happy householders, survivors of this collapse will be subject to the will of people seeking to monopolise remaining resources. This will is likely to be imposed through violence. Political accountability will be a distant memory. The chances of conserving any resource in these circumstances are approximately zero. The human and ecological consequences of the first global collapse are likely to persist for many generations, perhaps for our species' remaining time on earth. To imagine that good could come of the involuntary failure of industrial civilisation is also to succumb to denial. The answer to your question – what will we learn from this collapse? – is nothing. This is why, despite everything, I fight on. I am not fighting to sustain economic growth. I am fighting to prevent both initial collapse and the repeated catastrophe that follows. However faint the hopes of engineering a soft landing – an ordered and structured downsizing of the global economy – might be, we must keep this possibility alive. Perhaps we are both in denial: I, because I think the fight is still worth having; you, because you think it isn't.

Degrowth fails – doesn’t reverse problems, is ambiguous, and won’t be adopted

Van Den Bergh 10 [Jeroen C.J.M. Van Den Bergh – Research professor at UAB & affiliated with the Institute of Environmental Science & Technology and the Dept. of Economics & Economic History of Universidad Autònoma de Barcelona, May 21, 2010, “Environment versus growth — A criticism of “degrowth” and a plea for “a-growth”, http://degrowth.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/van-den-bergh\_degrowth-and-a-growth.pdf]

Five main insights follow from the assessment of degrowth interpretations and strategies. First, the many meanings of degrowth suggest it is bound to remain an ambiguous concept which will create confusion rather than contribute to a clear and constructive debate about environmental policy. Second, most interpretations of degrowth are not meaningful in the context of environmental aims, i.e. they do not represent strategies which guarantee an effective reduction of environmental pressure or a transition to a sustainable economy. Third, degrowth is unlikely to receive much social and democratic–political support so that it will be an ineffective political strategy to reach environmental sustainability. Fourth, a-growth (as deﬁned in Section 3) is a less ambiguous and — from the perspective of both environment and human well-being — a more sensible strategy to strive for. Five, the alternative to a degrowth strategy is simply a good policy package that includes environmental regulation and several other, complementary measures and institutional changes. Striving for political feasibility nationally and internationally is an important precondition for getting such a policy package implemented. The new aim of a-growth, and the associated removal of the GDP indicator from policy and political debate and decision-making, are likely to increase the social and political acceptance of this policy package. The main concern about degrowth as a primary or overarching goal to solve environmental problems is that it reﬂects a misinterpretation of the relevant causality. It suggests that degrowth, however interpreted, is a ﬁrst step, necessary and perhaps sufﬁcient, to reach environmental aims. Instead, one better would reverse the causality, and start with a safe environmental policy which then may or may not give rise to (some type of) degrowth. Even if one might support GDP, consumption or work-time degrowth for reasons of equity or happiness, they cannot be defended as appropriate strategies to reach environmental aims. The reason is that they function at best as blunt, ineffective and inefﬁcient instruments of environmental regulation. A degrowth strategy gives much weight to the scale of the economy or consumption, and underestimates or even neglects the role of composition and technical change. In relation to consumption it also often reﬂects a belief in the effectiveness of voluntary, bottom-up solutions. One additional belief that I have often encountered in debates with degrowth proponents is that environmental policies do not work, or will not be implemented, and that we therefore have to ﬁnd solutions outside the standard environmental policy framework. This view and judgment I cannot share. Without (standard) policies we certainly will not be able to solve the major global environmental problems. Their global and externality nature requires that we strike international agreements to create an international level playing ﬁeld which allows countries to implement regulatory policies that create the necessary incentives to alter¶ all behavior that contributes to the environmental problems. This is not enough, as suggested in the previous section on a wider policy package, but it represents the core of any effective solution.

## AT: Growth -> Terrorism

Terrorism is a result of political grievances, not economic

Posner 08 [Richard Posner – Senior Lecturer at the University of Chicago School of Law, February 06, 2008, “Terrorism and Economic Development--Posner's Comment”, http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/2008/01/terrorism-and-economic-development--posners-comment.html]

I agree with Becker's analysis as far as it goes, but I question whether the amount of terrorism is highly sensitive to economic development, to which the "demographic transition"--the well-documented tendency of birth rates (also death rates) to decline sharply when a nation reaches a threshold level of economic development--contributes. When birth and death rates decline, the average age of the population rises, which is a stabilizing force, the number of young men declines, and the economic opportunities of the young are greater because there are fewer young. So the number of potential foot soldiers for terrorism is diminished, as it is by anything that raises the opportunity costs of prospective terrorist recruits. But how important are those opportunity costs to the amount of terrorism? It is helpful to think of terrorism as of other goods and services in demand and supply terms. There is a demand for terrorism, and a supply of terrorism, and the intersection of demand and supply gives the amount of terrorism. Terrorism is a political phenomenon, and the demand is driven mainly by political grievances, real or imagined. Often the grievances are related to foreign occupation. France in Algeria; the British in Palestine; now the Israelis in the West Bank; the United States in Iraq (and earlier in the Philippines)--though in the case of Islamic terrorism, the major factor seems to be the Western "presence" in the Middle East, rather than foreign occupation; even Israel's occupation of the West Bank seems a subsidiary factor. And the Baader-Meinhoff gang in West Germany, the Red Brigades in Italy, and Aun Shirikyo in Japan are examples of terrorist groups unrelated to foreign occupation. But it is the existence of grievance that is key, and often--probably typically--the grievance is political rather than economic. If demand for terrorism is grievance-driven, then one can expect the supply of terrorists to come mainly from the intelligentsia, for the members of the intelligentsia are more likely than ordinary people to be moved by ideas, resentments, and political ambitions rather than by material concerns. They have the leisure and the education to think big thoughts, like overthrowing a government, which rarely brings material improvements. Nor is it the case that the intelligentsia supplies merely the leaders, who then send their simple-minded followers to destruction. The leaders are at risk themselves; more important, the perpetrators of the actual terrorist attacks tend to be middle class (though the second intifada, mentioned by Becker, may be an exception). From a labor-market standpoint, there are two important tradeoffs in recruiting a supply of terrorists: quality-quantity, and capital-labor, and they are related. Because terrorists tend to be few in number if only because of the need for concealment, and to be operating in a hostile environment, the recruitment of a large number of poorly trained and motivated cannon fodder is unlikely to be optimal; they are likely to give the game away. Moreover, the most effective terrorism requires some technical sophistication (such as piloting an airplane), and this is a further reason for terrorist leaders to recruit high-quality personnel. The relation of economic development in general or the demographic transition in particular to terrorism is likely to be extremely indirect, and is probably small. If one looks at a list of 195 countries ranked by birth rate, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\_of\_countries\_by\_birth\_rate, one discovers that of the 25 nations with the highest birth rates, all but one (Afghanistan) are in Africa, and Africa has not proved to be a major source of terrorists relative to its vast population. Pakistan has the world‚Äôs 57th highest birth rate--27.2 per thousand. This is high--replacement is 21; the U.S. birth rate 14; Germany‚Äôs 8.2--and Pakistan is often used as an illustration of a nation that has not made the demographic transition yet. Saudi Arabia, that cradle of Islamic terrorism, has a lower birth rate--24.2--though it is still high. On the other hand, Saudi Arabia is a relatively wealthy country by international standards; its per capita income is similar to that of Poland and Chile. Algeria, with a birth rate (20.8) considerably below Saudia Arabia's, has a severe terrorism problem. Jordan has a substantially higher birth rate than Algeria (in fact it is only slightly lower than Pakistan's), but is not a hotbed of terrorism. All this said, there is some negative correlation between birth rates and terrorism in Muslim countries, but it is weak, and probably swamped by other factors. The major factor in Islamic terrorism may have nothing directly to do with economic development or the factors that influence it; it may simply be the influence of extremist Islamic religious beliefs in particular Muslim nations and communities.

## Growth Inevitable

Complexity’s inevitable---post-collapse we’ll get right back on the complexity treadmill

Tainter 06 [Joseph A. Tainter – Professor at the Global Institute of Sustainability and School of Human Evolution and Social Change at Arizona State University, February 2006,” Social Complexity and Sustainability,” <http://upi-yptk.ac.id/Ekonomi/Tainter_Social.pdf>]

Thus, the development of complexity is a wonderful dilemmas of human history. Over the past 12,000 years, we have responded to challenges with strategies that cost more labor, time, money, and energy, and that go against our aversion to such costs. We have done this because most of the time complexity works. It is a basic problem-solving tool. Confronted with problems, we often respond by developing more complex technologies, establishing new institutions, adding more specialists or bureaucratic levels to an institution, increasing organization or regulation, or gathering and processing more information. Such increases in complexity work in part because they can be implemented rapidly, and typically build on what was developed before. While we usually prefer not to bear the cost of complexity, our problem solving efforts are powerful complexity generators. All that is needed for growth of complexity is a problem that requires it. Since problems continually arise, there is persistent pressure for complexity to increase.