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## \*\*\*Econ Good\*\*\*

## Spending = Econ collapse

#### Unstable markets trigger decline

Robinson ‘09

[Ron Robbins 5/19/09, MBA is the founder and analyst of Investing for the Soul and maintains the blog, Enlightened Economics, “Interest Rate Manipulation and Loose Money Promote Economic Collapse,” http://monetarycurrent.com/commentaries/53-philosophy/691-interest-rate-manipulation-and-loose-money-promote-economic-collapse.html]

Economies with excessively loose monetary policies and who force interest rates to ultra low levels for extended periods of time eventually succumb to a massive top-heavy debt structure which at some point 'topples over.' These countries then suffer either a deflationary debt implosion/depression in which much of the debt is liquidated, or the country's central bank instigates a huge inflationary push to reduce the value of all credit market debt in the country by vastly increasing the amount of currency and the expansion of its money supply. A big inflationary push frequently leads to a lack of confidence in the country's currency and hence the possibility of 'hyper-inflation' occurring as everyone unloads the country's currency for real goods or other currencies. Argentina earlier this decade and Zimbabwe recently, are examples of central bank sponsored inflation that led to no confidence in their currencies, resulting in hyper-inflation. The inflationary approach is what appears to be favoured by the American, Japanese and British central banks. From an Enlightened Economics perspective, the actions of manipulating down interest rates and the over printing of money by central banks fall under a terrible fallacy: the belief that we can resolve our short-term economic problems by going more into debt and not concern ourselves with the long-term consequences. A global consciousness has to arise which understands that manipulating markets, most especially interest rates and money supply, leads to highly unstable economies which in time either implode or explode!

## Us = Global collapse

#### US econ collapse triggers global—interdependence on resources

Lewis ‘98

[Chris H. Lewis, Professor of American Studies at the University of Colorado-Boulder, 1998, in The Coming Age of Scarcity, Dobkowski and Wallimann, eds, pp. 55-56.]

The successful collapse of global industrial civilization is, in part, dependent on the 80 percent not fully integrated with the global economy breaking free from their ties to modern industrial civilization. Faced with growing threats of economic and ecological collapse, many underdeveloped nations and regions should declare their independence from the global economy, recognizing that this economy is the larger cause of their poverty. After breaking free from the First World’s economic and political hegemony, underdeveloped countries can then use their resources and people to feed themselves and improve their quality of life. Of course, we have been witnessing such attempts for the past fifty years after World War II as colonial and neocolonial struggles for independence. The wars in Vietnam, Cambodia, Afghanistan, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Angola, Mozambique, Somalia, and in the nations of the former Soviet Union were all struggles to win independence from foreign domination. The cold war was, in large part, a struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union over who would dominate the modern world and the so-called nonaligned nations of the Third World. With the global instability created by the end of the cold war, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the decline of American hegemony, underdeveloped countries may find that they have the strategic opportunity to demand their independence from First World domination. They can refuse to pay their debts, withdraw from the global industrial economy, nationalize foreign corporations that are exploiting their wealth, and create local and regional economies to support their own people. But Third World independence from the First World-dominated global economy will not come without a heavy economic, political, and military price. With the withdrawal of underdeveloped countries from the global economy within the next thirty to fifty years, the developed countries will face continual material, ecological, and energy shortages that will force them to downscale their economies. The First World will, ironically, be forced to follow the lead of the Third World and create local and regional economies that are sustainable and self-sufficient. In many instances, nations will break up, forming smaller polities tied together by ethnic, religious, or social bonds. If these polities and nations take responsibility for helping their peoples survive the hardship and suffering imposed by the devolution of the global industrial civilization and economy, they will be better able to reduce the real threat of mass death and genocide that will arise from the collapse of modern industrial civilization

## Growth Inevitable—Psychology

#### Growth and consumption is inevitable in the long-run—it is rooted in our brain chemistry.

Allenby 7 (Brad, Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Arizona State University, “The Benefits of Our Hardwired Need to Consume,” GreenBiz.com, March 7, 2007, http://www.greenbiz.com/blog/2007/03/08/the-benefits-our-hardwired-need-consume, AD: 7-6-9) BL

That humans are inclined to make choices that offer more pleasure than pain comes as no surprise, but a look at how marketing -- whether of consumer goods or environmental causes -- offers intriguing ideas on how to create change, Brad Allenby writes. The issue of consumption is perhaps one of the most vexed in the environmental and sustainability discourses, especially when contrasting the United States, which tends towards more of a free market, free consumer choice philosophy, with the European Union. Some interesting recent work indicates that it may also be much more complex than we generally realize. Take the recent work by George Lowenstein at Carnegie-Mellon University, Brian Knutson of Stanford, and Drazen Prelec of MIT. In order to better understand the brain chemistry underlying consumption, they presented product choices, then payment choices, to volunteers while scanning their brains with functional magnetic resonance imaging. They found that the nucleus accumbens, which is involved in processing reward stimuli (food, recreational drugs) was activated by presentation of desirable products such as chocolates, while the insular cortex, linked to expectations of pain, was activated by price information. After both product and price were presented, the prefrontal cortex, an area associated with rational calculation, engaged as well. This not only indicated that modern behavior ("rational" consumption choices) are piggybacking on neural circuits evolved for much different circumstances (not a surprise), but leads to some interesting if speculative possibilities. A fairly straightforward interpretation of these data is the suggestion that, at the neural level, consumption is affected, perhaps significantly, by a weighing of immediate pleasure versus immediate pain, rather than rational calculation, which only comes later. This may not sound revolutionary, especially to marketing gurus, but it nonetheless has some substantial implications. To begin with, it emphasizes the importance of marketing and presentation in consumption: if the benefits of a product can be made explicit and attractive from the beginning, the decision to purchase can be encouraged before the "rational weighing" process is even engaged. This might argue against the traditional environmental project of reducing consumption by generating large amounts of environmental information to be appended to particular products: if the V8 GT or large SUV is initially appealing, information on fuel consumption may be only marginally relevant because it enters the cognitive processes after the purchasing decision is essentially made. Conceptually, in other words, the environmental approach to reducing consumption through product specific information implicitly accepts "the rational consumer" model of human behavior: provide more information on social and environmental costs, and consumers, rationally balancing their options, will choose the more “rational” outcome -- that is, environmental preferability (remembering that consumers may not share the values prioritization of environmentalists). This appears to be an oversimplistic, if not incorrect, model of consumer cognition. However, while this research might discourage product-by-product information schemes, it might support general anti-consumption campaigns. After all, such campaigns when successful make the act of consumption itself more negative emotionally, and thus enhance the expectations of pain associated with any consumption (the downsides of consistently negative messages from environmentalists are well known, however, and might generate consumer backlash that outweighs such consumption reduction effects over time). Another, perhaps more difficult, implication is the possibility that use of credit, which on balance reduces the immediate “pain” of a purchase because nothing material is apparently given up in exchange, creates a context within which consumers are inherently weighted towards consumption (the researchers have not yet tested this hypothesis). The growth and differentiation of credit mechanisms, and the dematerialization of money, are long-term trends in developed economies, and a major mechanism supporting the continued growth in complexity of financial and economic structures. Thus, it becomes problematic for anti-consumption activists if the inherent dynamics and structure of economic systems as they evolve shifts the balance between consumption and pain towards consumption. That consumption has deep emotional dimensions, and that access to credit encourages economic growth, and along with it consumption, are not revolutionary findings. But that consumption decisions engage particular brain pathways in ways that affect the effectiveness of environmental campaigns and projects is both interesting and important, even if at this point it may be difficult to be sure quite how these new discoveries cut. At the least, however, the demonstration that even apparently straightforward decisions are, in fact, grounded in pre-rational cognitive information processing suggests that environmental and sustainability activists need to become more sophisticated in the way they think about, and seek to socially engineer, consumption decisions. For social engineering is a double-edged sword, and especially in areas like consumption, increasingly understood as involving complex and fundamental behaviors, such efforts can rebound against those who seek to impose such behavior change, regardless of their good intentions.

## Growth Good—War

#### Economic collapse causes nuclear war

Broward 9 (Member of Triond) Will an Economic Collapse Kill You?, http://newsflavor.com/opinions/will-an-economic-collapse-kill-you/ AD: 7-7-09 CS

Now its time to look at the consequences of a failing world economy. With five offical nations having nuclear weapons, and four more likely to have them there could be major consequences of another world war. The first thing that will happen after an economic collapse will be war over resources. The United States currency will become useless and will have no way of securing reserves. The United States has little to no capacity to produce oil, it is totatlly dependent on foreign oil. If the United States stopped getting foreign oil, the government would go to no ends to secure more, if there were a war with any other major power over oil, like Russia or China, these wars would most likely involve nuclear weapons. Once one nation launches a nuclear weapon, there would of course be retaliation, and with five or more countries with nuclear weapons there would most likely be a world nuclear war. The risk is so high that acting to save the economy is the most important issue facing us in the 21st century.

#### Economic decline leads countries to war

Starr 6 (Martha, “Growth and Conflict in the Developing World”, 6-1-6, http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\_0286-17306337\_ITM) LE

Violent conflicts, such as civil wars and armed rebel movements, have not traditionally been seen through an economic lens. Because war profoundly disrupts production, consumption, investment, taxation, and provision of public goods, and because manifest reasons for conflicts often seem essentially non-economic (conflicts of values, self-determination, religion, justice), a usual tendency has been to suspend economic analysis of a place or a process when a conflict erupts, and resume analysis only after it stops. Yet the surge in violent conflict in the last quarter of the 20th century, shown in Figure 1, raised questions about relationships between economic factors and conflict risks, especially because many of the areas in which new conflicts were breaking out were in economic decline, notably in sub-Saharan African and the post-socialist world. To investigate connections between economic factors and violent conflict, the World Bank in the 1990s launched an ambitious research agenda led by Paul Collier, an Oxford University professor with a well-respected record of policy-oriented research. The project consisted of a series of econometric studies that used panel data on countries to gauge what factors affect the risks of experiencing civil war. The research has been published in such outlets as the European Economic Review, Oxford Economic Papers, and Journal of Peace Research; it has also been summarized in a book, Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy (Collier et al. 2003). (1) The central finding of this research has been described by Collier (2003) as, "It's the economy stupid"--that is, economic factors are central in all dimensions of violent conflicts: poor economic policies predispose countries to conflict, economic incentives cause armed rebellions to break out, economic factors sustain rebellions and explain their durations, manipulation of economic incentives and resources is essential for bringing conflicts to an end, and installing the right kinds of post-conflict economic policies is vital for keeping the peace.

## Growth Good—War

#### Economic crises causes transition wars and socialism

Nyquist, economic expert, 07[7-6-07,J. R. Nyquist, “The Path of Dissolution,” http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2007/0706.html, accessed 7-6-07]

Global financial disaster – the so-called “crisis of capitalism” – has a special place in modern political thought. The creepy crawlies of the intellectual underworld look forward to a global economic fiasco. They see it as an opportunity. For example, the founder of modern communism, Karl Marx, wanted to become the revolutionary dictator of Germany. And so, he looked forward to an economic crash and resulting social chaos as his window of opportunity. His theoretical work was an intellectual armament for propelling his revolutionary career. He was not the first of his kind and not the last. History records the lamentable success of figures like Lenin, Stalin and Mao. Today we can see Marx’s egotism and ambition in Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez. Any country that suffers an economic disaster is vulnerable to this species of opportunist. A global economic dislocation signals danger on a global scale. The malicious nobodies of the world, who dream of seizing power, look forward to economic troubles and the resulting social chaos. The anti-Semite, the fascist and the communist are all the same. Their ambition is to take and hold power. (Probably as a salve to their own insignificance.) A global financial crash, therefore, isn’t simply an economic problem. It is also a political problem.

If the world suffers a serious economic setback in the near future, there will be a political implosion. The United States is thought to be one of the most stable, successful societies in history. A severe economic setback today, however, would be occurring in a highly charged, partisan environment, in which the public has already been divided one from the other according to race, ideology and social class. As Julien Benda pointed out in his book, [The Treason of the Intellectuals](http://www.amazon.com/Treason-Intellectuals-Julien-Benda/dp/1412806232/ref=pd_bbs_sr_1/105-1895955-0763603?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1183730223&sr=8-1/financialsenseon), “Our age is the age of the intellectual organization of political hatreds. It will be one of its chief claims to notice in the moral history of humanity.” Hatred fuels ambitious demagogues and revolutionary agitators. It propels the anti-Semitism of the neo-Nazi and the class hatred of the socialist firebrand.

Writing between the First World War and the Second, Julien Benda wrote, “Indeed, if we ask ourselves what will happen to a humanity where every group is striving more eagerly than ever to feel conscious of its own particular interests, and makes its moralists tell it that it is sublime to the extent that it knows no law but this interest – a child can give the answer. This humanity is heading for the greatest and most perfect war ever seen in the world, whether it is a war of nations, or a war of classes.”

## Growth Good—Famine

#### Economic development empirically averts famine.

Norberg 3 (Johan, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, In Defense of Global Capitalism, p. 33-34, AD: 7-6-9) BL

Such is the triumph of the “green revolution.” Higher-yield, more-resistant crops have been developed, at the same time as sowing, irrigation, manuring, and harvesting methods have improved dramatically. New, efficient strains of wheat account for more than 75 percent of wheat production in the developing countries, and farmers there are estimated to have earned nearly $5 billion as a result of the change. In southern India, the green revolution is estimated to have boosted farmers' real earnings by 90 percent and those of landless peasants by 125 percent over 20 years. Its impact has been least in Africa, but even there the green revolution has raised maize production per acre by between 10 and 40 percent. Without this revolution, it is estimated that world prices of wheat and rice would be nearly 40 percent higher than they are today and that roughly another 2 percent of the world's children—children who are now getting enough to eat—would have suffered from chronic malnourishment. Today's food problem has nothing to do with overpopulation. Hunger today is a problem of access to the available knowledge and technology, to wealth, and to the secure background conditions that make food production possible. Many researchers believe that if modern farming techniques were applied in all the world's agriculture, we would already be able, here and now, to feed another billion or so people. 10 The incidence of major famine disasters has also declined dramatically, largely as a result of the spread of democracy. Starvation has occurred in states of practically every kind—communist regimes, colonial empires, technocratic dictatorships, and ancient tribal societies. In all cases they have been centralized, authoritarian states that suppressed free debate and the workings of the market. As Amartya Sen observes, there has never been a famine disaster in a democracy. Even poor democracies like India and Botswana have avoided starvation, despite having a poorer food supply than many countries where famine has struck. By contrast, communist states like China, the Soviet Union, Cambodia, Ethiopia, and North Korea, as well as colonies like India under the British Raj, have experienced starvation. This shows that famine is caused by dictatorship, not by food shortage. Famine is induced by leaders destroying production and trade, making war, and ignoring the plight of the starving population. Sen maintains that democracies are spared starvation for the simple reason that it is easily prevented if the rulers of a society wish to prevent it. Rulers can refrain from impeding the distribution of food, and they can create jobs for people who would not be able to afford food purchases in times of crisis. But dictators are under no pressure: they can eat their fill however badly off their people are, whereas democratic leaders will be unseated if they fail to address food distribution problems. Additionally, a free press makes the general public aware of the problems, so that they can be tackled in time. In a dictatorship, even the leaders may be deceived by censorship. Much evidence suggests that China's leaders were reassured by their own propaganda and their subordinates' laundered statistics while 30 million people died of starvation during “the Great Leap Forward” between 1958 and 1961. 11

## Growth Good—Terrorism

#### Growth solves terrorism

Schaefer 2001 (Brett D., Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs in the Center for International Trade and Economics at The Heritage Foundation, Heritage Foundation Backgrounder #1508, "Expand Freedom to Counter Terrorism", December 6, http:Ilwww.heritage.orglResearch~~radeandForeignAid/BGi 508.cfm)

The governments of those countries must be held reslponsible for policies that undermine or oppose freedom, stifle economic qrowth, and help create the circumstances under which terrorism flourishes. America's battle in Afghanistan against the Taliban regime and al-Qaeda terrorist network is merely the first skirmish in a long war. If the war on terrorism is to be won, and if this victory is to be sustainable, America must focus on encouraging the qovernments of developing countries to embrace economic liberty in order to counter the poverty and desperation upon which terrorist qroups depend.

## \*\*\*Growth Bad\*\*\*

## Uniqueness—Collapse by 2030

#### Their Economy scenario is non-unique—Economic collapse is inevitable by 2030

#### Bond ‘00

Michael. <Economic author and Environmental Reformer> “eve of the apocalypse” http://www.eveoftheapoc.com.au/Downloads/DebtVsGrowth.html

The present global economy is caught in a catch-22 of its own making. Solutions exist, but the blindness that created the problem also stops the solutions from being seen. Problem 1 How Much Is Enough? The present economy is obliged to grow annually at between 3% and 6%. Too much less than 3% for too long and the economy will collapse from lack of currency. Too much over 6% for too long and inflation will spiral out of control, rendering currency meaningless. Below is a table that points out how long it takes for something to double, triple, etc in size, when it increases at rates of 3%, 4%. 5% and 6% per year. For the last 15 years the global economy has been growing at an average of about 4% per year. Note that at 4% growth the economy doubles every 19 years, and grows 10 times its size in a mere 59 years. By the beginning of the 21st century the world's environment was in critical decline. Oceans are turning acidic from atmospheric CO2 threatening marine life, melting glaciers are flooding cities where soon little water will flow at all, species are disappearing from the Earth at a faster rate than during the dinosaur extinction 65 million years ago. The design of the global economy demands that by 2019 the economy will be twice the size it was in 2000. At its present rate of growth, by 2059 the global economy will be ten times its 2000 size. But Earth cannot sustainably support a global economy the size it was in 2000. Even if the economy slid along at a minimal 3% growth it would still be 10 times its 2000 size by the year 2080. So in order to survive, the global economy is compelled to keep growing like a cancer, at an unsustainable rate that will kill its host. This self-destructive design is a direct result of the flaw in the global money system (see accompanying article Money - Deadlier Than Plutonium). But wait - there's more! Let's assume, like most corporations and politicians do, that the world's resources are endless and that no environmental threats exist. Even if that were the case, the global economy is self-destructive for an entirely different reason, if the first way isn't fast enough. Problem 2 - Coming Ready Or Not! The second problem stems from the fact that in order to sustain 4% annual economic growth, global debt must increase at about 10% annually. Because it is annual growth, this means it is exponential rather than mathematical growth. The difference between the two is shown below. Mathematical Growth 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 7 Exponential Growth 1 + 2 + 4 + 8 + 16 + 32 + 64 = 127 (Much faster growth in same time.) Because global debt increases exponentially 6% faster than the global economy, debt will quickly smother the economy by demanding its entire output merely in interest payment. o the left is a table that illustrates the global situation using the Australian economy as an example. In 2003 the OECD rated Australia's economy as "one of the best performers" in the developed world. The table to the left showing Australia's debt and income figures, demonstrates that even the best performers in the global economy will be bankrupt before 2030. If Australia stays on its present "good" course, within a few decades Australia's interest bill each year will be larger than Australia's entire national income. . Australia would be bankrupt well before it got to this. The figures of 4% economic growth and 10% debt growth are about the same for the entire global economy. The Global Economy is on course to collapse well before 2030 due to a looming global inability to repay annual interest. The reason why debt outpaces economic growth stems from a fault in global money supply.

## Mindset Solvency

#### No impact to econ decline, sustainable states will still remain

Jackson ‘02

[8/1/02 Jackson and Jackson, Ph. D, no date Ross, Ph.D. in Operations Research (the theory and practice of problem solving), and Hildur. Founders of Gaia Trust. <http://www.gaia.org/rj/21987/22870/>]

One factor which will accelerate the development of ecovillages is the increasing cost and decreasing quality observable in the welfare state's institutionalized care of individual citizens from cradle to grave, and their corresponding health costs. With an increasing number of elderly in the population, it will become even more obvious that the current system is simply too expensive. In the future, it will be discovered that these same tasks can be solved at much greater cost-effectiveness and more satisfactorily for all by using the resources of local ecovillage communities and by putting far greater emphasis on preventative medicine and healthy home-grown food.

#### The Mindset Solves—Dedev forces people to be locally productive

#### Trainer ‘11

Dr. Ted. Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of New South Wales (Australia); lecturer and author of books regarding the transition to a sustainable society. “Ted Trainer: The Way I Live.” May 31, 2011

[http://ukiahcommunityblog.wordpress.com/2011/05/31/ted-trainer-the-way-i-live/]

Sometimes you have to grind away at something you would rather not have to do, so there is a very important place for that sort of discipline. Again you just have to face up to the fact that if you don’t get up the windmill tower now to check that rattle, at night in the cold wind and rain, the damn thing might have blown down by morning. It is therefore a way of life that is a very long way from the image of the hippie dropout lazing in the sun. It is in fact a life of almost constant work, in the sense of productive activity and thought, but in general necessary chores can be experienced as satisfying means to the goal of running the household economy well. Again collecting firewood is a good example; this has to be done but it isn’t work.

Above all there is the satisfaction of knowing that one is living in ways that are more morally defensible than those of consumer society. We use relatively few resources and cause relatively little environmental damage.

## Mindset Solvency

#### And, This happens on a large scale—the defense doesn’t assume the lack of capital for the world economy to sustain itself

Lewis 2k - Ph.D. University of Colorado at Boulder (Chris H, “The Paradox of Global Development and the Necessary Collapse of Global Industrial Civilization” <http://www.cross-x.com/archives/LewisParadox.pdf>)

A more hopeful cause of the collapse of global industrial civilization is a global economic collapse “financial crises have become increasingly common with the speed and growth of global capital flows.” The financial crises caused by the 1994 collapse of the Mexican peso, the 1997 Asian financial panic, the 1998 Russian financial panic, and the 1998 bailout of Long Term Capital Management by the United States Federal Reserve and Global Banks are all examples of recent financial crises that greatly stressed the global financial system. During the 1997 Asian financial crisis, U.S. Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin said, “There was a moment when I thought it could have come undone.” He was, of course, referring to the global financial system. A global depression caused by a financial panic could finally undermine the entire structure of globalization. With the loss of trillions of dollars of paper money, First World elites would find that they don’t have the funds to bail out Third World countries and banks, and even bail their own banks and corporations out. With the loss of trillions of dollars, the global economy would come to a grinding halt and there wouldn’t be the collective resources or the will to restart it. Of course, these are the precise sorts of crises that lead to World Wars and military conflict. No matter how it collapses, through economic collapse and the development of local and regional economies and/or through a global military struggle by the First World to maintain its access to Third World resources, global industrial civilization will collapse because its demands for wealth, natural resources, energy, and ecosystem services aren't sustainable.

## A2 Growth inevitable

#### Their representation of globalized economics as an unalterable system creates its inevitability—economies are localized, historically dependent social formations that can be changed

Gibson-Graham, 06 (Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson, Graham is Professor of Geography, Associate Department Head for Geography, B.A., Smith College, Ph.D., Clark University, 1984 , Gibson has a BSc (Hons) (Sydney), MA, PhD (Clark), (Pen Name is J.K. Gibson-Graham), ,“A Postcapitalist Politics”, p. 53-54) IG

This shift from an understanding of the economy as something that can be transformed, or at least managed (by people, the state, the IMF), to something that governs society has involved a hegemonic move by which representations of economy have slipped from their locations in discourse and landed "on the ground," in the "real," not just separate from but outside of society. In these postmodern times, the economy is denied the discursive mandate given to other social spheres and the consequences for the viability of any political project of economic innovation are dire. If we are to enact new economies, we need to imagine "the economy" differently-as something that is created in specific geographical contexts and in historically path-dependent ways, but this is not an easy or straightforward project.

## Growth Bad—Warming

#### Growth necessitates the never-ending quest for energy and consumption making warming inevitable – only a shift away can solve

Trainer ‘95

Dr. Ted. Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of New South Wales (Australia); lecturer and author of books regarding the transition to a sustainable society. The Conserver Society: Alternatives for Sustainability. Zed Books. 1995. Accessed 7/2/11. Pages 3-4. http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=jc2vNO6WIMwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA2&dq=ted+trainer&ots=HCDaObS8wc&sig=lWdRlgLZOtw8XuPh8Di0Vv0IhWI#v=onepage&q&f=false Accessed through Google Books.

The fundamental cause of the accelerating destruction of the global ecosystems is simply over-production and over-consumption. The 20 tonnes of new materials the average American uses every year must come from the environment and will be dumped back into it as pollution and waste. The need for reduction is evident in the greenhouse problem. This is caused primarily by gases from the burning of fossil fuels, most of which takes place in the rich countries. Atmosphere scientists have agreed that use of these fossil fuels must be cut by at least 60 per cent. To achieve that goal in a world of 11 billion people would mean that average per capita fuel use would have to be cut to one-eighteenth the present rich-world average. There is no plausible solution to the greenhouse effect or to most of the other serious problems apart from drastically reducing the amount of fuel being burnt, and therefore the level of producing and consuming going on. Now, consider the environmental impact in relation to the growth economy. If an economy grows at a mere 3 per cent p.a. then in 70 years it will be churning out eight times as much as it was p.a. the start. All respectable economists and politicians would much prefer a 5 per cent growth rate – which would mean 32 times as much output p.a. after 70 years! How many wild rivers and forests would be left in 2060 at that rate? Continued growth in living standards and GNP is of course the top priority of virtually all nations. Yet present levels of production and consumption and environmental damage are unsustainable. If we want to save the ecosystems of this planet we must embrace not just a zero-growth economy, but a considerable long-term reduction in the amount of producing and consuming going on.

## Growth Bad—War

#### Globalization necessitates violence—only degrowth can solve

Trainer ‘95

[Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, 1995, The Conserver Society, p. 16]

If the foregoing analysis is valid, not much needs to be said about the alternative. We must develop ways of life in which all can live well without taking more than their fair share and therefore without living in fear of someone else threatening what we have. That is precisely what a radical conserver society involves. A world made up of relatively small communities which were supplying their own needs mostly from their local resources, and concerned primarily with enjoying a life rich in cultural and craft and community activities, without any interest in constantly increasing the amount they consume, would be a far more secure world. There would be no point in you attacking anyone, because you would not want much and what you did want you would have in abundance from local sources. Similarly you would not feel any need for weapons with which to defend yourself, because you would know that others were living comfortable and interesting lives without wanting more resources than they could supply for themselves and therefore they would have no interest in attacking you. Security is an impossible goal if it is conceived in terms of developing the arms needed to defend our imperial interests and to defend ourselves against attack — while we insist on lifestyles which inevitably involve us in taking more than our fair share and therefore asserting control over ‘ours oilfields in the Middle East and in turn having to be armed to the teeth to fight off threats to them. Real security consists in knowing no one has any desire to threaten you.

#### Transition is key to peaceful and sustainable communities

Trainer 2k

[Ted Trainer 2000 DEMOCRACY & NATURE: The International Journal of INCLUSIVE DEMOCRACY, <http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/dn/vol6/trainer_where.htm> JULY]

There is a world of difference between the Marxist vision of a post-capitalist society that is still centralised and industrialised and in which people do specialised work and officials manage, and on the other hand the alternative or Simpler Way in which there is radical decentralisation of production and control into very small self-governing regions, which will require a great deal of conscientious participation and goodwill on the part of most if not all citizens. Such communities cannot function satisfactorily unless almost all people work enthusiastically at keeping their local ecological, agricultural, industrial, commercial, social and cultural systems in good shape. These systems will not be run by external or centralised governments. They will only function if local people take responsibility, research, plan, organise, manage, evaluate and govern well. These functions will require of the average citizen far more skills, social responsibility and public spirit than most of us have today in consumer society.

## Growth Bad—Famine

#### Economic growth ensures famine through resource depletion—this will spark global resource wars.

Milbrath 89 (Lester, Professor Emeritus of Political science and Sociology at SUNY-Buffalo, Envisioning a Sustainable Society, pp. 343-344, AD: 7-6-9) BL

Trying to solve our nested set of ecological/economic problems only with technological fixes is like treating an organic failure with a bandage. The key difficulties, which will be ignored by that strategy are that biospheric systems will change their patterns and there will be an increasing squeeze on resources. As global human population continues to grow, and these new people demand economic growth to fulfill their needs, there will be unbearable pressure for resources. Soils will be depleted. Farmland will be gobbled up into urban settlements. Water will become scarce, more polluted, and very high priced. Forests will be depleted faster than they can regenerate. Wilderness will nearly disappear. The most easily extracted mineral deposits will be exhausted. We will search the far corners of the globe, at very high economic and environmental cost, for more minerals and possible substitutes for those that are being depleted. Fossil fuels, especially petroleum, will constantly diminish in supply and rise in price. Worst of all, biospheric systems will react to our interference by no longer working the way we have counted on. International competition for scarce mineral and fuel resources could become intense and bloody. The highly developed nations are likely to try using their money and/or military power to garner the bulk of the resources for their own use. (It is difficult to imagine that a big power would allow its supply of critical fuels or minerals to be cut off without putting up a fight.) At best, those actions will only postpone the inevitable adjustment. The poorest nations (usually those with the densest populations) will be unable to maintain even subsistence levels—they are likely to suffer widespread famine and disease. All of this frantic activity will have devastating impacts on the ecosphere. Climate change will debilitate every ecosystem and economy. Ultraviolet radiation will increase, as will acid rain and toxic poisoning of our air, soil, and water. In addition, we can expect more and more soil depletion, loss of crop land, mismanagement of water resources, oil spills, devastating accidents (Bhopal, Chernobyl), deforestation, spreading deserts, extinction of species, loss of wildlife, and air and water pollution. With disrupted biospheric systems and severe resource shortages, I cannot imagine that it will be possible to sustain growth in material throughput. We may be able to grow in nonmaterial ways (increasing knowledge, artistic output, games, and so forth), but material growth cannot continue. Our endeavor not to change will have failed to forestall change; instead, we will become victims of change.

## Growth Bad—Terror

#### Terrorism

Trainer ‘04 (The Simpler Way, WORKING FOR TRANSITION FROM CONSUMER SOCIETY TO A SIMPLER, MORE COOPERATIVE, JUST AND ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE SOCIETY. accessed 2004) http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/10-Our-Empire.html

Any serious student of international relations or US foreign policy will be clearly aware of the general scope and significance of the empire which rich countries operate, and of the human rights violations, the violence and injustice this involves. Rich world "living standards", corporate prosperity, comfort and security could not be sustained at anywhere near current levels without this empire, nor without the oppression, violence and military activity that keep in place conventional investment, trade and development policies. It should therefore be not in the least surprising that several hundred million people more or less hate the rich Western nations. This is the context in which events like those of September 11 must be understood. (For documents relevant to Sept. 11, see a section within Our Empire, COLLECTED DOCUMENTS.) It is surprising that the huge and chronic injustice, plunder, repression and indifference evident in the global economic system has not generated a much greater hostile reaction from the Third World, and more eagerness to hit back with violence. This is partly explained by the fact that it is in the interests of Third World rulers to acquiesce in conventional development strategies.