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\*\*Growth Good\*\*

Growth Good – War – Interdependence

Growth leads to interdependence which greatly reduces the risk of war – five reasons

Yee 99 (Tan Tan, Journal of the Singapore Armed Forces, Jan-Mar, http://www.mindef.gov.sg/safti/pointer/back/journals/1999/Vol25\_1/7.htm)JFS

Like the Democratic Peace Proposition, the notion that increased interdependence reduces the probability of war among nations is not new. For one, economists have long demonstrated that economic interdependence benefits both parties through the process of international trade. The underlying rationale is worth explaining. In a simple model of a two-state-two-product international economy, even if a particular state is more efficient at producing both goods, it would still make more economic sense for each state to specialise in producing one of the goods and thereafter obtain the other through barter exchange. This is because the issue is one of relative rather than absolute efficiency; the more efficient state should optimise its limited resources to focus entirely on producing the goods where it has a relatively greater efficiency. From an economic viewpoint, therefore, international trade represents one of the rare occasions in international affairs that present a win-win situation to both parties.15 Traditionally, theories on the effect of interdependence between states on the risk of war can be divided into two main camps. On the one extreme, liberals argue that economic interdependence lowers the likelihood of war by increasing the value of trading over the alternative of aggression; in other words, states would rather trade than fight.16 To put it simply, trade is mutually beneficial, while war is at best a zero-sum game. At the same time, the increasing lethality of modern weapons has greatly increased the costs and risks of war, thus making the trading option seem even more rational. Four other subsidiary propositions supporting the liberal view are worth mentioning here.17 Firstly, the increased economic activity that accompanies higher trade levels tends to promote domestic prosperity, and in doing so lessens the internal problems that push leaders to war. Secondly, trade may alter the domestic structure of a particular state, giving more influence to groups with a vested interest in the continuation of peaceful trade. Thirdly, a higher level of interdependence inevitably leads to increased interaction between governments and peoples. This enhances understanding and an appreciation of each other's views and perspectives, reducing the misunderstandings and miscalculations that sometimes lead to war. The final argument asserts that trade has the spillover effect of enhancing political ties between trading partners, thus improving the prospects for long-term co-operation. Going by the liberal arguments, there is cause for optimism as long as a high level of interdependence can be maintained among all states. Rosecrance sums up the view rather neatly that high interdependence fosters peace by making trading more profitable than invading.18 Some liberals explain the continuing occurrence of war as a result of the misconception of political leaders caught up in the outmoded belief that war still pays.19 Yet others saw it as the misguided attempts by political leaders to gamble for an outright victory in war, in which case the benefits would be even greater. The contention is that inspite of the pacifist tendencies that interdependence brings about, it may sometimes not be enough to prevent war from happening.

Economic collapse ensures nuclear resource wars

Broward 9 ((Member of Triond) http://newsflavor.com/opinions/will-an-economic-collapse-kill-you)JFS

Now its time to look at the consequences of a failing world economy. With five official 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 totally 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.

Growth Good – War – Interdependence

Continued economic decline will result in global war.

Mead 9 (Walter Russell Mead, [Henry A. Kissinger](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_A._Kissinger) senior fellow for [U.S. foreign policy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._foreign_policy) at the Council on Foreign Relations. The New Republic, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2)JFS

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well.If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

Their impact takeouts are wrong – laundry list of reasons why economic crisis causes war

Strauss-Kahn 9 (Dominique, Manging Director of the IMF, International Monetary Fund, http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/2009/102309.htm)JFS

Let me stress that the crisis is by no means over, and many risks remain. Economic activity is still dependent on policy support, and a premature withdrawal of this support could kill the recovery. And even as growth recovers, it will take some time for jobs to follow suit. This economic instability will continue to threaten social stability. The stakes are particularly high in the low-income countries. Our colleagues at the United Nations and World Bank think that up to 90 million people might be pushed into extreme poverty as a result of this crisis. In many areas of the world, what is at stake is not only higher unemployment or lower purchasing power, but life and death itself. Economic marginalization and destitution could lead to social unrest, political instability, a breakdown of democracy, or war. In a sense, our collective efforts to fight the crisis cannot be separated from our efforts guard social stability and to secure peace. This is particularly important in low-income countries. War might justifiably be called “development in reverse”. War leads to death, disability, disease, and displacement of population. War increases poverty. War reduces growth potential by destroying infrastructure as well as financial and human capital. War diverts resources toward violence, rent-seeking, and corruption. War weakens institutions. War in one country harms neighboring countries, including through an influx of refugees. Most wars since the 1970s have been wars within states. It is hard to estimate the true cost of a civil war. Recent research suggests that one year of conflict can knock 2-2½ percentage points off a country’s growth rate. And since the average civil war lasts 7 years, that means an economy that is 15 percent smaller than it would have been with peace. Of course, no cost can be put on the loss of life or the great human suffering that always accompanies war. The causality also runs the other way. Just as wars devastate the economy, a weak economy makes a country more prone to war. The evidence is quite clear on this point—low income or slow economic growth increases the risk of a country falling into civil conflict. Poverty and economic stagnation lead people to become marginalized, without a stake in the productive economy. With little hope of employment or a decent standard of living, they might turn instead to violent activities. Dependence on natural resources is also a risk factor—competition for control over these resources can trigger conflict and income from natural resources can finance war. And so we can see a vicious circle—war makes economic conditions and prospects worse, and weakens institutions, and this in turn increases the likelihood of war. Once a war has started, it’s hard to stop. And even if it stops, it’s easy to slip back into conflict. During the first decade after a war, there is a 50 percent chance of returning to violence, partly because of weakened institutions.

Growth Good – War – Interdependence

Growth creates cultures of peace and conflict resolution

Soysa 2k (Indra de, senior research associate at the International Peace Research Institute, , in Greed and Grievance, ed. Berdal and Malone, p. 126)JFS

The question is, How can a country escape from resource dependence and manage to innovate? Economic growth is vital because the raising of per capita income proxies innovative capabilities. Bringing about economic growth through development assistance is one obvious answer. Countries with higher per capita wealth are far less likely to suffer internal conflict and are more likely to exhibit strong democracy—which is widely seen as promoting peace and conflict resolution. Thus, renewed efforts at promoting economic growth and democratic institutions seem to be the best long-term strategy for creating what UNESCO has termed “a culture of peace” in the developing world.

Growth checks war – exports and education

Soysa 2k (Indra de, senior research associate at the International Peace Research Institute, , in Greed and Grievance, ed. Berdal and Malone, p. 116)JFS

Collier finds that ethnic heterogeneity and income inequality are mostly unrelated to conflict. Primary goods exports and average years of schooling in the male population, however, are strongly related to conflict. A large share of primary goods in exports provides a revenue stream easy to capture, offering the motivation for rebels to coalesce in seeking loot. The average years of schooling in the male population measures the opportunity costs for young men to join greed-motivated rebellion. This variable is significantly negatively related to conflict: The higher the level of education among males, the less likely they are to engage in risky endeavors such as armed conflict. A country more than one-fourth dependent on primary commodity exports emerges as four times more likely to be engaged in a conflict than one that is not. Similarly, even a slight increase in the level of education can decrease the risk of conflict. As Collier puts it, “A country with large natural resources, many young men, and little education is very much more at risk of conflict than one with opposite characteristics” (italics added). He concludes that the “true cause of much civil war is not the loud discourse of grievance, but the silent force of greed**.”** Higher levels of development usually mean the growth of a stronger manufacturing base and the diversification of exports. Because exports of primary commodities are strongly related to conflict, such development will also help reduce the incentives for greed-motivated violence. Again, development assistance can be targeted toward this end. If resource abundance acts to distort the processes that lead to better policies, the donor agencies should seek to counteract trends toward Dutch Disease. To this end, donor agencies could insist on sounder fiscal policies, prevent the adoption of policies that promote rent-seeking, help identify and alter perverse subsidization that benefits merely the urban elite, and build institutions that protect property rights. Moreover, the international community can help with transfer of technology to developing countries and support the processes of harnessing that technology by promoting investment in human capital. Providing assistance toward better educational systems will not only discourage recruitment of youths into rebellion but will also strengthen the longer-term prospects of economic growth and development. Investment in education will also encourage better government in the longer run that will result in informed participation in political and economic life. As recent studies of aid effectiveness find, aid can work wonders in the right policy setting, but it fails in bad ones.” The right policy conditions cannot simply be imposed but must be accepted by those who benefit from such policies. Acceptance of certain policies can be achieved only if people are able to understand them.

Growth Good – War – AT: Resource Wars

Resource wars are rare and renewable energy solves the internal link

Homer-Dixon 99 (Thomas F., Director of the Centre for the Study of Peace and Conflict ,Professor of Political Science, at the University of Toronto, Environment, Scarcity, and Violence, pp. 138-139)JFS

Four environmental resources in particular would appear likely to spark simple-scarcity conflicts: agriculturally productive land, forests, river water, and fish. Scarcity of these renewables is rising rapidly in some regions; they are often essential for human survival; and they can be physically seized or controlled. Butclose study of historical and current cases provides little support for this idea. There is,in fact,virtually no evidence that environmental scarcity is a principal cause of major war among modern states. Arthur Westing has compiled a list of twelve conflicts in the twentieth centuiy involving resources, beginning with World War I and concluding with the Falklands/Malvinas War. Access to oil or minerals was at issue in ten of these conflicts. Just five involved renewable resources, and only two of these**—**the 1969 Soccer War between El Salvador and Honduras, and the Anglo-Icelandic Cod War of 1972—1973**—**concerned neither oil nor minerals(cropland was a factor in the former case, and fish in the latter). But, the Soccer War was not a simple-scarcity conflict between states; rather, as explained later in this chapter, it arose from the ecological marginalization of El Salvadoran peasants and their consequent migration into Honduras. And, because the Cod War, despite its name, involved negligible violence, it hardly qualifies as a resource war. In general, scholarssuch as Choucri and North have not adequately distinguished between scarcities of renewable and nonrenewable resources as causes of international conflict. They have overlooked two reasons why modern states do not generally fight over renewable resources. First, states cannot easily convert cropland, forests, and fish seized from a neighbor into increased state power; although these resources may eventually generate wealth that can be hamessed by the state for its own ends, this outcome is uncertain and remote in time. In contrast, states can quickly use nonrenewables like oil and iron to build and fuel the military machines of national aggression. (Renewables have not always been less important to state power: in the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries, for example, shortages of timber for naval ships contributed to serious, and sometimes violent, conflict among European powers.) Second, countries with economies highly dependent on renewables tend to be poor, and poor countries cannot easily buy large and sophisticated conventional armies to attack their neighbors. For these reasons, both the incentives and the means to launch resource wars are likely to be lower for renewables than for nonrenewables**.**

Growth Good – War – AT: Water Wars

Water scarcity induces cooperation and will never prompt a war- 3 reasons.

Lomborg 1 (Bjorn, Professor of Statistics, University of Aarhus, The Skeptical Environmentalist, pp. 156-7)JFS

There is actually good reason why we should expect the water war argument to be seriously overstated. First,waging a war for water simply makes very little strategic sense. What would be the goal? Only downstream, strong states have the motivation and ability, but they are forever vulnerable to retribution from upstream states intentionally polluting the water source. So a war would require not just a simple power demonstration but a permanent occupation and possible depopulation of the entire watershed.’ Second, such a war would be extremely costly, especially compared to the price of desalination. As an Israeli Defense Forces analyst pointed out: “Why go to war over water? For the price of one week’s fighting, you could build five desalination plants. No loss of life, no international pressure, and a reliable supply you don’t have to defend in hostile territory.” Third, states often share interests in water, with upstream states getting hydropower from dams and downstream states getting better-managed water for agriculture. Finally, water cooperation is highly resilient — the Mekong Committee on water functioned throughout the Vietnam war, Israel and Jordan held secret water talks throughout 30 years of formal war, and the Indus River Commission survived two wars between India and Pakistan. Actually, a number of quarrels have been solved exactly because the problems surrounding water have gained more attention recently. Ever since independence India and Bangladesh have bitterly disputed the rights to water from the Ganges, which is controlled by India but is essential to Bangladesh’s agriculture. After 50 years of India asserting the right to take as much water from the river as it needed, the government signed a treaty in 1996, providing both countries with a guaranteed flow of water in the crucial spring months of March, April and May. Thus, while water will get more valuable, there is little reason to expect this to escalate the number of wars, simply because war makes little strategic or economic sense. Rather, it is to be expected that increased water value will help increase the focus and attention needed to solve the remaining, substantial water issues.

Growth Good – War – Diversionary Theory

Times of economic turmoil lead to wars to distract the public from hard economic times

Pickering and Kisangani 9 (department of political science at Kansas State, citing the International Military Intervention dataset Jeffrey and Emizet, British Journal of Political Science, 39:483-515, ProQuest)JFS

In this article, we contend that the Argentinian use of diversionary force was an anomaly in 1982, but the British diversion was not. Contrary to common normative assumptions, leaders in mature, established democracies are more prone to use foreign military force for domestic political gain than even the most contemptible autocrats. This argument seems paradoxical, because policy makers in established democracies have presumably not only accepted norms which emphasize negotiation, compromise and the value of human life, they operate within systems designed to check their own authority. We maintain that it is these very checks which often compel decision makers in mature democracies to divert. Institutional and partisan restraints prevent them from implementing effective domestic policy when their electoral prospects dim, forcing them to at least consider diversionary force. Leaders in the most liberal states in the international system may consequently, and seemingly illogically, fall into an illiberal pattern of using foreign military force to solve domestic problems. We have followed our own earlier extension of Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and his associates’ institutional approach, rational choice literature on voting and research on democratic audience costs to develop the three major components of our argument.7 We define ‘audience costs’ as the penalty that leaders incur for failing to keep commitments or for initiating disastrous policies.8 Following Michael Doyle’s conceptualization, we define mature democracies as countries with sovereignty, market and private economies, judicial rights and representative political institutions.9 The institutional approach highlights the institutional barriers that leaders in mature democracies encounter when they try to find domestic solutions to certain domestic problems. The rational choice literature on voting demonstrates how difficult it is for leaders in mature democracies to regain popular support when the country has experienced domestic economic difficulties. Even domestic policy which successfully resolves economic problems and increases growth often does little to boost the political executive’s popular support and may even have the seemingly contradictory effect of reducing the leader’s standing in public opinion polls further.10 Since the voting public is not inclined to reward successful economic policy, embattled leaders in mature democracies may turn to foreign policy to regain their political credibility and to improve their chances of retaining office. The decision to use diversionary force is made easier when leaders are confident that the military operation will be both a military success and provide the domestic political boost they are seeking. Recent research on audience costs suggests that military missions launched by leaders in mature democracies have a high probability of achieving both of these outcomes. Of course, a good deal of institutional variation exists among countries typically labelled ‘mature democracies’. The final component of our theory refines our earlier approach further by developing hypotheses on the impact that institutional differences have on mature democracies’ diversionary proclivities. To determine whether the leaders of mature democracies, and especially certain types of mature democracies, are more likely both to use diversionary force and to reap political rewards from doing so than other leaders, we test the reciprocal relationships which exist between the use of foreign military force and the domestic political and economic variables which may cause it. Our study is certainly not the first to analyse mature democracies’ propensity to use diversionary military force. A number of studies have been undertaken on the subject with, to date, mixed results.11 Our analysis is, however, the first to separate out and test the diversionary behaviour of several distinct types of established democracies and to determine whether diversionary force by these actors ‘works’ by producing domestic political and economic benefits for leaders. To our knowledge, it is also the first to develop an integrated, multi-layer theory that attempts to bring greater clarity to the seemingly illogical phenomenon of democratic diversion.

It’s more likely in mature democratic societies

Pickering and Kisangani 9 (department of political science at Kansas State, citing the International Military Intervention dataset, Jeffrey and Emizet, British Journal of Political Science, 39:483-515)JFS

**Our control variables provide further evidence that mature democracies may be more prone to use military force in response to domestic stimuli than other regimes. The statistical significance and positive direction of strategic rivalry** and sub-system crisis **indicate** that leaders in non-democracies dispatch troops overseas in response to external threats rather than to domestic difficulties. These external variables are, in contrast, negative when interacted with mature democracy. **The interaction** term for strategic rivalry **is** also **statistically significant**. Our formula provides marginal effects for strategic rivalryt3democracyt of 0.017311[(20.01204)3(119)]521.4155 for 119 year old democracies and 0.017311[(20.01204)3(119)]521.9693 for 165 year old democracies. Thus, as democracies become more mature, they grow less likely to use military force abroad in response to the external stimuli of strategic rivalry (or, in this case, an increase in the number of rivals).

Growth Good – War – Self-Correcting

Growth is self-correcting

Zey 98 (Michael, founder of the Expansionary Institute, Seizing the Future: The Dawn of the Macroindustrial Era, pg. 36-37)JFS

Third, growth itself contains the solutions to the problems it produces. Supporting this principle is the World Bank's 1992 report "Development and the Environment," which blatantly starts that growth is a powerful antidote to a number of ills plaguing Third World countries, including the pollution that growth supposedly generates. The report thus contends that eliminating poverty should remain the top goal of world policymakers. Although economic growth can initially lead to such problems as pollution and waste, the resulting prosperity also facilitates the developments of technologies that lead to cleaner air and water. In fact, once a nation's per capita income rises to about $4000 in 1993 dollars, it produces less of some pollutants per capita, mainly due to the fact that it can afford technology like catalytic converters and sewage systems that treat a variety of wastes. According to Norio Yamamoto, research director of the Mitsubishi Research Institute, "We consider any kind of environment damage to result from mismanagement of the economy." He claims that the pollution problems of poorer regions such as Eastern Europe can be traced to their economic woes. Hence, he concludes that in order to ensure environmental safety "we need a sound economy on a global basis."

Growth Good – War – AT: Goldstein

Goldstein concludes economic depression is the root cause of war

Cashman 2k (Greg, prof in the Department of Political Science at Salisbury U in Salisbury, Maryland, "What causes war?: an introduction to theories of international conflict," book, p. 135-136, jm)

Why should economic recoveries be related to war? It could be that the underlying cause of hostilities had been present for many years, but that governments practiced restraint during the period of economic distress. War was undertaken only when the economic upswing made it financially feasible for them to engage in military action. Goldstein suggests that major wars occur only when nations can afford them—that is, after a sustained period of stable economic growth.41 It should be noted that in this explanation, economic upturns are not cited as the actual cause of war, but as a factor that enables wars to occur. The historical association of wars with economic upswings may therefore actually obscure the real causes of war, which might be found in the preceding period of economic decline.42

Goldstein is wrong- fails to take key authors into account

Midlarsky 89 ( Manus, political science @ Rutgers U, *Journal of Politics*, Vol 51 No. 4, Nov 89, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2131568 , pg 1068-9)ET

There are heartening and disappointing aspects to both books taken together. On the positive side, the study of systemic, world, or hegemonic wars is now receiving separate and, I might add, highly successful theoretical and empirical treatment. This is indicative of the maturation of a science. Cognate elements of a phenomenon are analyzed separately from the remainder to see how well they cohere in the attempt at explanation. Additionally and importantly, how successful is that explanatory effort? Fortunately, in the case of Goldstein treatment, the answer to both questions is yes. The disappointing aspect emerges in the danger that analysts of systemic wars may become increasingly divorced from those who treat smaller wars. This danger is already foreshadowed in the two books under review here. Neither Modelski, Levy, nor Doran are referenced in James' book. In turn, neither Bueno de Mesquita, Zinnes, nor Wilkenfeld are referred to in Goldstein's volume. The division already is appearing at this time, with unforeseen, but I suspect ultimately deleterious consequences for the field of international conflict research.

Goldstein’s statistical methods were flawed- wrong groupings and lack of quantitative methods

Rostow 88 (W.W., United States National Security Advisor, *Journal of Economic History*, vol 48 no. 4, Dec 1988, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2121682 , p.990 ) ET

This book is flawed in a number of respects. The review of long-cycle theories and evidence is complicated by the effort to link the character of theories to the political orientation of theorists. The grouping proves rather unsatisfactory, with a good many figures disposed of in a few unpersuasive phrases; and there are some curious anomalies as well. While respecting Goldstein's effort to survey and give shape to the whole long-cycle literature, I can only report that, for this reader, it didn't come off. The flaw in Part Two is much more serious. First, as indicated earlier, the data are not adequate for a test of his long-wave/war hypothesis, with respect to time periods, quality, or variables covered. Second, the statistical methods and results constitute a reduction and absurdum of the present fashion in political science of reliance on formal quantitative methods.

Goldstein is wrong- his empirics are based off of nominal rather than real figures- economically incorrect

Rostow 88 (W.W., United States National Security Advisor, *Journal of Economic History*, vol 48 no. 4, Dec 1988, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2121682 , p.990 ) ET

To get at the heart of the matter, it is simply not true that there is a systematic relation between the price trends which underlie Goldstein's "base dating scheme" and trends in production. There are good and bad price upswings and downswings. The first price downswing (1815-1848) was marked by a higher rate of growth in the British and world economies than the first upswing (1790-1815), when corrected for cyclical biases in dating. The second price downswing (1873-1896) was a period of deceleration in British production (not real wages) but accelerated growth in a good many other countries. The third price downswing (1920-1933) was, of course, accompanied by deceleration or decline in most parts of the world economy. The results of the upswings are similarly mixed. The clustering of major innovations is also erratic in relation to the "base dating scheme."

Growth Good – War – AT: Goldstein

Goldstein is false- historical summaries incorrect

Rostow 88 (W.W., United States National Security Advisor, *Journal of Economic History*, vol 48 no. 4, Dec 1988, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2121682 , p.990 ) ET

Finally Goldstein's historical summaries are inevitably thin, given the long timeperiod covered, his speculations on the past and future as well, and the complexity of the issues he raises. The human race won't get from here to "common security" by incantation, or even the joint exploration of space. The peaceful phasing out of the Cold War; the absorption into the world economy and polity of technologically mature China, India, Brazil, and Mexico, and other upwardly mobile states; the preservation of a viable physical environment in the face of the strains imposed by global industrialization; the patient provision of support for countries not yet in take-off; and the maintenance of strong, vital societies in North America, Western Europe, and Japanworking in partnership-and much more are implied by the decent aspirations evoked by Goldstein at the close.

Goldstein only shows correlation- no causation claims

Midlarsky 89 ( Manus, political science @ Rutgers U, *Journal of Politics*, Vol 51 No. 4, Nov 89, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2131568 , pg 1065-1066)ET

The core of Goldstein's analysis is the relationship between elements of the long cycle and what has been called the hegemonic war (more on that usage momentarily). As conceived of by Nikolai Kondratieff in his first 1925 publication, long cycles are waves of economic activity which undergo long upswings and downswings as measured by prices, production, and trade, among other economic indices. His legacy, although not without substantial controversy, has been to bequeath his name to what is now frequently called the Kondratieff wave. More recently, George Modelski suggested theoretical relationships between the Kondratieff wave (or more generally, the long cycle) and world war, and William Thompson, among others, provided empirical support for aspects of this relationship. In this book, data on prices, production, wages, and other important economic indicators are collected over the period 1495-1975. A total of 55 economic time series are used to test a bevy of hypotheses that Goldstein has collected from the long-cycle literature. What is appealing about these hypotheses is that they are frequently paired with their obverse counterparts, also culled from that literature. Thus, the first hypothesis-that "long waves exist"-is paired with its obverse, namely, that "long waves do not exist" (164). Or "war concentrations occur on long wave upswings" is coupled with "war clusters early in the downswing" (168). The economic time series then are used to demonstrate the strong relationship between prices and, in a time-lagged effect, production, with periods of war severity (measured by battle fatalities) occurring on the long-wave upswing. This is the major contribution of Goldstein's study-not only to confirm or disconfirm hypotheses in the long-wave literature using a variety of straightforward as well as highly sophisticated methodologies-but finally to demonstrate a robust relationship between two of the most frequently used economic variables in longwave research, and periods of war severity. These points coincide with wars such as the Thirty Years' War, the Napoleonic Wars, and World War I. The findings are used to construct a theory of long waves with production growth and war severity at its core.

Goldstein wrong- based off the wrong hegemon

Midlarsky 89 ( Manus, political science @ Rutgers U, *Journal of Politics*, Vol 51 No. 4, Nov 89, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2131568 , pg 1066)ET

These accomplishments notwithstanding, there is a problematic area in the historical treatment of the book. And in fairness to Goldstein, this emerges not so much from his own analysis, as in his acceptance of the term hegemonic war, used by others, to characterize his periods of greatest war severity. The difficulty may be summarized in the question: Who is the hegemon at any given time? It is fairly easy to pinpoint hegemonic powers in the contemporary period, especially if one accepts the primacy of economic production and sea power in that determination. Great Britain during the nineteenth century or the United States during the latter part of the twentieth century easily comes to mind. But what of earlier time periods when the choice of a particular country is unclear and the criteria for selection are fuzzy? These difficulties lead Goldstein to choose Venice as the initial hegemon of the modern period beginning approximately in 1350 and ending in 1648. With a population only slightly in excess of 100,000 in the middle of this period, and a military size to match, it is difficult to conceive of Venice as a hegemonic power. True, in economic terms, and especially trade, she stood out from the remainder but is it sufficient to use only economic criteria and sea power in the Mediterranean, when the other bases of power are so meager? This problem points to the further difficulty of choosing either landbased or sea-based power as the principal basis for selecting the hegemon.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: War- Goldstein- Wave theory

Kondratieff wave theory empirically false

North 6/27 (Gary, economist and publisher and PhD in history from the University of California, Riverside, The Myth of the Kondratieff Wave, http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north725.html, 6/27/09, AD: 7/6/09) JC

THE K-WAVE These days, the Kondratieff Wave has a spiffy new name: the K-Wave. (I can almost hear it: "Attention: K-Wave shoppers!") The K-Wave is supposedly going to bring a deflationary collapse Real Soon Now. The Western world's debt structure will disappear in a wave of defaults. Kondratieff's 54-year cycle is almost upon us. Again. The last deflationary period ended in 1933. This became clear no later than 1940. World War II orders from Great Britain, funded by American loans and Federal Reserve policy, ended the Great Depression by lowering real wages. In 1942, price and wage controls were imposed by Washington, the FED began pumping out new money, ration stamps replaced the free market, the black market overcame shortages, and the inflationary era began. That was a long time ago. But the K-Wave is heralded as a 50 to 60-year cycle, or even more specifically, a 54-year cycle. That's the entire cycle, trough to trough or peak to peak. The K-Wave supposedly should have bottomed in 1933, risen for 27 years (1960), declined in economic contraction until 1987, and boomed thereafter. The peak should therefore be in 2014. There is a problem here: the cyclical decline from 1960 to 1987. It never materialized. Prices kept rising, escalating with a vengeance after 1968, then slowing somewhat – just in time for the longest stock market boom in American history: 1982–2000. OK, say the K-Wavers: let's extend the cycle to 60 years. Fine. Let's do just that. Boom, 1932–62; bust, 1963–93; boom, 1994–2024. Does this correspond to anything that happened in American economic history since 1932? No.

More empirical ev

North 6/27 (Gary, economist and publisher and PhD in history from the University of California, Riverside, The Myth of the Kondratieff Wave, http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north725.html, 6/27/09, AD: 7/6/09) JC

You may think that I am devoting way too much space to this. But I want my readers to understand why Kondratieff was wrong in 1925. His popularizers were even more wrong in 1975–85, with their "idealized" chart, and their contemporary heirs' unwillingness to learn from the fact that the downward phase of the cycle is now 44 years late. It should have begun no later than Kennedy's administration: 1932+30=1962. This assumes that the original downward phase was due in 1932. It wasn't. It was due around 1926: 1896+30=1926. It should have lasted until 1956. But 1945–73 was a boom era, with mild recessions and remarkable economic growth per capita. Forget about a K-Wave which is going to produce price deflation. The Federal Reserve System remains in control. Sorry about that. It is creating new money. Long-term price deflation of 5% per annum is not in the cards or the charts – anywhere. I recommend that you not take seriously arguments to the contrary that are based on the latest updated version of the K-Wave. The K-Wave forecasted that secular deflation was just around the corner, repeatedly, ever since 1932. It wasn't.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: War- Goldstein- Wave theory

Kondratieff wave theory fails – creator even admits the theory is false

North 6/27 (Gary, economist and publisher and PhD in history from the University of California, Riverside, The Myth of the Kondratieff Wave, http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north725.html, 6/27/09, AD: 7/6/09) JC

Kondratieff admitted that there was no theoretical basis for his cycle. He also admitted that some of the price data revealed no traces in his cycle. He selected two groups of "elements of economic reality," as he called them. This is from [The Long Wave Cycle](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0943940079?ie=UTF8&tag=lewrockwell&linkCode=xm2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=0943940079) (Richardson & Snyder, 1984). The elements of the first group were characterized by the fact that, along with the fluctuating processes, their dynamic did not manifest any general growth or decline (secular trend), or else that trend was scarcely noticeable – at any rate, for the period under observation (p. 33). What was he talking about? For one thing, commodity prices. He admitted: "In processing the statistics on the dynamics of the series of this group, I used simple analytical methods to bring out the long cycles" (p. 33). In short, he manipulated the evidence until he obtained a pattern. He said he found patterns in other statistics. But was there an underlying economic reality, "some real trends in economic development? This is a very big question, and I cannot now elucidate it." Yet this is the heart of his supposed cycle. "We do not have a method for determining how accurately a theoretical curve reflects real evolutionary-economic trends" (p. 35). All that he could find in the pig iron and lead statistics was one and a half or maybe two cycles (p. 52). . . . we did not succeed at all if finding long cycles in the dynamics of cotton consumption in France, and wool and sugar production in the United States, or in the dynamics of certain other series (p. 58). As has already been noted, in my own investigation I discovered series in whose dynamics there were no long cycles (p. 62). As for the pattern of the long cycle, First, I emphasize its empirical character: as such, it is lacking in precision and certainly allows of exceptions. Second, in presenting it I am absolutely disinclined to believe that it offers any explanation of the causes of the long cycles (pp. 68–69). He was frank about the extreme limitations on his data and his findings. His disciples are not.

Depression empirically proves K-wave validity

Baranov 8 (Eric Von, Founder & CEO of The Kondratyev Theory Letter, An Introduction, http://www.kondratyev.com/reference/theory\_explained.htm, 1/3/08, AD: 7/6/09) JC

He was arrested in 1930 and sentenced to the Russian Gulag (prison); his sentence was reviewed in 1938, and he received the death penalty, which it is speculated was carried out that same year. Kondratieff’s major premise was that capitalist economies displayed long wave cycles of boom and busy ranging between 50-60 years in duration. Kondratieff’s study covered the period 1789 to 1926 and was centered on prices and interest rates. Kondratieff’s theories documented in the 1920’s were validated with the depression less than 10 years later. Today, we are faced with another Kondratieff Winter (depression) when the majority of the world anticipates economic expansion. Each individual needs to weigh the risk of depression in light of Kondratieff's work.

Historical evidence proves the K-wave theory

Taylor 5/12 (Jay, Taylor Hard Money Advisors, Kondratieff Winter Is Here? Is This the Greater Depression, http://www.modavox.com/voiceamerica/vepisode.aspx?aid=38122, 5/12/09, AD: 7/5/09) JC

Nations and their economies run through 50 to 70 year credit expansion/contraction cycles known as a Kondratieff wave. Special guest Ian Gordon, Chairman of Long Wave Group and economic historian tells Jay Taylor why the U.S. and the global economy has entered into a credit contraction that will be as bad or worse than the deflationary depression of the 1930s. Ian will explain why polices geared to stimulating the economy will not only fail but will plunge us even deeper into a price collapsing depression. Ian will explain why he is betting on deflation, not inflation and why, in this environment, gold mining will be a portfolio savior as it was during the Great Depression when the Dow to gold ratio approached 1:1. Ian tells why he believes the Dow to gold ratio may well fall to an even more remarkable 0.25:1.0 in this depression and why gold stocks will make their owners truly wealthy. Ian may also name a few of his favorite gold mining stocks.

Growth Good – War – Russia

Russian collapse ensures nuclear civil war that escalates globally

David 99(Steven, Professor of Political Science at The Johns Hopkins University, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb)JFS

If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.

Growth Good – War – Russia

**Russian economic decline causes nuclear war**

Filger 9 (Sheldon, founder of Global Economic Crisis, *The Huffington Post,*, 5.10.9, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html ) ET

In Russia, historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S.

Russian economic collapse breeds political instability and global insecurity

Filger 9 (Sheldon, founder of Global Economic Crisis, *The Huffington Post,*, 5.10.9, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html ) ET

President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least

Growth Good – War – Russia

Russian growth prevents war with the US

Bronwen 9 (Maddox, Chief Foreign Commentator for The Times, The Times, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/bronwe n\_maddox/article6 652936.ece ) ET

The most interesting and unexpected ingredient in the Russia-US summit is how well the Russian leaders have managed the financial turmoil. That changes in their favour, slightly, the dynamics of the meeting, which otherwise turn on that peculiar Russian mix of extremes of strength and weakness.On one hand, President Medvedev and Vladimir Putin, the Prime Minister, hold cards that matter hugely to any US president: nuclear missiles; oil; gas; one of the world’s largest armies; friendship with Iran; influence, obsessively deployed, over the Caucasus and Central Asia; a permanent seat — and veto — on the United Nations Security Council. On the other, there is the reality of Russia’s vulnerability on every count of finance, trade, and military strength. There are the big, bald statistics of its shrinking population (although that may be reversing), falling life expectancy (although that is suddenly improving), and stubborn poverty. Most painfully, too, there is the memory of the Soviet era and the incredulity at the sharpness of the reversal. The US team has made clear that in its calculation, the strengths make it worth its while trying to “reset” the relationship. But the weaknesses mean that if the attempt fails, Russia could be relegated behind more pressing problems.The element that might change this calculation is the Russian leaders’ recent skilful management of the economy. It not only points to surefootedness in economic management, which their rhetoric has not often suggested. It offers hope that Russia may find its way out of its current sour resentment, and autocratic rule, and into a more stable future. A World Bank report last month spelt out the unexpected upside to Russia’s otherwise unsurprising suffering during the crisis. Yes, there has been plenty of damage. Real gross domestic product is expected to shrink by about 7.9 per cent this year (compared with a global fall in output of 2.9 per cent). That is a big shock after a decade of high growth, driven by high oil and gas prices. The stock market lost two thirds of its value in the five months to November 2008.Unemployment could now rise to 13 per cent and poverty to 17.4 per cent by the end of the year, the bank warned, noting that the middle class would also shrink by a tenth, or more than six million people, to just over half the population.However, the bank, which called the Government’s response “swift, co-ordinated, and comprehensive”, noted that Russia’s leaders had moved quickly to cut spending as the oil price fell (including pushing through an aggressive rethinking of the military). They had arranged a large stimulus, and had responded to the plunge in foreign reserves (figures yesterday showed a net capital inflow of $7.2 billion in the second quarter of 2009, after $35 billion flowed out in the first quarter). The worst effects of the crisis were perhaps past, the bank suggested. If — a huge if — Russia took the chance to reform old industries, and made them more competitive, then it could come out of the crisis with a more modern, diversified economy.There are a few slight signs that Russia’s leaders might seize that chance, such as the overhaul of the military (arms, and rules for conscription). Alternatively, they will persist with their technique of blaming others for their problems, and focusing on external threats, not obstacles at home.President Obama’s quest of trying to find a new deal to cut stockpiles of nuclear missiles is an honourable one. But its success will depend on whether Russia can be persuaded out of the mindset in which the expansion and success of the European Union and Nato are a threat. The US has had much less success with Russia than with China in persuading it of the value of becoming part of international organisations and laws. Not much in Putin’s or Medvedev’s recent behaviour suggests that they are that way inclined. All the same, the weakness of modern Russia, clutching the few great prizes of its recent past, in the form of missiles and oil wells while the rest lies in tatters, is one point of leverage. So is the Russian leaders’ astute reaction to the crisis, which they dubbed the failure of capitalism. That shows that they can set ideology aside and take quick steps in the country’s interest. That can only be a hopeful sign for Russia’s chances of becoming a less fearful and more modern state.

Growth Good – War – Russia

Russian growth prevents war with the US – capitalism must look good in order to maintain its ideological prominence and avoid conflict

Bronwen 9 (Maddox, Chief Foreign Commentator for The Times, The Times, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/bronwe n\_maddox/article6 652936.ece ) ET

The most interesting and unexpected ingredient in the Russia-US summit is how well the Russian leaders have managed the financial turmoil. That changes in their favour, slightly, the dynamics of the meeting, which otherwise turn on that peculiar Russian mix of extremes of strength and weakness.On one hand, President Medvedev and Vladimir Putin, the Prime Minister, hold cards that matter hugely to any US president: nuclear missiles; oil; gas; one of the world’s largest armies; friendship with Iran; influence, obsessively deployed, over the Caucasus and Central Asia; a permanent seat — and veto — on the United Nations Security Council. On the other, there is the reality of Russia’s vulnerability on every count of finance, trade, and military strength. There are the big, bald statistics of its shrinking population (although that may be reversing), falling life expectancy (although that is suddenly improving), and stubborn poverty. Most painfully, too, there is the memory of the Soviet era and the incredulity at the sharpness of the reversal. The US team has made clear that in its calculation, the strengths make it worth its while trying to “reset” the relationship. But the weaknesses mean that if the attempt fails, Russia could be relegated behind more pressing problems.The element that might change this calculation is the Russian leaders’ recent skilful management of the economy. It not only points to surefootedness in economic management, which their rhetoric has not often suggested. It offers hope that Russia may find its way out of its current sour resentment, and autocratic rule, and into a more stable future. A World Bank report last month spelt out the unexpected upside to Russia’s otherwise unsurprising suffering during the crisis. Yes, there has been plenty of damage. Real gross domestic product is expected to shrink by about 7.9 per cent this year (compared with a global fall in output of 2.9 per cent). That is a big shock after a decade of high growth, driven by high oil and gas prices. The stock market lost two thirds of its value in the five months to November 2008.Unemployment could now rise to 13 per cent and poverty to 17.4 per cent by the end of the year, the bank warned, noting that the middle class would also shrink by a tenth, or more than six million people, to just over half the population.However, the bank, which called the Government’s response “swift, co-ordinated, and comprehensive”, noted that Russia’s leaders had moved quickly to cut spending as the oil price fell (including pushing through an aggressive rethinking of the military). They had arranged a large stimulus, and had responded to the plunge in foreign reserves (figures yesterday showed a net capital inflow of $7.2 billion in the second quarter of 2009, after $35 billion flowed out in the first quarter). The worst effects of the crisis were perhaps past, the bank suggested. If — a huge if — Russia took the chance to reform old industries, and made them more competitive, then it could come out of the crisis with a more modern, diversified economy.There are a few slight signs that Russia’s leaders might seize that chance, such as the overhaul of the military (arms, and rules for conscription). Alternatively, they will persist with their technique of blaming others for their problems, and focusing on external threats, not obstacles at home.President Obama’s quest of trying to find a new deal to cut stockpiles of nuclear missiles is an honourable one. But its success will depend on whether Russia can be persuaded out of the mindset in which the expansion and success of the European Union and Nato are a threat. The US has had much less success with Russia than with China in persuading it of the value of becoming part of international organisations and laws. Not much in Putin’s or Medvedev’s recent behaviour suggests that they are that way inclined. All the same, the weakness of modern Russia, clutching the few great prizes of its recent past, in the form of missiles and oil wells while the rest lies in tatters, is one point of leverage. So is the Russian leaders’ astute reaction to the crisis, which they dubbed the failure of capitalism. That shows that they can set ideology aside and take quick steps in the country’s interest. That can only be a hopeful sign for Russia’s chances of becoming a less fearful and more modern state.

Growth Good – War – Middle East

Economic growth solves Middle East conflict

Sørli et al 5 (Mirjam E., CSCW Assistant @ Peace Research Institute Oslo, Nils Petter Gleditsch, Research prof at PRIO, Håvard Strand, Senior Resarcher at PRIO, “Why Is There so Much Conflict in the Middle East?” *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol.49(1), Feb, pp. 141-165, jm)

Economic growth and economic development are the two most important variables in our analysis. Poor countries that are trapped in poverty seem to be the most war prone, with an average probability of conflict onset at 8.8 percent, more than 5 percentage points higher than the global average. We are unable to report any strong findings for raw material dependence. Figure 2 presents the effect of oil dependence from model 6 in Table 5. It is both small and statistically insignificant. The same figure illustrates the effect of the political regime variable. While this effect is statistically significant only at the 10 percent level, the effect portrayed in the figure clearly outperforms that of oil dependence. An average semi-democracy is close to 3 percentage points more likely to experience a conflict onset than is a full democracy.

Growth Good – Enviro – General

Statistical models prove growth solves for the environment

Tierney 9 (John, science columnist for the New York Times, journalism degree from Yale U, cites Nobel Prize winning economist Simon Kuznets, Ph.D from Columbia U, Apr 20, [tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/04/20/the-richer-is-greener-curve/] AD: 6-21-11, jm)

In my Findings column, I explain how researchers have discovered that, over the long term, being richer often translates into being greener. Many environmental problems get worse as a country first industrializes, but once it reaches a certain level of income, the trend often reverses, producing a curve shaped like an upside-down U. It’s called a Kuznets curve (in honor of the economist Simon Kuznets, who detected this pattern in trends of income inequality). As promised in the column, here are some graphic examples of Kuznets curves for sulphur dioxide pollution, as measured in an assortment of rich and poor countries, and also as measured over time in the United States. Each line is an environmental Kuznets curve for a group of countries during the 1980s. The levels of sulphur dioxide pollution (the vertical axis) rise as countries becomes more affluent (the horizontal axis). But then, once countries reach an economic turning point (a gross domestic product close to $8,000 per capita), the trend reverses and air pollution declines as countries get richer. In this analysis by Xiang Dong Qin of Clemson University, the green line shows countries with strong protections for property rights; the red curve shows countries with weaker protections. I’m not trying to argue that all environmental problems fit these curves, or that these improvements happen automatically. How fast the environment improves depends not just on money but on whether a country has an effective government, educated citizens, healthy institutions and the right laws. (For discussions of the variability of these curves and the factors that affect them, see this PERC report by a group led by Bruce Yandle of Clemson University and this article in Environment, Development and Sustainability by Kuheli Dutt of Northeastern University.) But rising incomes can make it more likely that improvements will come, and these Kuznets curves give more reason for optimism than the old idea that economic growth endangered the planet. In the 1970s, rich countries were urged to “de-develop” by Paul Ehrlich and John P. Holdren, now the White House science adviser. I welcome your thoughts on what can be learned from Kuznets curves — and whether people at opposite ends of the curves can find common ground. As America got richer in the the 20th century, emissions of sulphur dioxide rose. But thanks to new technologies, new laws and new desires for cleaner air, the trend reversed, and sulphur-dioxide pollution declined even though population and wealth kept rising.

Growth reverses environmental damage – EKC models prove

Yandle et al 2 (Bruce, prof of econ @ Clemson U, Maya Vijayaraghavan, Ph.D in applied econ from Clemson U, Madhusudan Bhattarai, postdoctoral economist with the International Water Management Institute in Colombo, Sri Lanka, Feb 1, [www.perc.org/articles/article688.php] AD: 6-21-11, jm)

Since 1991, when economists first reported a systematic relationship between income changes and environmental quality, this relationship, known as the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC), has become standard fare in technical conversations about environmental policy (Grossman and Krueger 1991). When first unveiled, EKCs revealed a surprising outcome: Some important indicators of environmental quality such as the levels of sulfur dioxide and particulates in the air actually improved as incomes and levels of consumption went up. Prior to the advent of EKCs, many well-informed people believed that richer economies damaged and even destroyed their natural resource endowments at a faster pace than poorer ones. They thought that environmental quality could only be achieved by escaping the clutches of industrialization and the desire for higher incomes. The EKC's paradoxical relationship cast doubt on this assumption. We now know far more about the linkages between an economy and its environment than we did before 1991. This primer shares this knowledge. There is no single EKC relationship that fits all pollutants for all places and times. There are families of relationships, and in many cases the inverted-U Environmental Kuznets Curve is the best way to approximate the link between environmental change and income growth. The indicators for which the EKC relationship seems most plausible are local air pollutants such as oxides of nitrogen, sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter. The EKC evidence for water pollution is mixed, but there may be an inverted U-shaped curve for biological oxygen demand (BOD), chemical oxygen demand (COD), nitrates, and some heavy metals (arsenic and cadmium). In most cases, the income threshold for improving water quality is much lower than the air pollution improvement threshold. The acceptance of the EKC hypothesis for select pollutants has important policy implications. It implies that some environmental degradation along a country's development path is inevitable, especially during the take-off process of industrialization. Second, it suggests that when a certain level of per capita income is reached, economic growth helps to undo the damage done in earlier years. If economic growth is good for the environment, policies that stimulate growth (trade liberalization, economic restructuring, and price reform) should be good for the environment.
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Growth solves pollution and incentivizes green living

Taylor 3 (Jerry, director of natural resource studies at the Cato Institute, adjunct scholar at the Institute for Energy Research, Apr 23, [www.connectusfund.org/resources/happy-earth-day-thank-capitalism] AD: 6-21-11, jm)

Indeed, we wouldn't even have environmentalists in our midst were it not for capitalism. Environmental amenities, after all, are luxury goods. America -- like much of the Third World today -- had no environmental movement to speak of until living standards rose sufficiently so that we could turn our attention from simply providing for food, shelter, and a reasonable education to higher "quality of life" issues. The richer you are, the more likely you are to be an environmentalist. And people wouldn't be rich without capitalism. Wealth not only breeds environmentalists, it begets environmental quality. There are dozens of studies showing that, as per capita income initially rises from subsistence levels, air and water pollution increases correspondingly. But once per capita income hits between $3,500 and $15,000 (dependent upon the pollutant), the ambient concentration of pollutants begins to decline just as rapidly as it had previously increased. This relationship is found for virtually every significant pollutant in every single region of the planet. It is an iron law. Given that wealthier societies use more resources than poorer societies, such findings are indeed counterintuitive. But the data don't lie. How do we explain this? The obvious answer -- that wealthier societies are willing to trade-off the economic costs of government regulation for environmental improvements and that poorer societies are not -- is only partially correct. In the United States, pollution declines generally predated the passage of laws mandating pollution controls. In fact, for most pollutants, declines were greater before the federal government passed its panoply of environmental regulations than after the EPA came upon the scene. Much of this had to do with individual demands for environmental quality. People who could afford cleaner-burning furnaces, for instance, bought them. People who wanted recreational services spent their money accordingly, creating profit opportunities for the provision of untrammeled nature. Property values rose in cleaner areas and declined in more polluted areas, shifting capital from Brown to Green investments. Market agents will supply whatever it is that people are willing to spend money on. And when people are willing to spend money on environmental quality, the market will provide it. Meanwhile, capitalism rewards efficiency and punishes waste. Profit-hungry companies found ingenious ways to reduce the natural resource inputs necessary to produce all kinds of goods, which in turn reduced environmental demands on the land and the amount of waste that flowed through smokestacks and water pipes. As we learned to do more and more with a given unit of resources, the waste involved (which manifests itself in the form of pollution) shrank. This trend was magnified by the shift away from manufacturing to service industries, which characterizes wealthy, growing economies. The latter are far less pollution-intensive than the former. But the former are necessary prerequisites for the latter. Property rights -- a necessary prerequisite for free market economies -- also provide strong incentives to invest in resource health. Without them, no one cares about future returns because no one can be sure they'll be around to reap the gains. Property rights are also important means by which private desires for resource conservation and preservation can be realized. When the government, on the other hand, holds a monopoly on such decisions, minority preferences in developing societies are overruled (see the old Soviet block for details). Furthermore, only wealthy societies can afford the investments necessary to secure basic environmental improvements, such as sewage treatment and electrification. Unsanitary water and the indoor air pollution (caused primarily by burning organic fuels in the home for heating and cooking needs) are directly responsible for about 10 million deaths a year in the Third World, making poverty the number one environmental killer on the planet today. Capitalism can save more lives threatened by environmental pollution than all the environmental organizations combined. Finally, the technological advances that are part and parcel of growing economies create more natural resources than they consume. That's because what is or is not a "natural resource" is dependent upon our ability to harness the resource in question for human benefit. Resources are therefore a function of human knowledge. Because the stock of human knowledge increases faster in free economies than it does in socialist economies, it should be no surprise that most natural resources in the western world are more abundant today than ever before no matter which measure one uses.
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Statistical analysis proves that long term economic growth solves for the environment

Grossman and Krueger 95 (Gene M., Jacob Viner prof of International Econ and dir of the International Econ Section at Princeton U, and Alan B., Bendheim prof of Econ and Public Affairs at Princeton U, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol.110, No.2, May, pp.353-377, JSTOR, AD: 6-21-11, jm)

We have estimated equation (1) for each of the pollutants described in Section II. The GLS estimates are reported in Appendixes 1-4. The tables in these appendixes also show the p-values for the three current income variables, the three lagged income variables, and the six income variables taken together. In view of the strong multicollinearity between current and lagged GDP, as well as among powers of GDP, it is difficult to infer much about the individual coefficients. However, in most cases the collection of current and lagged GDP terms is highly significant. It appears therefore that national income is an important determinant of local air and water pollution. Figures I-IV present graphs that summarize the shape of the estimated reduced-form relationship between per capita GDP and each of the pollutants. Each figure relates to one class of environ- mental quality indicators: urban air quality, oxygen regime in rivers, fecal contamination of rivers, and heavy metal pollution in rivers. The graphs were constructed by multiplying GDP, GDP- squared, and GDP-cubed by the sum of the estimated coefficients for current and lagged GDP. We normalized by adding to this the mean value of the other variables multiplied by their corresponding coefficients. Formally, we plot Yj,, where (2) Yt = G-t(I3 + N) + G (P2 + P5) + G ($3 + I6) + XitAP7 and all variables are defined as before. Each graph shows the predicted level of pollution at a hypothetical site in a country with the indicated per capita GDP (and the same level of GDP in each of the prior three years) and with mean values for the other site- specific variables. On the left-hand side of each graph, we present a scale showing the original units of measurements. On the right- hand side we show an alternative scale obtained by dividing pollution levels by the standard deviation for that pollutant across all monitoring stations in our sample. This scale provides a common metric with which the different pollutants can be com- pared. We have set the vertical range of all of the graphs equal to four standard deviations of the dependent variable. The relative slopes of the curves therefore reveal the relative sensitivity of the different pollutants to changes in income. In addition to the estimated (cubic) relationship between pollution and GDP, the graphs display the mean residual from the fitted equation for each $2000 income interval. The sizes of these points have been scaled to be proportional to the number of observations in each cell. The mean residuals suggest that, in most cases, the assumed cubic functional form does not do injustice to the shape of the observed relationship between pollution and GDP. We also see from the graphs that there are relatively few observations for most pollutants at the upper extremes of income. As a consequence, the shape of the estimated relationship may be imprecisely estimated at these extreme points. We discuss first the indicators of urban air quality. Sulfur dioxide and smoke display an inverted U-shaped relationship with GDP. Pollution appears to rise with GDP at low levels of income, but eventually to reach a peak, and then to fall with GDP at higher levels of income. In the case of SO2, the estimated relationship turns up again at very high levels of income, but the relatively small number of observations for sites with incomes above $16,000 means that we cannot have much confidence in the shape of the curve in this range.9 We find a monotonically decreasing relation- ship between heavy particles and per capita GDP at all levels of income in the sample range. In all three of these cases, the income variables are jointly significant at the 1 percent level. Although the income variables are highly correlated, the lagged GDP terms tend to have the lowerp-values, perhaps indicating that past income has been a major determinant of current pollution standards. In Table I we examine more closely the following question: are increases in per capita GDP eventually associated with an improvement in the environmental quality? The table shows the income level at which each environmental problem appears to reach its worst proportions (if such an income level can be identified). We report also the standard errors for these estimated "peaks." 10 Concentra- tions of sulfur dioxide and smoke are found to peak at a relatively early stage in national development (that is, at a level of income reports the estimated slope of the relationship between pollution and per capita GDP at $10,000 and $12,000, and the associated standard errors. These estimates allow us to assess how confident we can be that pollution problems actually will be abating once a country reaches a middle-income level. For all three urban air pollutants, we find that increases in income are associated with lower concentrations at both $10,000 and $12,000, and we can reject the hypothesis that the relationship is actually flat or upward sloping for five of the six estimates. Next we turn to the oxygen regime in rivers. The income terms are jointly significant at less than the 1 percent level in two cases (dissolved oxygen and nitrates), at less than the 10 percent level in one case (BOD), and at only the 22 percent level in the remaining case (COD). Again the lagged income terms tend to be more significant than the current income terms. And again we find an inverted U-shaped relationship between income and the three measures of environmental damage, and a U-shaped relationship between income and the one direct measure of environmental quality (i.e., dissolved oxygen). In Table I we see that the turning points for these water quality indicators come somewhat later than those for urban air quality. The estimated turning points are at least $7500 for three of the measures, and in the case of the fourth (dissolved oxygen) the confidence interval includes a wide range of incomes. As for our tests of the association between environmental quality and per capita GDP in the middle-income range, we find a statistically significant beneficial relationship only for dissolved oxygen (at both $10,000 and $12,000) and for nitrates (at $12,000). However, inasmuch as BOD, COD, and dissolved oxygen are all indicator variables for essentially the same phenomenon, the
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consistency of the estimates across these different samples gives us some added confidence in each one. Our third group of environmental indicators relates to fecal contamination of rivers. The findings for fecal coliform are quite similar to those we have seen before. The income terms are jointly significant at less than the 1 percent level, and the lagged income terms are

themselves significant whereas the current income terms are not. This latter result is quite plausible, because fecal contami- nation does not stem from economic activity per se. Since contami- nation can be controlled by the treatment of raw sewage, our result could be explained by a lagged response of treatment plant construction to per capita income growth. Figure III indicates that increases in per capita GDP are associated with roughly constant levels of fecal coliform until a country reaches a real income level of about $8000. Thereafter, fecal contamination falls sharply with income. The estimated slope of the relationship is significantly negative at both the $10,000 and $12,000 levels of per capita GDP. The results relating to total coliform are rather baffling. Concentrations of total coliforms are found to rise with income at first, then fall, and then rise again sharply. By $10,000 the relationship is upward sloping and statistically significant. More- over, current income is more significantly associated with this indicator than past income. We have no explanation for these findings. Perhaps they reflect a spurious relationship inasmuch as the presence of some types of coliform does not necessarily indicate fecal contamination, and these bacteria have many nonanthropo- genic sources. Finally, we turn to the heavy metals. A statistically significant relationship exists between concentrations of pollution and current and lagged GDP only for lead, cadmium, and arsenic.1" For lead, the relationship is mostly downward sloping; for cadmium it is flat, with perhaps a slight downturn at high levels of income; for arsenic it resembles an inverted U. The peak concentration of arsenic is estimated to occur at a per capita GDP of $4900, with a standard error of $250. The estimated slope of the curve is negative for lead and arsenic at both $10,000 and $12,000, and is statistically significant in each case. To summarize, we find little evidence that environmental quality deteriorates steadily with economic growth. Rather, we find for most indicators that economic growth brings an initial phase of deterioration followed by a subsequent phase of improvement. We suspect that the eventual improvement reflects, in part, an in- creased demand for (and supply of) environmental protection at higher levels of national income. The turning points for the different pollutants vary, but in most cases they occur before a country reaches a per capita income of $8000. For seven of the fourteen indicators we find a statistically significant positive relationship between environmental quality and income for a middle-income country with a per capita GDP of $10,000. Only in one case (total coliform) do we find a significant adverse relation- ship at this income level. Let us comment briefly on some of the other covariates included in our models. For the most part these variables have plausible effects. For example, dissolved oxygen is negatively associated with mean water temperature, whereas BOD, COD, and The coliforms are all positively associated with temperature, as the physical properties of water would lead one to expect. Air pollution is less severe in coastal cities (all else being equal), perhaps reflecting the dispersal caused by offshore winds or a smaller average inflow of pollution from neighboring cities. On the other hand, heavy particles are found in higher concentrations in cities located near a desert, while smoke is especially prevalent in densely populated areas.

Economic growth and environmental protection are not zero sum

DeCanio 97 (Stephen, prof of Econ, Emeritus, at the U of California, Santa Barbara, Ph.D from MIT, *Contemporary Economic Policy*, Vol. XV, Oct, "Economic Modeling And The False Tradeoff Between Environmental Protection And Economic Growth," EBSCO, jm)

This theoretical and empirical survey leads to only one conclusion: it is time for policy- makers to abandon the presumption that in- creased environmental quality can only be pur- chased at the expense of other goods and ser- vices. A tradeoff between the environment and the rest of the economy is not inevitable. Let there be no mis u n d e r s t a n d i ng-s it ua t i o n s quite obviously exist in which environmental regulations are costly. Resources devoted to cleaning u p pollution could be used for other things. This does not vitiate the conclusion of the text. Technological progress is continu- ously expanding the production possibilities of the economy, and producing organizations a r e not likely to be operating a t the maximum lim- its o f their capacity. In either case, reductions in pollution may be accompanied by concur- rent improvements in productivity. If the effort to prevent pollution engenders organizational reform or stimulates technical progress, then environmental improvement can be a cause of more general productivity growth. These conclusions are dictated both by the- oretical considerations and by the weight of empirical evidence. In addition to the direct measurements of productive inefficiency re- ported here, the body of bottom-up studies re- main unrefuted. It is the top-down studies that depend for their conclusions on the validity of the “inevitable t r adeof f ’ assumption; the bot- tom-up studies are consistent with the reality that firms and other producers ordinarily fall short of complete maximization.
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Trade spurs clean tech – that solves for the environment

Mahto 2k (Ananda, BA in econ from the U of California, Santa Barbara, Jun 1, [ananda.mahto.info/sustainable-development-and-economic-growth/] AD: 6-21-11, jm)

The United Nations feels that businesses are indeed their “Partners in Sustainable Development.” In a publication by that title, the United Nations discussed the role of business and industry in improvement of the production process (at home and abroad) “through the introduction of technologies that use resources more efficiently and minimize environmental impacts” (Alvarez-Rivero iv). While the UN does admit that there are great costs associated with research and development (R&D) involving cleaner production technologies, it points out that the long run benefits outweigh these costs, and that furthermore, the large market would help absorb the costs. In a number of case studies, the clean technologies not only had environmental benefits, but they also generally resulted in higher production efficiency (Alvarez-Rivero 1). One of the major obstacles to investment in cleaner production identified in the UN report is misinformation about the costs of environmental protection. Part of the misinformation stems from the difficulty in doing cost-benefit analyses involving environmental costs. The UN recommends increased use of environmental accounting—using a framework that would allow firms to internalize the environmental costs to better determine whether a given project would “meet their benchmark for rate of return on investment” (Alvarez-Rivero 6). The effect of growth on the environment is an important one to look at when the goal is sustainable development. “Trade liberalization, per se, is not necessarily linked to either environmental degradation or environmental preservation.” It is likely, however, that trade can be an “effective agent” for sustainable development (Schultz 424). Environmental issues are of international concern and span many generations. Matters of intergenerational equity arise when considering environmental issues, because there is often a trade off to be made between “efficiency, [which] puts society on the utility possibilities frontier…[and] sustainability, [which] is a matter of distribution of assets across generations” (Howarth 473). There is also the concern that our placing a value on sacrificing something today for future generations may not be a value that is passed down through generations. We may be inclined to wonder about whether our efforts today may simply be foiled by acts of these future generations. The environmental concerns regarding sustainability have many different aspects. These include problems stemming from agricultural practices, increased levels of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions, and concern about global warming. Improper farming techniques, for example, while embodying good intentions such as providing more abundant, cheaper food, has resulted in environmental damage in the form of soil degradation, pollution, water scarcity and biodiversity loss. Soil degradation is taking place as a result of over-planting and overgrazing, accompanied by poor drainage and improper irrigation techniques. Pollution arises from the widespread use of fertilizers and pesticides. In addition to contaminating water sources, it is also causing many biological problems “throughout food-chains…in both man and beast.” Water is running out as a result of inefficient use in farming. Farm practices such as intensive monoculture programs, deforestation, selective animal breeding, and genetically modified high yielding, fast growing crops, have had a severe impact on biodiversity. “Over a sixth of the 3,800 breeds of domestic animals that existed a century ago have disappeared” (El Feki The Economist “Agriculture and Technology Survey,” Mar. 25 2000 p11). This is not to say that the situation concerning the environment is entirely bleak. The World Trade Organization, for example, has begun to include statements in its publications of interest in environmental issues and, as a more active stance, formed the Committee on Trade and the Environment in early 1994 (Schultz 425). There have also been environmental subsidy provisions that permit “governmental assistance to promote the adaptation of existing facilities to new environmental requirements (Schultz 429). Such acts as eco-labeling are being promoted by environmental groups and help raise public awareness and information about the goods that they consume. Perhaps the most well known case was the US ban on Mexican tuna that was not dolphin safe. At the time, tuna canners began a program labeling their products “dolphin safe.” Interestingly, such programs may “obviate the need for governmental product regulations,” by letting consumers express their environmental preferences by the informed choices they make in the marketplace (Schwartz 435). In addition, international economic relations are increasingly being formed conditional on adopting environmental protection measures. A few countries have already begun to position themselves “to compete in what will be one of the most dynamic markets of the future, environmentally sound technologies. Being able to provide environmentally friendly technologies is rapidly becoming a source of competitive advantage in the global search for new markets” (Sagasti 50). Studies have also found that “while increased economic output tends to be associated with higher CO2 emissions, a rising standard of living also slows down population growth and leads to reduced energy consumption per unit of output” (DeCanio 41). One thing that is key to success, however, is the rate of change at which new policies for promoting environmental sustainability are enforced. As Lester Brown points out, “This is not a spectator sport…the central issue [to the environmental challenges] is the need to restructure the global economy quickly” (20-21).
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Growth leads to tech and lower population rates – that solves for the environment

Hayward et al 2k (Steven, Ph.D. in American studies, M.A. in gov from Claremont U, Elizabeth Fowler, public policy fellow with the center for environmental and regulatory reform at the Pacific Research Institute (PRI), and Laura Steadman, research assistant with the center for environmental and regulatory reform and the center for enterprise and opporunity @ PRI, Apr 4, [www.mackinac.org/2841] AD: 6-21-11, jm)

Even when more exacting definitions of sustainable development are offered, confusion still persists because of honest scientific disputes and uncertainties about the facts, and differing opinions about how economies adapt over time to changing resource constraints. Consider Herman Daly's definition that sustainable development is "development without growth in throughput of matter and energy beyond regenerative and absorptive capacities." Scientists can point to favorable trends in resource bases, increasing efficiencies of production, and falling amounts of pollution, reaching the conclusion that we are on the way to achieving, if not already achieving, Daly's definition. Yet Daly and many others take a dimmer view, arguing that the imperative of sustainable development requires "steady state" economics, which would include zero population growth, centralized command of natural resources, and controls on individual incomes and personal wealth. Some economists have called Daly's "steady state" idea "a return to a regulated caveman culture."66 His view throws a spotlight on the implication some have drawn that economic growth itself is unsustainable and should be stopped or drastically curtailed.67 The most stark expression of this view is found in Paul and Anne Ehrlich's equation for human environmental impact, I = P x A x T where I = environmental impact, P = population, A = affluence, and T = technology. In other words, any increases in population, wealth, and technology are inherently damaging to the environment, no matter what mitigating measures are possible. It is a schematic for the most extreme pessimism and would require wholesale transformation of human society and political institutions if it were made the basis of policy. Indur Goklany offers an elegant and compelling refutation of the Ehrlichs' equation, and in the process explains why the signs point to a sustainable future.68 The most significant flaw is the assumption that population, affluence, and technology are wholly independent factors with no relation to each other. To the contrary, these three factors are highly interdependent, mostly in favorable ways. Rising affluence, for example, cuts fertility rates. The richest nations of the world have negative fertility rates and falling populations, a condition that would be true of the United States in the absence of high rates of immigration. The world fertility rate has fallen by nearly half since 1960, from 5.58 to 2.75, and with it the global rate of population growth, from 2.07 percent in 1967 to 1.33 percent in 1998. The stabilization of world population can be expected as the rest of the world grows more affluent. The environmental impact of technology is exactly backward from what the Ehrlichs' equation suggests. The amount of energy used and pollution emitted per dollar of economic activity has been falling for as long as reliable long-term data exist. In the United States, energy intensity has been falling by one percent per year since 1800. That is, it takes one percent less energy each year to produce the same amount of goods. Goklany has examined specific air pollutants in the United States, finding, for example, that a dollar of economic activity today generates only .084 times as much sulfur dioxide emissions as a dollar of economic activity in 1900. In other words, changing technology has delivered a more than tenfold reduction in SO2 pollution per unit of economic output in the twentieth century. Other pollutants show even larger declines—30-fold for volatile organic compounds and particulates, and 100-fold for lead. This trends means, among other things, that today's worldwide carbon emissions are nearly 60 less than what they would have been were we still using 1950 technology. As developing nations become wealthier, we can expect to see a convergence of environmental performance that approaches the progress of the United States and other western nations. An example of what this convergence should look like can be seen in Chart 32 which shows sulfur dioxide trends in the U.S. and some of the eastern European nations that have embraced market economies in the last decade. Goklany's conclusion is worth quoting at length: The future could see a world in which the population has stabilized, is richer, cleaner, and with room for both humanity and the rest of nature, or one which is more populated, poor and polluted and where the rest of nature is pinched for space and water. The odds of the former are increased by bolstering the co-evolving, mutually reinforcing forces of economic growth, technology, and trade by strengthening the institutions that are their mainstays. These institutions are free markets; secure property rights to both tangible and intellectual products; fair, equitable and relatively transparent rules to govern those markets and enforce contracts; institutions for accumulating and converting knowledge into useful and beneficial products; and honest and predictable bureaucracies and governments . . . [I]ndustrial ecology can play an important role in moving such solutions closer to perfection, and in accelerating society's various environmental transitions so that technological change and economic growth are transformed from being problems to becoming solutions in the quest for a sustainable industrial society.69
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Drinking water up – Grants solving

News around the Caribbean 6-20 (http://www.caribbean360.com/index.php/news/guyana\_news/468402.html#axzz1Q3qVsyJZ, 6-20-2011, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

GEORGETOWN, Guyana, Monday June 20, 2011 – The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) has approved a $12 million loan to improve efficiency, quality and sustainability of the drinking water service in Linden, Guyana's second largest city. The funds will help the city cut energy use; improve pressure, quality and continuity of the water supply system; reduce the level of revenue loss due to physical and commercial reasons; and strengthen the operation and maintenance performance of the country’s public utility, Guyana Water Incorporated (GWI). Specifically, according to a statement from the IDB, the five-year programme will help reduce GWI’s annual energy spending in Linden from US$232,000 to US$140,000, while building and rehabilitating 10 kilometers of mains, reducing non-revenue water (NRW) levels from 65 percent to less than 50 percent and bringing water pressure to adequate levels in all households. “Works will include construction of two treatment plants to ensure good water quality and of two large reservoirs aimed at ensuring water supply continuity and better pressure in the distribution network,” it said.

Drinking water up – “super sand” solves

UPI 6-22 (United Press International, http://www.upi.com/Science\_News/2011/06/22/Super-sand-could-improve-drinking-water/UPI-66511308787353/#ixzz1Q3ubnblt, dw: 6-22-2011, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

Australian scientists say ordinary sand, used to filter and purify drinking water around the world, can be made into a "super sand" five times more efficient. Researchers writing in the journal Applied Materials & Interfaces say the material could be a low-cost benefit in developing countries where more than a billion people lack clean drinking water. Sand has been used to purify water for more than 6,000 years, and sand or gravel water filtration is endorsed by the World Health Organization, researchers Mainak Majumder and his colleagues write, but their study of a nanomaterial called graphite oxide suggests it could be used to improve sand filtration in a cost-effective way. Sand grains coated with graphite oxide become a "super sand" that can successfully remove mercury and other contaminants from water. While ordinary sand was saturated with mercury after just 10 minutes of filtration, the super sand was capable of absorbing the heavy metal for more than 50 minutes, the researchers said.
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Studies show all environmental indicators are up

Tater 9 (Red, political writer with experience in politics, public schools, business, sports and LIFE, May 30, [redstaterusa.blogspot.com/2009/05/our-environment-is-actually-getting.html] AD: 6-23-11, jm)

Environmental quality continues to improve dramatically in the United States, according to the Index of Leading Environmental Indicators 2002, released today by the San Francisco-based Pacific Research Institute (PRI). Authors Steven Hayward and Julie Majeres show that environmental quality has been improving since the first Earth Day 32 years ago, despite the public perception that it is getting worse. “Environmental scare-mongering harms environmental policy because it detracts from constructive, science-based policy,” said the authors. “With all of the information that's available online, citizens don't have to take anyone's word for it, they can check it out for themselves.” The study uses government data to examine long-term air and water quality trends, toxic chemicals and land use, as well as biodiversity issues. The authors take an in-depth look at the evolution of the environmental debate and provide extensive web-based resources. On Earth Day, April 22, the Institute launched a new environmental section on its website with local data for all 50 states and an exhaustive guide to online environmental resources www.pacificresearch.org/press/index.html).

No Overpopoulation – stats prove

Craven 6-13 (Michael, Christian Post, President of the Center for Christ & Culture, http://www.christianpost.com/news/the-myth-of-overpopulation-51113/, dw: 6-13-2011, da: 6-22-2011)

Perhaps one of the most persistent and pervasive myths that have shaped the thinking of many people and, subsequently, public policy is the myth that the world’s population is spiraling out of control and that it will ultimately lead to catastrophic shortages of the essential resources necessary to sustain life. This whole concept of “overpopulation” can be traced to Thomas Malthus, the British scholar and Anglican clergyman (albeit a very misguided one) who, without any specific knowledge other than his own speculations, predicted in 1789 that the planet’s rapid increase in population would soon outstrip the planet’s ability to produce food, resulting in massive worldwide starvation. Malthus’s predicted famine never materialized, of course; he could not have predicted the industrial revolution or the enormous impact subsequent technological innovations would have on our ability to produce food. Recall that today our federal government actually pays farmers not to grow crops due to the abundance of food produced on considerably less farmland than existed just a century ago. Even the United Nations, historically a rabid advocate of population control, has conceded that the world’s current infrastructure is capable of supporting a worldwide population of more than 9 billion people. Furthermore, according to the most recent estimates, the planet’s population will most likely continue to climb from its current level until 2050, when it will peak at 9 billion; other predictions have the world’s population peaking at 7.5 billion in 2040. In either case, global population levels will begin a sharp decline sometime during the middle of the twenty-first century. Present fertility rates actually indicate a massive underpopulation crisis is coming, particularly among Western nations. The question of overpopulation is not merely a topic for conversation; it is a burning matter of policy and action at the local, national, and international levels. Our national government is actually committed by law and by international agreement to reducing the worldwide rate of population growth. Government officials, such as former Assistant Secretary of State for Global Affairs in the Clinton administration, Timothy Wirth, insist that this effort must also apply to the population of the United States. Wirth, as you may recall, was at the center of controversy when the Clinton administration decided to deport 13 Chinese women who sought asylum in the United States to avoid forced abortion under communist China’s notorious one-child policy. By offering asylum to these women, Wirth explained, “we could potentially open ourselves up to just about everybody in the world saying ‘I don't want to plan my family, therefore I deserve political asylum.’” Apparently, Wirth believes government-forced abortions and sterilization constitutes “family planning.” ”

Growth Good – Enviro – So2 I/L

SO2 causes warming and kills the ozone layer

Huff 98 (Kara, Ph.D., Purdue U, assistant prof of analytic chemistry @ Southern Illinois U, Sep 21, [www.iitap.iastate.edu/gcp/studentpapers/1996/atmoschem/huff.html] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

However, after two months, most SO2 is converted to sulfuric acid by reaction with hydroxyl radicals (OH). This condenses into aerosols in the atmosphere. This is known as the aerosol effect. Nitrogen oxides (NOx =NO, NO2, NO3, and N2O5) react with the surface of the aerosols to form nitric acid (HNO3). Normally, NOx reacts with ozone-depleting Cl and ClO to form less ozone-depleting compounds. However, because the sulfuric acid aerosol removes NOx, the ozone layer becomes more sensitive to Cl and ClO. In this case, the ozone concentration decreases. This long-term situation was verified using three computer models. First, a situation was studied three months after the eruption, assuming the SO2 cloud was confined to the tropics. It was also assumed that SO2 acted as a greenhouse gas and caused slight stratospheric heating. In this case, it was found that the concentration of ozone-depleting radicals increased by 25-50% at 20 km. Second, the same situation was studied without heating. In this case, NO2 was decreased by 40% and ClO was increased by a factor of 2.3. Lastly, this was studied seven months after eruption, assuming that the cloud was evenly dispersed over the Earth. In this case, NO2 concentration was reduced by 30-35% at 20-25 km. As shown, SO2 has been found to not change ozone concentration at 25 km in the first two months after a volcanic eruption. Then, in all three long-term computer modeling studies, the ozone concentration decreases, due to the aerosol effect. These facts agree well with the stratospheric ozone data collected. For this reason, a mechanism to explain the effect of volcanic SO2 on the ozone layer has been found.

Growth Good – Enviro – AT: Carrying Capacity Theory

There’s no limit to the carrying capacity – free markets adjust accordingly

Perry 10 (Mark J., prof of econ and finance @ U of Mich, Ph.D in econ from George Mason U, Dec 28, [mjperry.blogspot.com/2010/12/finite-world-of-paul-krugmans-thinking.html] AD: 6-21-11, jm)

"It’s not true that vigorous economic growth necessarily makes resources more scarce. In fact, history shows that, because of human ingenuity, the opposite is not only possible but prevalent. Since the dawn of the industrial revolution in the mid-18th century, available supplies of coal, petroleum, iron ore, and most other resources have increased significantly – and, as a result, their real prices have fallen." MP: The evidence is working against Krugman and in favor of Boudreaux on this one. The chart above shows the monthly, inflation-adjusted Dow Jones-AIG Commodity Index back to January of 1934 (data from Global Financial Data, paid subscription required). The DJ-AIG index is composed of futures contracts on 19 physical commodities in five categories with the following weights (individual weights are listed here): 1. Agriculture (coffee, corn, cotton, soybeans, soybean oil, sugar, wheat): 34.37% 2. Energy (crude oil, natural gas, heating oil, unleaded gas): 27.28% 3. Industrial Metals (aluminum, copper, nickel, zinc): 17.65% 4. Precious Metals (gold, silver): 14.60% 5. Livestock (lean hogs, live cattle): 6.10% (Note: According to Global Financial Data, data in the index from 1933 to 1989 are from the Dow Jones Futures Index, and data from 1990 are from the Dow Jones-AIG Commodity Index.) Bottom Line: Over a very long period of time (76 years), there has been a significant downward trend in the real prices of commodities (see red trend line in graph), and the decline in commodity prices has taken place during a period when the world population increased by more than three times, from 2 billion in 1934 to the current population of 7 billion in 2010. Don asks the right question: "If economic growth since the industrial revolution coincided with increasing resource supplies, why should we expect that continued economic growth will suddenly start to have the opposite, dreary effects predicted by Mr. Krugman?"

Growth Good – Enviro – Warming

Free market solves warming – even if it doesn’t, it’s key to adaptability

Callahan 7 (Gene, adjunct scholar with the Ludwig von Mises Institute, Oct, [www.thefreemanonline.org/featured/how-a-free-society-could-solve-global-warming/] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

For these reasons, I believe it is crucial to accept provisionally, for the sake of argument, the scientific claims behind the case for manmade global warming. In the present article I will demonstrate that it still would not follow that the taxes and other regulations typically proposed by greens are the best way to address the problem. Just as the free market is still the optimal economic arrangement, regardless of how many citizens are angels or devils, so too does the free market outperform government intervention, regardless of the fragility of Earth’s ecosystems. When trying to determine if the free market is to blame for possibly dangerous carbon emissions, a logical starting point is to list the numerous ways that government policies encourage the very activities that Al Gore and his friends want us to curtail. The U.S. government has subsidized many activities that burn carbon: it has seized land through eminent domain to build highways, funded rural electrification projects, and fought wars to ensure Americans’ access to oil. After World War II it played a key role in the mass exodus of the middle class from urban centers to the suburbs, chiefly through encouraging mortgage lending. Every American schoolchild has heard of the bold transcontinental railroad (finished with great ceremony at Promontory Summit, Utah) promoted by the federal government. Historian Burt Folsom explains that due to the construction contracts, the incentive was to lay as much track as possible between points A and B—hardly an approach to economize on carbon emissions from the wood- and coal-burning locomotives. For a more recent example, consider John F. Kennedy’s visionary moon shot. I’m no engineer, but I’ve seen the takeoffs of the Apollo spacecraft and think it’s quite likely that the free market’s use of those resources would have involved far lower CO2 emissions. While myriad government policies have thus encouraged carbon emissions, at the same time the government has restricted activities that would have reduced them. For example, there would probably be far more reliance on nuclear power were it not for the overblown regulations of this energy source. For a different example, imagine the reduction in emissions if the government would merely allow market-clearing pricing for the nation’s major roads, thereby eliminating traffic jams! The pollution from vehicles in major urban areas could be drastically cut overnight if the government set tolls to whatever the market could bear—or better yet, sold bridges and highways to private owners. Of course, there is no way to determine just what the energy landscape in America would look like if these interventions had not occurred. Yet it is entirely possible that on net, with a freer market economy, in the past we would have burned less fossil fuel and today we would be more energy efficient. Even if it were true that reliance on the free-enterprise system makes it difficult to curtail activities that contribute to global warming, still the undeniable advantages of unfettered markets would allow humans to deal with climate change more easily. For example, the financial industry, by creating new securities and derivative markets, could crystallize the “dispersed knowledge” that many different experts held in order to coordinate and mobilize mankind’s total response to global warming. For instance, weather futures can serve to spread the risk of bad weather beyond the local area affected. Perhaps there could arise a market betting on the areas most likely to be permanently flooded. That may seem ghoulish, but by betting on their own area, inhabitants could offset the cost of relocating should the flooding occur. Creative entrepreneurs, left free to innovate, will generate a wealth of alternative energy sources. (State intervention, of course, tends to stifle innovations that threaten the continued dominance of currently powerful special interests, such as oil companies—for example, the state of North Carolina recently fined Bob Teixeira for running his car on soybean oil.) Private insurers have a strong incentive to assess the potential effects of global warming without bias in order to price their policies optimally—if they overestimate the risk, they will lose business to lower-priced rivals; if they are too sanguine about the dangers, they will lose money once the claims start rolling in. Individuals finding their homes or businesses threatened by rising sea levels will find it easier to relocate to the extent that unfettered markets have made them wealthier. Industrial manufacturers, as long as they are held liable for the negative environmental effects of their production processes—a traditional common-law liability from which state policies intended to “promote industry” have often sought to shield manufacturers—will strive to develop technologies that minimize the environmental impact of their activities without sacrificing efficiency. Government interventions and “five-year plans,” even when they are sincere attempts to protect the environment rather than disguised schemes to benefit some powerful lobby, lack the profit incentive and are protected from the competitive pressures that drive private actors to seek an optimal cost-benefit tradeoff. If the situation truly becomes dire, it will be free-market capitalism that allows humans to develop techniques for sucking massive amounts of carbon out of the atmosphere, and to colonize the oceans and outer space. Beyond these futuristic possibilities, the obvious responses to global warming—such as more houses with AC, sturdier sea walls, and better equipment to evacuate flooded regions—are again only feasible when the free market is unleashed. It is the poorest people and nations that stand to suffer the most if the worst-case scenario for global warming is realized, and the only reliable way to alleviate their poverty, and thus help protect them from those effects, is the free market.

Growth Good – Enviro – Warming

Market forces drive tech shifts which solve warming

Anderson 4 (Terry L., senior fellow at the Hoover Institute, and adjunct prof at the Stanford Graduate School of Business, Hoover Digest, No.3 Summer, [www.perc.org/articles/article446.php] AD: 6-21-11, jm)

In the March 2004 issue of Scientific American, National Aeronautics and Space Administration global-warming expert James Hansen notes that greenhouse gas emissions and global-warming projections are "consistently pessimistic." Hansen suggests that projections do not take into account the lower carbon dioxide and methane emissions that have resulted from technological advancements. He explains that the lower carbon dioxide emissions result from increased energy efficiency following the energy crisis in the 1970s and the lower methane emissions, from technological changes in agriculture. Hansen's essay concludes on an optimistic note, saying "the main elements [new technologies] required to halt climate change have come into being with remarkable rapidity." This statement would not have surprised economist Julian Simon. He saw the "ultimate resource" to be the human mind and believed it to be best motivated by market forces. Because of a combination of market forces and technological innovations, we are not running out of natural resources. As a resource becomes more scarce, prices increase, thus encouraging development of cheaper alternatives and technological innovations. Just as fossil fuel replaced scarce whale oil, its use will be reduced by new technology and alternative fuel sources. Market forces also cause economic growth, which in turn leads to environmental improvements. Put simply, poor people are willing to sacrifice clean water and air, healthy forests, and wildlife habitat for economic growth. But as their incomes rise above subsistence, "economic growth helps to undo the damage done in earlier years," says economist Bruce Yandle. "If economic growth is good for the environment, policies that stimulate growth ought to be good for the environment." The link between greenhouse gas emissions and economic prosperity is no different. Using data from the United States, Professor Robert McCormick finds that "higher GDP reduces total net [greenhouse gas] emissions." He goes a step further by performing the complex task of estimating net U.S. carbon emissions. This requires subtracting carbon sequestration (long-term storage of carbon in soil and water) from carbon emissions. Think of it this way: When you build a house, the wood in it stores carbon. In a poor country that wood would have been burned to cook supper or to provide heat, thus releasing carbon into the atmosphere. McCormick shows that economic growth in the United States has increased carbon sequestration in many ways, including improved methods of storing waste, increased forest coverage, and greater agricultural productivity that reduces the acreage of cultivated land. Because rich economies sequester more carbon than poor ones, stored carbon must be subtracted from emissions to determine an economy's net addition to greenhouse gas emissions. McCormick's data show that "rich countries take more carbon out of the air than poorer ones" and that "the growth rate of net carbon emission per person will soon be negative in the United States." Put differently—richer may well be cooler. Global-warming policy analysts agree that greenhouse gas regulations such as those proposed at Kyoto would have negative impacts on the economy. Therefore, as McCormick warns, we should take great care that regulations in the name of global warming "not kill the goose that lays the golden eggs."

Growth Good – Enviro – Desertification

Free market solves desertification

Port 10 (Rob, author of the conservative Say Anything blog, Jun 6, [sayanythingblog.com/entry/property-rights-can-reverse-desertification/] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

Surprisingly, that flies in the face of modern wisdom about land management–the typical response is to rest land completely, and livestock are often named as the chief culprits in desertification. “We’ve been ridiculed for 50 years,” says Savory. But he argues that examples from around the world show that resting the land doesn’t prepare it for the return of vegetation–instead, it simply remains barren, with rain simply running off soil that stays cracked and dry. “But when you range animals correctly, the land starts returning,” he says. “The only thing that can do it is a heavy herbivore with a wet gut.”I find it not very shocking that the environmentalist experts were wrong again. How much government money have they wasted doing studies on their failed ideology that’s made things worse. What’s worse is how much have they contributed to poverty and misery in the people that live there that were denied the right to earn a living. I don’t want to go into the causes for desertification. That’s a trend that’s gone on for thousands of years. I still blame the Romans for salting the soil around Carthage to keep the city from rising another army to threaten Rome. (Big Babies.) Let’s assume that this guy’s strategy of moving domestic animals in the same way that herds of wild animals did in the time before people change the environment. What’s the best way to deliver that. I think the best way would be for to restore private rights to the landowners. History has shown that only landowners with strong rights have the incentive to improve the land. Strong rights would include not having to pay ruinous taxes on the land and your profits. If the government requires too much in the way of taxes the landowner has no choice but to squeeze the land more than he should to keep ahead of the taxman. There’s no doubt that pressure by government has led to overgrazing in certain times in certain places in the world. Strong rights also include the ability to leave the property to your offspring without ruinous taxation. That give the farmer the incentive to improve the land for future generations. I shouldn’t have to explain why the government holding the land for everyone to use as they feel like won’t work. That’s called the tragedy of the common. When everyone owns something, no one does. A farmer has every incentive to overgraze when he can because if he doesn’t someone else will. You don’t have that problem when someone owns the property and they have strong property rights. It’s a matter of incentives. With private ownership the incentives are in the right place. The collectivists will say that the government should own and manage the land while the farmers might be allowed to own the livestock. Like a lot of collectivist schemes this sounds like it might work, but when put into practice it doesn’t.

**Desertification is getting reversed**

Web Wire 6-13 (http://www.webwire.com/ViewPressRel.asp?aId=139259, dw: 6-13-2011, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

Climate change has led to prolonged periods of drought, over-intensive farming and over-grazing have caused land degradation and deforestation has turned the once fertile land into desert. In an attempt to reverse that process of desertification, FAO has stepped in with the Acacia project. Fatou Seye and her family are among the beneficiaries. "Before the project we had no trees, we were cultivating degraded, infertile lands, but with the project that has changed, " she says. Fatou Seye is one of 150 women in the village benefiting from the project. From 2004 to 2007, FAO, in partnership with the Senegalese forestry service, provided seeds and seedlings and taught the women in the village how to sow and plant the Acacia trees as well as how to extract and market the gum they produce. In the last year, the trees have finally reached maturity and gum extraction has become possible. But even before the local community benefited. According to Nora Berrahmouni, FAO Forestry officer, "Acacia offers many benefits. They feed the soil by capturing nitrogen that restores fertility. It is a shelter for crops. It also provides gum Arabic, which has an international market, and so it is good for the economy. Not only that but it is also a source of fodder for livestock and food for local communities" Great potential Fatou confirms that the Acacia have already dramatically improved living conditions "because now we’re producing hibiscus juice and millet, peanuts and beans, which we can eat. Production of fodder for livestock has increased and we sell the fodder at market. With the money, we are planning to build a mill so can make flour and bread" Harvesting of the gum itself has only just begun as, at 7 years if age, the plants are only just mature enough. In the coming years the plants will provide further income for these women.

Growth Good – Enviro – Species

Growth solves bio-d – especially in high income countries

Asafu-Adjaye 3 (John, associate prof at the school of Economics, The U of Queensland, Apr 1, [www.freepatentsonline.com/article/Contemporary-Economic-Policy/100500093.html] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

The institutional proxy used in the study was an indicator of economic freedoms that is more narrowly defined than those used in previous studies. This indicator is based mainly on economic freedoms, whereas the others have been based on broad social freedoms. The study results indicate that although improvement in economic freedoms can be associated with improvement in mammal and bird species numbers, the effect on biodiversity is much stronger in low-income countries compared to high-income countries. The main implication here is that there is a need to develop appropriate institutional and macroeconomic policies that allow biodiversity values to be internalized in decision-making processes at the individual and national levels. However, a major obstacle to achieving this objective is that biodiversity is a global public good, and as such individuals and countries have no incentive to invest in the stocks of such resources. Thus there is the need for more international initiatives, such as the Global Enviro nmental Facility, that aim to promote the management of biodiversity resources.

BioD loss being reversed

Environment News 6-4 (http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/jun2011/2011-06-04-01.html, dw:6-4-2011, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

Leaders of more than 35 nations covering the world's three major rainforest regions agreed Friday to prepare an action plan on sustainable management of forests for signature next year at the Rio+20 Summit meeting in Brazil. The heads of state and government from nations across the Amazon, the Congo and the Borneo-Mekong forest basins met in Brazzaville May 31 through June 3 at the Summit of the Three Rainforest Basins. The gathering was backed by the United Nations as part of activities marking the International Year of Forests 2011. In their Joint Declaration, the leaders said they "share a vision of a cooperation that holistically incorporates economic, environment, and socio-cultural aspects, with a view to promoting harmonious and sustainable development of their respective forests." The leaders directed their ministers to draw up an action plan "advocating for conservation, sustainable management and rehabilitation and restoration of tropical forests ecosystems and their biodiversity; promoting sustainable trade in forest services and products, including forest genetic resources; and strengthening of forest governance, including access and benefit sharing; forest law, environmental governance and trade."

Growth Good – Enviro – Oceans

Industrial emissions solve warming and ocean health

Cain 5 (Fraser, studied engineering at the U of British Columbia, completing his computer science degree, Feb 11, [www.universetoday.com/10263/air-pollution-linked-to-growth-of-life-in-oceans/] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

A surprising link may exist between ocean fertility and air pollution over land, according to Georgia Institute of Technology research reported in the Feb. 16 issue of the Journal of Geophysical Research – Atmospheres. The work provides new insight into the role that ocean fertility plays in the complex cycle involving carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in global warming. When dust storms pass over industrialized areas, they can pick up sulfur dioxide, an acidic trace gas emitted from industrial facilities and power plants. As the dust storms move out over the ocean, the sulfur dioxide they carry lowers the pH (a measure of acidity and alkalinity) level of dust and transforms iron into a soluble form, said Nicholas Meskhidze, a postdoctoral fellow in Professor Athanasios Nenes’ group at Georgia Tech’s School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences and lead author of the paper “Dust and Pollution: A Recipe for Enhanced Ocean Fertilization.” This conversion is important because dissolved iron is a necessary micronutrient for phytoplankton – tiny aquatic plants that serve as food for fish and other marine organisms, and also reduce carbon dioxide levels in Earth’s atmosphere via photosynthesis. Phytoplankton carry out almost half of Earth’s photosynthesis even though they represent less than 1 percent of the planet’s biomass.

Only man-made pollution can solve for warming and ocean health

Cain 5 (Fraser, studied engineering at the U of British Columbia, completing his computer science degree, Feb 11, [www.universetoday.com/10263/air-pollution-linked-to-growth-of-life-in-oceans/] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

In research funded by the National Science Foundation, Meskhidze began studying dust storms three years ago under the guidance of William Chameides, Regents’ Professor and Smithgall Chair at Georgia Tech’s School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences and co-author of the paper. “I knew that large storms from the Gobi deserts in northern China and Mongolia could carry iron from the soil to remote regions of the northern Pacific Ocean, facilitating photosynthesis and carbon-dioxide uptake,” Meskhidze said. “But I was puzzled because the iron in desert dust is primarily hematite, a mineral that is insoluble in high-pH solutions such as seawater. So it’s not readily available to the plankton.” Using data obtained in a flight over the study area, Meskhidze analyzed the chemistry of a dust storm that originated in the Gobi desert and passed over Shanghai before moving onto the northern Pacific Ocean. His discovery: When a high-concentration of sulfur dioxide mixed with the desert dust, it acidified the dust to a pH below 2 – the level needed for mineral iron to convert into a dissolved form that would be available to phytoplankton. Expanding on this discovery, Meskhidze studied how variations in air pollution and mineral dust affect iron mobilization. Obtaining in-flight data from two different Gobi-desert storms – one occurring on March 12, 2001, and the other on April 6, 2001 — Meskhidze analyzed the pollution content and then modeled the storms’ trajectory and chemical transformation over the North Pacific Ocean. Using satellite measurements, he determined whether there had been increased growth of phytoplankton in the ocean area where the storms passed. The results were surprising, he said. Although the April storm was a large one, with three sources of dust colliding and traveling as far as the continental United States, there was no increased phytoplankton activity. Yet the March storm, albeit smaller, significantly boosted the production of phytoplankton. The differing results can be attributed to the concentration of sulfur dioxide existing in dust storms, Meskhidze said. Large storms are highly alkaline because they contain a higher proportion of calcium carbonate. Thus, the amount of sulfur dioxide picked up from pollution is not enough to bring down the pH below 2. “Although large storms can export vast amounts of mineral dust to the open ocean, the amount of sulfur dioxide required to acidify these large plumes and generate bioavailable iron is about five to 10 times higher than the average springtime concentrations of this pollutant found in industrialized areas of China,” Meskhidze explained. “Yet the percentage of soluble iron in small dust storms can be many orders of magnitude higher than large dust storms.” So even though small storms are limited in the amount of dust they transport to the ocean and may not cause large plankton blooms, small storms still produce enough soluble iron to consistently feed phytoplankton and fertilize the ocean. This may be especially important for high-nitrate, low-chlorophyll waters, where phytoplankton production is limited because of a lack of iron. Natural sources of sulfur dioxide, such as volcanic emissions and ocean production, may also cause iron mobilization and stimulate phytoplankton growth. Yet emissions from human-made sources normally represent a larger portion of the trace gas. Also, human-made emission sites may be closer to the storm’s course and have a stronger influence on it than natural sulfur dioxide, Meskhidze said. This research deepens scientists’ understanding of the carbon cycle and climate change, he added. “It appears that the recipe of adding pollution to mineral dust from East Asia may actually enhance ocean productivity and, in so doing, draw down atmospheric carbon dioxide and reduce global warming,” Chameides said. “Thus, China’s current plans to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions, which will have far-reaching benefits for the environment and health of the people of China, may have the unintended consequence of exacerbating global warming,” he added. “This is perhaps one more reason why we all need to get serious about reducing our emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.”

Growth Good – Enviro – Oceans UQ

Ocean quality is improving

Barboza 10 (Tony, journalist for the LA Times, Sep 30, [articles.latimes.com/2010/sep/30/local/la-me-0930-ocean-testing-20100930] AD: 6-23-11, jm)

Water quality at California beaches has continued to show improvement, even as the future of monitoring programs remains uncertain because of state budget shortfalls, according to a report released Wednesday by Heal the Bay. This summer was one of the cleanest on record for California beaches and the fourth straight summer of excellent water quality grades statewide. Of the beaches tested, 92% received A or B grades during the high-traffic beachgoing season, according to the environmental group's End of Summer Beach Report Card. But if money isn't found to continue funding the $1-million-a-year beach testing program next year, the state and coastal counties may be forced to discontinue water-quality monitoring, ending public alerts when the ocean poses a health risk to swimmers and surfers, according to the report. "We continue to see water quality improvements at California beaches," Heal the Bay President Mark Gold said in a news release. "However without a sustainable source of beach-monitoring funding, the public health of millions of ocean users will be jeopardized."

Growth Good – Space – General

Space exploration requires a good economy

Elhefnawy 8 (Nader, The Space Review, prof, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1220/1, dw: 9-29-8, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

Nevertheless, that emphasis also happens to be narrow. Particularly where manned space flight is overly concerned, cheaper must go hand in hand with safer and more reliable. (A manned vehicle with a failure rate of one every fifty launches is not nearly good enough, at any price.) The reduction of the needed payload size to accomplish a given task, which has greatly helped to widen access to satellites, is just as important. No less important is the expansion of the economic base that would have to support such endeavors, a point which rarely gets much attention. There is an obvious reason why that approach is often ignored: the common claim that the limits to growth on Earth mandate a turn to the exploitation of space. (Such arguments are not exclusive to the writers of the 1970s. John S. Lewis posits that the failure to do so will mean “civilization collapses to subsistence agriculture by 2030” in his 1996 book Mining the Sky.) However, this is far from being the only reason. The plain truth is that relying on terrestrial economic expansion to endow us with the resources for eventual space expansion will mean admitting the most exciting things are further off than we would like, outside the time frame of “meaningful” discussions of what public policy should be or what private business can do. Besides, it makes for a less compelling and attractive story than the idea of a technological revolution just over the horizon that opens up the heavens to all of us—especially if one is a market romantic when it comes to these matters (see “Market romanticism and the outlook for private space development”, The Space Review, September 2, 2008). Nonetheless, that is what one would have to assume given the state of the art. Additionally, however, while space launch costs (and other, related costs) may drop in real terms in the coming decades, it is safe to say that any viable future spacefaring society will also see them drop markedly in relative terms. The United Nations predicts the rise of Gross World Product (GWP) to about $140 trillion by 2050, more than twice today’s level, and this is still rather conservative next to some previous periods of comparable length. A repeat of the growth of 1950–1990, for instance, would likely result in a GWP in the $250–350 trillion range. And of course, if one goes in for that sort of thinking, the growth we could realize if the predictions of futurists like Ray Kurzweil pan out would absolutely explode those numbers. Of course, some caution is in order. Given the challenges the world now faces, including tight energy supplies, ecological degradation, and financial instability (and the huge uncertainties involved in not just space, but other technologies like molecular engineering and robotics), it is easy to picture even the modest numbers supplied by the UN proving overoptimistic. Additionally, even if these levels of income actually are attained (and the possibility is certainly worth considering), one should not get carried away in fantasizing about their significance. Joseph Schumpeter once considered the prospect of a per capita U.S. GDP of $1300 ($16,700 in today’s dollars) in 1978. It seemed obvious to him that at such a level of income: all the desiderata that have so far been espoused by any social reformers—practically without exception, including even the greater part of the cranks—either would be fulfilled automatically or could be fulfilled without significant interference with the capitalist process. Put more plainly, he argued that “this would do away with anything that according to present standards could be called poverty, even in the lowest strata of the population.” Schumpeter’s scenario was both overly pessimistic, and overly optimistic. As it turned out, the US economy grew far more rapidly than that. By 1978 America’s per capita GDP was about fifty percent higher than in his prediction, some $25,000. However, the utopian results he described did not come about. Indeed, it is worth noting that Botswana and Estonia today meet the level of economic development he described. No one considers either of those countries to be anything close to “poverty-free”. This danger of overestimating the significance of a given level of income certainly carries over to discussions of how large a space program a country (or the international community as a whole) can afford. US GDP in 1970 was roughly forty percent what it is today, but the NASA budget is actually a little smaller. Clearly, growth alone (at least as conventionally measured) did not suffice to fund a more ambitious space program.

Growth Good – Space – General

Economic growth is key to expanding space exploration

Elhefnawy 8 (Nader, prof @ u of Miami, *The Space Review*, Sep 29-8, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1220/1 ) ET

No less important is the expansion of the economic base that would have to support such endeavors, a point which rarely gets much attention. There is an obvious reason why that approach is often ignored: the common claim that the limits to growth on Earth mandate a turn to the exploitation of space. (Such arguments are not exclusive to the writers of the 1970s. John S. Lewis posits that the failure to do so will mean “civilization collapses to subsistence agriculture by 2030” in his 1996 book Mining the Sky.) However, this is far from being the only reason. The plain truth is that relying on terrestrial economic expansion to endow us with the resources for eventual space expansion will mean admitting the most exciting things are further off than we would like, outside the time frame of “meaningful” discussions of what public policy should be or what private business can do. Besides, it makes for a less compelling and attractive story than the idea of a technological revolution just over the horizon that opens up the heavens to all of us—especially if one is a market romantic when it comes to these matters (see “Market romanticism and the outlook for private space development”, The Space Review, September 2, 2008) Nonetheless, that is what one would have to assume given the state of the art. Additionally, however, while space launch costs (and other, related costs) may drop in real terms in the coming decades, it is safe to say that any viable future spacefaring society will also see them drop markedly in relative terms. The United Nations predicts the rise of Gross World Product (GWP) to about $140 trillion by 2050, more than twice today’s level, and this is still rather conservative next to some previous periods of comparable length. A repeat of the growth of 1950–1990, for instance, would likely result in a GWP in the $250–350 trillion range. And of course, if one goes in for that sort of thinking, the growth we could realize if the predictions of futurists like Ray Kurzweil pan out would absolutely explode those numbers. Of course, some caution is in order. Given the challenges the world now faces, including tight energy supplies, ecological degradation, and financial instability (and the huge uncertainties involved in not just space, but other technologies like molecular engineering and robotics), it is easy to picture even the modest numbers supplied by the UN proving overoptimistic.

Growth Good – Space - NASA

NASA can’t do anything, even with Congressional support, without growth

Dignan 9 (Larry, smart planet, staff, http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/smart-takes/house-supports-nasa-8217s-human-spaceflight-plans-more-funding-needed/901, dw: 9-16-2009, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

House members of the Committee on Science and Technology are reluctant to alter NASA’s plans for human spaceflight. The conundrum: Give NASA more money or scale back its ambitious plans. The House member remarks, detailed in a New York Times story, indicate that legislators don’t think that the end of the space shuttle should mean the end of human spaceflight. However, NASA doesn’t have the funding to head to Mars and beyond. The House Committee on Science and Technology also issued a statement. The key quote from Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics Chairwoman Gabrielle Giffords (D-AZ): “I have to say that I am extremely frustrated, in fact, I am angry. I have to say that I think we are no further ahead in our understanding of what it will take to ensure a robust and meaningful human space flight program than we were before they started their review. Probably the most important finding of the Review of U.S. Human Space Flight Plans is the panel’s determination that there is a serious mismatch between the challenges that we have asked NASA to meet and the resources that have been provided to the agency. In other words, we can’t get anywhere worth going to under NASA’s projected budgets. But we didn’t need an independent commission to tell us that. That’s been painfully obvious for some time now. And the impact of that shortfall is that the good work being done by NASA’s civil servants and contractors risks being undone.”

Growth Good – Space – Nanotech

Economic growth is needed to developing nanotech

McGrath 11 (Rachel, mvstar, staff, http://m.vcstar.com/news/2011/jun/17/westlake-village-company-gets-epa-money-to-with/, dw: 6-17-2011, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

A company headquartered in Westlake Village has received funding from the Environmental Protection Agency to continue developing its innovative, environmentally friendly paint and coatings. The EPA's Small Business Innovation Research program has awarded $295,000 to Instrumental Polymer Technologies, LLC for its development of polymers using nanotechnology. Randy Cameron, the company's CEO and president, says the funding will allow him to go from the research phase to the development and production phase of water-based coatings that could replace polyurethane coatings derived from petroleum. "What we are is a nanotechnology company. We're using nanotechnology to make water-based paint with no solvents that can be applied to steel or metal without primers," said Cameron, 52, who is a chemist with degrees from UCLA and Princeton.

Tech is unfeasible without funds

Nanotechnology Now 8 (http://www.nanotech-now.com/news.cgi?story\_id=27259, dw: 1-5-2008, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

It's difficult — if not impossible — to see what will get researchers excited 20 or even 10 years from now. But this much we know: Oklahoma has been wisely investing in research and technology for the past two decades, knowing that the payoff might not come for years. As the state begins its second century, that investment must grow. In 2006, lawmakers created the Economic Development Generating Excellence fund at the behest of a blue-ribbon panel. The goal is a $1 billion endowment to help fund research and promising high-tech projects to help make the state's economy more diverse and prosperous. So far, lawmakers have deposited only about $150 million — far too little in a world where technology advances more quickly than ever before.

Growth Good – Space – Skynet

Lots of funding necessary for SkyNet-like programs

Abrar 11 (Peerzada, http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-06-14/news/29657011\_1\_software-product-artificial-intelligence-customer-relationship-management-software, dw: 6-14-2011, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

BANGALORE: CustomerXPs Software, a technology product start-up has raised its first round of funding to expand its global sales, marketing and delivery teams and do research and development. The five-year-old firm has raised $4 million from a fund managed by Singapore based JAFCO Investment (Asia Pacific) Limited, which has $730 million in funds under management. The Bangalore-based start-up, founded by a team that was earlier part of the products division at information technology major Infosys, has built a software product based on artificial intelligence and psychology.

Growth Good – Space – Asteroids

Good economy needed to protect ourselves from asteroids

Talley 11 (Tim, http://www.easternct.edu/mt-static/press\_releases/2011/03/impact-ofasteroids-and-comets.html, dw: 3-4-2011, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

Russell Sampson, associate professor of physical sciences and assistant director of the Planetarium, feels that knowledge of astronomy is helpful for all people. "This star show will not only entertain our students with the wonders of the universe, but will also demonstrate how an interdisciplinary education is important in the development of a good citizen," Sampson said. "Understanding a little astronomy is important in understanding how to protect our world and our civilization from asteroid and comet impacts. To protect the world from such threats, it will cost money, and taxpayers will probably foot some of or the entire bill. If it is our tax money, then we should be informed.

Growth Good – Health – General

Development economics makes it possible to close the health gap.

Fogel 94 (Robert W., Winner of Noble Prize in Economics*, Economic Growth, Population Theory, and Physiology: The Bearing of Long-Term Processes on the Making of Economic Policy*, 370, AH)

Third, a widespread effort was undertaken to determine the relationship between the food supply and mortality rates. There were several aspects to this effort. Perhaps the most important was the emergence of a science of nutrition that identified a series of diseases related to specific nutritional deficiencies and discovered the synergy between nutrition and infection (Nevin S. Scrimshaw et al., 1968). Another aspect was the emergence of the field of development economics after World War II as part of the campaign to close the yawning gap in income, health, and life expectancy between the industrialized nations and the "developing nations." Still another aspect was the combined effort of economic and demographic historians to study the role of mortality crises and their relationship to famines during the 17th and 18th centuries.

Healthy economies promote healthy populations.

Bloom & Canning 8 (David E. & David, Bloom is Clarence James Gamble Professor of Economics and Demography and Chair and Canning is Professor of Economics and International Health, *Population Health and Economic Growth*, 1-2, AH)

Improvements in health may be as important as improvements in income in thinking about development and human welfare. Good health can be thought of as a goal in its own right independently of its relationship with income. However, there is a link between health and income mat is important for policy purposes. To the extent that health follows income, income growth should be the priority for developing countries. To the extent that income is a consequence of he aim, investments in health, even in the poorest developing countries, may be a priority. This argument for health as an investment good is particularly relevant since mere are cheap and easily implementable health policies that can improve health dramatically even in the poorest countries. Empirically, high levels of population health go hand in hand with high levels of national income. This is not unexpected. Higher incomes promote better health through improved nutrition, better access to safe water and sanitation, and increased ability to purchase more and better-quality health care. However, health may be not only a consequence but also a cause of high income. This can work through a number of mechanisms (Bloom and Canning, 2000). The first is the role of health in labor productivity. Healthy workers lose less time from work due to ill health and are more productive when working. The second is the effect of health on education. Childhood health can have a direct effect on cognitive development and the ability to leam as well as school attendance. In addition, because adult mortality and morbidity (sickness) can lower the prospective returns to investments in schooling, improving adult health can raise the incentives to invest in education. The third is the effect of health on savings. A longer prospective lifespan can increase the incentive to save for retirement, generating higher levels of saving and wealth, and a healthy workforce can increase the incentives for business investment. In addition, health care costs can force families to sell productive assets, forcing them into long-term poverty. The fourth is the effect of population health on population numbers and age structure.

Low health leads to extinction.

Smith, Sax, & Lafferty 6 (Katherine F., Dov F., & Kevin D., University of Georgia Institute of Ecology*, Conservation Biology Volume 20*, 1350, AH)

Recent studies suggest that infectious diseases in wildlife populations are emerging at unusually high rates (Harvell et al. 1999, 2002; Epstein 2001). Emerging infectious diseases (EIDs) are those caused by parasites and pathogens that have recently increased in incidence, occupied host species or geographic extent; have been newly discovered; or are caused by a newly evolved agent (Lederberg et al. 1992; Daszak et al. 2000). The diversity of EIDs afflicting wildlife, coupled with the fear that an increased frequency of outbreaks will occur in the future, have raised concern that infectious disease may play a strong role in species extinction (Holmes 1996; Daszak et al. 2000; Harvell et al. 2002). Indeed, infectious diseases can extirpate local populations, mediate community dynamics, and shrink host ranges (McCallum & Dobson 1995; Daszak et al. 1999; Lafferty 2003; Walsh et al. 2003).

Growth Good – Health – General

Disease causes armed conflict and civil war.

Letendre, Fincher, & Thornhill 10 (K, CL, & R, U.S. National Library of Medicine National Institutes of Health, 4-1, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?term=%22Letendre %20K%22%5BAuthor%5D, 6-21-11, AH)

Geographic and cross-national variation in the frequency of intrastate armed conflict and civil war is a subject of great interest. Previous theory on this variation has focused on the influence on human behaviour of climate, resource competition, national wealth, and cultural characteristics. We present the parasite-stress model of intrastate conflict, which unites previous work on the correlates of intrastate conflict by linking frequency of the outbreak of such conflict, including civil war, to the intensity of infectious disease across countries of the world. High intensity of infectious disease leads to the emergence of xenophobic and ethnocentric cultural norms. These cultures suffer greater poverty and deprivation due to the morbidity and mortality caused by disease, and as a result of decreased investment in public health and welfare. Resource competition among xenophobic and ethnocentric groups within a nation leads to increased frequency of civil war. We present support for the parasite-stress model with regression analyses. We find support for a direct effect of infectious disease on intrastate armed conflict, and support for an indirect effect of infectious disease on the incidence of civil war via its negative effect on national wealth. We consider the entanglements of feedback of conflict into further reduced wealth and increased incidence of disease, and discuss implications for international warfare and global patterns of wealth and imperialism.

Disease causes extinction.

Yu 9 (Victoria, Dartmouth Undergraduate Journal of Science, 5-22, http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate, 6-23-11)

A pandemic will kill off all humans. In the past, humans have indeed fallen victim to viruses. Perhaps the best-known case was the bubonic plague that killed up to one third of the European population in the mid-14th century (7). While vaccines have been developed for the plague and some other infectious diseases, new viral strains are constantly emerging — a process that maintains the possibility of a pandemic-facilitated human extinction. Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus. It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system. However, for more easily transmitted viruses such as influenza, the evolution of new strains could prove far more consequential. The simultaneous occurrence of antigenic drift (point mutations that lead to new strains) and antigenic shift (the inter-species transfer of disease) in the influenza virus could produce a new version of influenza for which scientists may not immediately find a cure. Since influenza can spread quickly, this lag time could potentially lead to a “global influenza pandemic,” according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (9). The most recent scare of this variety came in 1918 when bird flu managed to kill over 50 million people around the world in what is sometimes referred to as the Spanish flu pandemic. Perhaps even more frightening is the fact that only 25 mutations were required to convert the original viral strain — which could only infect birds — into a human-viable strain (10).

Growth Good – Health – General – UQ

The recession has led to decrease in funding for the global health initiative.

Cohn 11 (Jonathan, The New Republic, 3-24, http://www.tnr.com/blog/jonathan-cohn/85725/malaria-hiv-tb-libya-republican-budget-cut, 6-22-11, AH)

When House Republicans passed H.R.1, their proposal to fund the federal government for the rest of the fiscal year, they voted to reduce global health funding by more than $1 billion from the 2010 level. That reduction is actually slightly bigger than it might seem, for the same reason your purchasing power declines when you don’t get a raise: Funding must rise just to keep up with inflation. And while a billion dollars is not a huge amount of cash, given the size of the federal budget, global health money buys a lot of treatment for very little money--which means, ironically, that even nominally small cuts can reduce program reach significantly.

**Resistant bacteria strains are proliferating now, causing disease.**

Evenson 2 (Brad, The National Post- Canada, 9-30, http://www.rense.com/general29/asani.htm, 6-22-11, AH)

Antibiotic-resistant bacteria kill more than 40,000 North Americans a year, and the numbers will soar unless the so-called super-germs are brought under control, a new book warns. The book, The Killers Within, charts the acceleration of resistant infections that began with a few cases in the late 1980s and is now spiralling out of control. The germs, once killed easily with standard antibiotics, can disintegrate skin, clog the lungs and carve golf-ball-size abscesses in flesh. "The bad bugs are getting stronger and they're getting stronger faster," says co-author Mark Plotkin, a Smithsonian Institution ethnobotanist whom Time magazine dubbed a "Hero of the Planet" in 1998. "We feel like we're looking at almost a hyper-evolutionary period," he says. While West Nile virus is grabbing headlines for killing about 100 people, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates 44,000 people in North America die annually of infections from drug-resistant germs. Some experts believe the numbers are higher. The epidemic comes as pharmaceutical companies have all but stopped doing research on antibiotics. "They'd rather develop lifestyle drugs like Viagra and blood-pressure medicine that you're going to take every day of your life for 40 years," says Dr. Plotkin, who concedes a few drug companies are pursuing new antimicrobials. "If you're selling antibiotics, I'm going to take it for a week, and I'm either going to get better or I'm going to die." Even the newest types of antibiotics, such as Synercid and Zyvox, are already threatened by resistant strains.

Growth Good – Health – Infant Mortality

**Better health can ease population pressure by decreasing infant mortality.**

**Bloom & Canning 8** (David E. & David, Bloom is Clarence James Gamble Professor of Economics and Demography and Chair and Canning is Professor of Economics and International Health, *Population Health and Economic Growth*, 9, AH)

Improvements in health and decreases in mortality rates can catalyze a transition from high to low rates of fertility and mortality—the “demographic transition” (Lee, 2003). Population growth is the difference between birth and death rates (ignoring migration) and the global population explosion in the twentieth century is attributable to improvements in health and falling death rates. In developing countries, health advances tend to lower infant and child mortality rates, leading initially to a surge in the number of children. Reduced infant mortality, increased numbers of surviving children, and rising wages for women can lower desired fertility (see Schultz, 1997) leading to smaller cohorts of children in future generations. Better access to family planning can also help couples match more closely their fertility desires and realizations.

Low mortality lowers extinction risk.

Mode and Jacobson 86 (Charles and Marc, U of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, 9-29, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/002555648790006X, 6-23-11, AH)

An environmental process was characterized by a stationary second order autogressive process with Gaussian noise. This process was then linked to survivorship and reproductive success by logistic transformations. The sensitivity of extinction probabilities to variations in the parameters of the environmental process was studied by computer experiments in Monte Carlo integration. Against the background of the rather limited number of fertility and mortality levels studied in these experiments, the extinction probabilities were demonstrated to be quite sensitive to variations in the parameters of the environmental process. Although more extensive experiments will need to be carried out, those conducted so far suggest that concerted efforts should be made to model those environmental factors that are critical to the survivability of an endangered species in assessing its chances for continued existence.

Growth Good – Health – Infant Mortality – UQ

Infant mortality rates are increasing.

Lallanilla 5 (Marc, ABC News, 11-1, http://abcnews.go.com/Health/GlobalHealth/story? id=1266515, 6-22-11, AH)

What's causing the increased death rate among babies in the United States? While the health of infants in many countries is improving, babies born in the United States now face an increased risk of dying in the first year of life. The U.S. infant mortality rate is on the rise for the first time since 1958, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. In 2001, the infant mortality rate was 6.8 deaths per 1,000 live births -- in 2002, the rate rose to 7.0. (2003 data is not yet complete.)

**Growth Good – Health – AIDS**

**Economic growth is necessary to fund the fight against AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria.**

Shah 9 (Anup, Degree in Computer Science and Founder of Globalissues.org, 11-29, http://www.globalissues.org/ article/90/aids-in-africa#Globalfundshelpglobalfinancialcrisishinders, 6-21-11, AH)

The global financial crisis—a problem largely caused by rich nations—has led to some African countries cutting their health and HIV budgets. Their health budgets and resources have been constrained for many years already, so this crisis makes a bad situation worse: “Already, large percentages of households in Sub-Saharan Africa are poor, and the large number of people on treatment means ever-increasing treatment program costs. Yet, Sub-Saharan Africa only accounts for one percent of global health expenditure and two percent of the global health workforce. Currently, only one third of HIV-positive Africans in need of antiretroviral (ARV) treatment can access it. … Dr Bactrin Killingo, chairperson of the Nairobi-based Collaborative Fund for HIV Treatment Preparedness [says, ] “If current cost constraints faced by HIV treatment programmes are not addressed, while the demand for expensive second-line treatment increases, we will soon find ourselves in a situation similar to the 1990s, where millions of lives were lost unnecessarily because people could not afford the treatment they needed to stay alive.” And it is not just poor nations’ health funds at risk. IPS adds that even international donor organizations have started to feel the financial crunch: “The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria recently announced it is at least $4 billion short of the money it will need to continue funding essential HIV, TB and malaria services in 2010. The coalition believes there is a $10.7 billion funding gap for regional implementation of the Global Plan to Stop TB alone.”

AIDS is a disease of economic hardship.

Shah 9 (Anup, Degree in Computer Science and Founder of Globalissues.org, 11-29, http://www.globalissues.org/ article/90/aids-in-africa#Globalfundshelpglobalfinancialcrisishinders, 6-21-11, AH)

Although there are numerous factors in the spread of HIV/AIDS, it is largely recognised as a disease of poverty, hitting hardest where people are marginalised and suffering economic hardship. IMF designed Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), adopted by debtor countries as a condition of debt relief, are hurting, not working. By pushing poor people even deeper into poverty, SAPs may be increasing their vulnerability to HIV infection, and reinforcing conditions where the scourge of HIV/AIDS can flourish.

**AIDS will cause extinction.**

**KRQE News 2** (8-28, http://www.rense.com/general28/exc.htm, 6-23-11, AH)

 "We are faced with extinction," said Dr. Banu Khan, head of the National AIDS Co-ordinating Agency in Botswana. Swaziland will see an average of 33 years and Zimbabwe, Zambia and Namibia 34 years. Angola, Lesotho, Malawi, Rwanda and Mali will see life expectancy drop to the mid- to late 30s. Without AIDS, average life in southern Africa would have been around 70 years by 2010. The figures are the latest in a series that show Africa buckling under the growing AIDS epidemic. Sub-Saharan Africa has 28.5 million of the world's 40 million infected people. Stephen Lewis, Canada's former ambassador the United Nations, said Canada's response to the crisis has been "abysmal, wholly inadequate."

Growth Good – Health – AIDS – UQ

AIDS is currently spreading, new measures are needed to contain it.

Associated Press 5 (6-2, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/8072321/ns/health-aids/t/aids-spreading-faster-efforts-stop-it/, 6-22-11, AH)

Secretary-General Kofi Annan on Thursday warned that the AIDS epidemic is accelerating on every continent and called for more money and leadership to halt its spread by the U.N. target date of 2015. In an opening address to representatives of 127 countries at a high-level conference, Annan said the scale of the global response to the scourge of AIDS has been significant, but insufficient because “it has not matched the epidemic in scale.” “Last year saw more new infections and more AIDS-related deaths than ever before,” he said. “Indeed, HIV and AIDS expanded at an accelerating rate on every continent.” Treatment and prevention efforts lacking Treatment and prevention efforts also were insufficient, Annan said. “Only 12 percent of the people in need of antiretroviral therapies in low- and middle-income countries were receiving them. And while young people — especially young women — account for more than half of all new infections , most of the world’s young people still lacked meaningful access to youth-oriented prevention services,” he said. “It is now clear that the epidemic continues to outrun our efforts to contain it,” he said.

AIDS is spreading at an alarming rate.

Duru 11 (Peter, Staff Writer for Vanguard News, 6-16, http://www.vanguardngr.com/2011/06/hivaids-spread-in-benue-worries-unicef/, 6-22-11, AH)

The United Nation Children’s Fund, UNICEF, has decried the alarming prevalence of HIV/AIDS in Benue State which is said to be the highest in the country. The National HIV Sentinel Report put the prevalence at 12.4 per cent; which is far above the national average of a little above 4 per cent. Dr. Femi Adeyemi, a HIV Specialist (Care), UNICEF A-Field Office, Enugu, said this in Makurdi. In a paper, entitled; ”An AIDS-Free Generation is Possible Through Elimination of Mother-To-Child-Transmission”, during a quarterly media breakfast meeting with newsmen, Adeyemi said UNICEF was surprised at the rate the virus was spreading in the rural communities of the Middle Belt region in the country. Adeyemi said that the virus was attacking more victims in the rural communities of the state; as against known trends of high infestation rates in urban centres. He noted that the prevalence of the pandemic in 10 states under the Field-A office was higher than the national average which, according to him, called for concerted effort on the part of governments and stakeholders to bring down the rate of spread of the virus. The HIV specialist regretted that the rate of transmission of the virus through mother-to-children was to a large extent aiding the spread of the disease and hampering the fight against the scourges in the country.

**Growth Good – Health – Ebola**

**A healthy economy is key to combating ebola.**

**Schultz 3** (Steven, Princeton Weekly Bulletin, 4-14, http://www.princeton.edu/pr/ pwb/03/0414/7a.shtml, 6-21-11, AH)

The Ebola problem also demands immediate financial support for rigorous studies of the forces driving the epidemic, Walsh said. He recommended that Congress make a $10 million emergency supplement to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Great Ape Conservation Fund earmarked specifically for Ebola field research and intervention. Walsh said the ape problem progressed as far as it has in part because of a lack funding for large-scale studies that are not tied to small, individual projects. He attributed the success of the study to the dedication of Lee White and other researchers with the Wildlife Conservation Society, for which Walsh worked before coming to Princeton in 1999. Researchers with the society, the World Wildlife Fund, and the Gabonese Water and Forests Ministry gathered important data as part of a successful project to create 13 national parks in Gabon. "People in the field knew that commercial hunting was taking a huge toll but it took 10 extra years to piece together the data to make it a compelling story. Let's not make the same mistake with Ebola."

Ebola could wipe-out a huge percentage of humanity.

Chicago Tribune 94 (10-16, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1994-10-16/features/9410160231\_1 \_marburg-virus-ebola-hot-zone, 6-23-11, AH)

The answer you want to hear to the question posed by this story's headline is, of course, "No." But the best you'll get from Richard Preston, who knows a great deal about the brilliantly colored virus that benignly dots this page, is a halting, "Probably not. It is, however, likely that this could be a slate wiper. It could wipe out a vast portion of humanity." The virus is Ebola. It is named for a river in Zaire. It is almost unimaginably lethal. "Ebola kills 9 out of 10 people who contract it. And Ebola does in 10 days what it takes AIDS 10 years to accomplish," says Preston.

Ebola could mutate, risking extinction.

Boyd 2 (Robert, Herald Washington Bureau, 1-18, http://www.aegis.org/news/mh/2002/ MH020106.html, 6-23-11, AH)

They are responsible for a host of ailments ranging from pesky common colds to the devastating HIV epidemic and incurable killers like Ebola, again on the prowl in Africa. Unlike bacteria \_ much larger germs that can usually be controlled by antibiotics \_ most viruses cannot be defeated with existing medications. Antibiotics work only against living organisms, and viruses lack most of the features of life. They cannot move, eat or reproduce on their own, but must depend on the genes they steal from their unwilling host. In addition, viruses evolve rapidly. A new strain capable of causing a global epidemic, like the flu virus that killed 25 million people in 1918-19, could emerge at any moment, Crawford wrote in her recent book, "The Invisible Enemy: A Natural History of Viruses" (Oxford University Press, 2000). Some scientists even speculate that a future "doomsday virus" combining the worst features of smallpox and Ebola could wipe out the human race. Joshua Lederberg, a Nobel Prize-winning biologist at Rockefeller University in New York, has called viruses "the single biggest threat" to human life on the planet. "Barring what we do to one another, if anything is going to wipe out humankind, it will be a virus," Lederberg said.

Growth Good – Health – Ebola – UQ

Ebola can always get out of control.

Pearse 97 (J, Staff, Sep.19, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12321236, 6-22-11, AH)

This article discusses infection prevention and control in Africa and describes an available manual for infection control. The effectiveness of prevention and control efforts is dependent on health care services and the prevalence of disease. Funding for health care, the perceived economic impact of infection control, and trained administrators determine the availability of health services and the spread of disease. The challenge is to provide cleanliness, aseptic techniques in patient care, and protection for the health worker. If the hospital infection rate is as high as 15% of admissions and each case requires an additional 7 days of hospitalization, the estimated costs nationally could exceed US $110 million. Africa has a massive infectious disease burden, in addition to HIV and tuberculosis. The spread of Ebola fever shows how out-of-control infections can become. Most African countries are unequipped with infrastructure to handle surveillance of the new resistant bacterial strains resulting from indiscriminate use of antibiotics. In Zimbabwe, infection and prevention control was proved possible and cost effective. Education was provided at the village level in basic hygiene, home nursing, construction of fly-proof pit toilets, and a safe water supply. Training of trainers expanded the process of education. The "Infection Control Manual" provides the manager with the principles and background knowledge for prevention and control of infections. The Infection Control Association of Southern Africa is a useful source of information, standards, and support base.

Diseases like Ebola can get out of control under current conditions.

Anderson 11 (Phil, St. Rosemary Educational Institution, 6-1, http://schoolworkhelper.net/ 2011/06/ebola-virus-history-transmission, 6-22-11, AH)

On the other hand many third world countries could have serious problems if there is an outbreak due to unsanitary living and medical conditions. The hospitals and medical personnel reuse needles that have been infected and they don’t use latex or any other kind of gloves which can be a cause of widespread sickness. Everyone hopes that diseases like Ebola will not get out of control before a cure can be found. Such hopes seem unreasonable due to the facilities available in some areas of the world.

Growth Good – Health – TB

The fight against drug-resistant tuberculosis is expensive; healthy economy is needed to support funding.

Oliver 7 (Jove, Staff Writer for Results, 2-7, http://results.techriver.net/website/article.asp? id=2572, 6-21-11, AH)

The Pentagon’s announcement of plans to open an African Command (AFRICOM) comes amid a flurry of recent reports about a growing epidemic of extremely drug-resistant tuberculosis (XDR-TB) in Africa that spreads through the air and that is impervious to most existing anti-TB drugs. An outbreak in South Africa that began last year initially killed within a matter of weeks 52 of 53 people infected with XDR-TB. Now, more than 400 people are infected with the strain in Africa. “XDR-TB will be one of the most serious and virtually incurable health threats to our troops in Africa,” said Dr. Lee Reichman, executive director of the New Jersey Medical School’s Global Tuberculosis Institute. “It’s Ebola with wings. The dearth of laboratories in African countries means numerous cases of drug-resistant TB remain undetected and if we do not scale up our investment in TB control now, this will spiral out of control threatening our troops and their African counterparts.” According to the Pentagon, AFRICOM will focus heavily on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, putting some U.S. military personnel in close contact with XDR-TB and other drug-resistant forms of TB. To protect our military personnel from this grave airborne threat, investments that strengthen laboratory capacity to detect and control XDR-TB and improve treatment of basic TB to stop progression to drug-resistance must be undertaken. The World Health Organization has called for emergency action by donor governments to boost surveillance capacity to detect XDR-TB in Africa and to improve TB control systems to prevent further emergence of drug-resistant strains of TB. “With large numbers of our troops en route to Africa, we are calling on Congress to provide $300 million in emergency funding to battle the scourge of XDR-TB through the defense supplemental spending bill,” said Joanne Carter, director of global initiatives at RESULTS and RESULTS Educational Fund. “Not only will emergency funding protect the lives of our troops and save U.S. taxpayers money, but at the end of the day it is the right thing to do for millions in Africa at risk from these lethal strains.” The $300 million being called for in the defense supplemental spending bill is a mere 0.3 percent of the total request. President Bush included a request for emergency funding to fight avian flu in the supplemental spending bill. Avian flu — while a serious potential threat — has killed a total of 166 people since its discovery, while TB routinely kills nearly 2 million people per year. The respected Center for Global Development argues thatavian flu and XDR-TB are the two most important global health issues for 2007.

**Economic growth is necessary to fund the fight against tuberculosis, AIDS, and Malaria.**

Shah 9 (Anup, Degree in Computer Science and Founder of Globalissues.org, 11-29, http://www.globalissues.org/ article/90/aids-in-africa#Globalfundshelpglobalfinancialcrisishinders, 6-21-11, AH)

The global financial crisis**—**a problem largely caused by rich nations**—**has led to some African countries cutting their health and HIV budgets. Their health budgets and resources have been constrained for many years already, so this crisis makes a bad situation worse: “Already, large percentages of households in Sub-Saharan Africa are poor, and the large number of people on treatment means ever-increasing treatment program costs. Yet, Sub-Saharan Africa only accounts for one percent of global health expenditure and two percent of the global health workforce. Currently, only one third of HIV-positive Africans in need of antiretroviral (ARV) treatment can access it. … Dr Bactrin Killingo, chairperson of the Nairobi-based Collaborative Fund for HIV Treatment Preparedness [says, ] “If current cost constraints faced by HIV treatment programmes are not addressed, while the demand for expensive second-line treatment increases, we will soon find ourselves in a situation similar to the 1990s, where millions of lives were lost unnecessarily because people could not afford the treatment they needed to stay alive.” And it is not just poor nations’ health funds at risk. IPS adds that even international donor organizations have started to feel the financial crunch: “The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria recently announced it is at least $4 billion short of the money it will need to continue funding essential HIV, TB and malaria services in 2010. The coalition believes there is a $10.7 billion funding gap for regional implementation of the Global Plan to Stop TB alone.”

Growth Good – Health – TB

Key to prevent extinction.

Unruh 7 (Bob, World Net Daily Staff, 6-24, http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=42238, 6-23-11, AH)

The World Health Organization is appealing for billions of dollars in funding to avert the apocalypse en route if a virtually untreatable form of tuberculosis that already infects 30,000 people a year is left unchecked. The TB, called XDR-TB for extensively drug resistant, is virtually immune to currently available antibiotics, turning aside the effects of both front-line and secondary drugs, officials have said. It has been in the news of late because of an American airline passenger, Andrew Speaker, an Atlanta, Ga., lawyer, who was diagnosed, then traveled to Europe for his wedding, and returned, on commercial airliners, potentially exposing hundreds of people to the frequently fatal disease. He now is being treated at a special center in Denver that deals with cases of tuberculosis. "XDR-TB is a threat to the security and stability of global health. This response plan identifies costs, milestones and priorities for health services that will continue to have an impact beyond its two-year time line," said WHO Director-General Dr. Margaret Chan.

Growth Good – Health – TB – UQ

Drug-resistant TB is proliferating alarmingly.

Johnson 9 (Tim, Staff Writer for McClatchy Newspapers, 4-1, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2009/04/01/65242/un-killer-strains-of-tuberculosis.html, 6-22-11, AH)

The world is on the cusp of an explosion of drug-resistant tuberculosis cases that could deluge hospitals and leave physicians fighting a nearly untreatable malady with little help from modern drugs, global experts said Wednesday. "The situation is already alarming, and poised to grow much worse very quickly," said Dr. Margaret Chan, the director-general of the World Health Organization. With Bill Gates at her side, Chan urged health officials from 27 countries at a three-day forum in Beijing on drug-resistant TB to recognize the warning signs of what looms ahead, sayingthat traditional drugs are useless against some strains of tuberculosis and health-care costs for treating those strains can be 100 to 200 times more than for regular tuberculosis. "This is a situation set to spiral out of control. Call it what you may: a time bomb or a powder keg. Any way you look at it, this is a potentially explosive situation," Chan warned. Gates, the software magnate turned philanthropist, said scientific overconfidence had led to a lack of innovation and urgency in fighting tuberculosis, which affects 9 million people each year, killing nearly 2 million of them. "The most commonly used diagnostic test is today more than 125 years old," Gates said. **"**The vaccine was developed more than 80 years ago, and drugs have not changed in 50 years." Tuberculosis is a highly contagious bacterial infection that attacks the lungs and can affect other organs as well. Coughing, sneezing and even talking can spread the bacteria. If untreated, a person with TB can infect 10 to 15 other people in a year**.** Once thought conquered in developed countries, virulent forms of tuberculosis are again on the march, caused often by improper use of drugs and poorly managed treatment regimes. It remains largely a disease of poverty. Chan said that traditional treatment often left the patient wishing to end the medicine. "Instead of taking two to four pills, one has to take 13 pills. Put yourself in the position of the patient. Thirteen pills are not 13 candies," Chan said, noting that courses of treatment can last four to six months and patients don't like the hassle of taking the pills for so long. Outbreaks of multi-drug-resistant strains of tuberculosis are highest in India, China, Russia, South Africa and Bangladesh. Scientists now see even worse strains, which they label extensively drug-resistant TB, that can be treated neither with the two principal anti-TB drugs nor with more expensive second-line drugs. In early 2007, 20 countries reported cases of the more fatal TB. By the end of last year, 54 countries reported the malady. Jorge Sampaio, the U.N. secretary general's special envoy to halt TB, called the extensively drug-resistant strain "a very deadly and devastating epidemic."

Tuberculosis is at an all time high.

Borland 11 (Sophie, Writer for Daily Mail, 6-3, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-1393814/Tuberculosis-TB-jab-thousands-babies-NHS-admits-infection-control.html, 6-22-11, AH)

Thousands of babies could be vaccinated against tuberculosis amid concern over soaring rates of infection. The number of cases has risen by 50 per cent in the past decade and NHS officials fear it is becoming out of control. Doctors and managers of health trusts in London – which has the highest infection rates in Britain – are drawing up plans to vaccinate all babies within six weeks of birth. GPs would be encouraged to test for the disease in all new patients registering with their surgery, particularly those coming from countries with very high infection rates. The plans would also see family doctors, nurses and midwives and housing workers undergo extra training to help them spot the symptoms of the illness – a notorious killer well into the 20th century. Rates of TB have hit a 30-year high with 9,040 infections in Britain last year, Health Protection Agency figures show. This is the highest number recorded since 1979, when there were 9,266 cases. The disease is often brought into the country by immigrants from India, South-East Asia and Africa, and it is also common amongst the homeless and drug users. London has by far the highest rates of infections in Britain, accounting for 40 per cent of the country's total number of cases.

Growth Good – Health – Biotech

Biotech research is a costly endeavor that requires optimal economic conditions.

Goswami & Vorhaus 11 (Sharon & Dan, Genomics Law Report, 5-5, http://www.genomicslawreport.com/index.php/ 2011/05/05/news-roundup-biotech-funding-and-ldt-regulation/, 6-21-11, AH)

Despite speculation that a recent rise in venture capital investments is indicative of a bubble, to be followed soon by a plunge in available investment capital, venture capital investments in the life sciences are holding steady, both in total dollars and in the size of an average financing. Thus, says Bruce Booth, a partner at Atlas Venture and author of Life Sci VC, there appears to be no bubble to debate, at least not in the life sciences. Booth observes that overall funding is “down considerably from the recent highs in 2007 and 2008” and, while other industries may be experiencing fewer but larger financings, “the data doesn’t support a frothy market for LS venture financings these days.” Still, biotechnology innovation is neither easy nor cheap, leading venture firms to explore new product development and financing models. Large pharmaceutical companies, meanwhile, are also seeking to reinvent how they develop products in the face of a looming “patent cliff”. As the patents protecting many branded pharmaceuticals begin to expire, as will happen with Pfizer’s cholesterol drug Lipitor later this year, sales of these lucrative drugs will decline due to aggressive competition from generic pharmaceutical manufacturers. While not everyone is convinced that the patent cliff is a real phenomenon, real or not, big pharma certainly appears to be facing pressure to find new ways to identify and develop therapeutics.

The biotech industry is struggling; economic growth is needed for a boost.

Mirasol 9 (Feliza, Staff Writer for ICIS, 3-10, http://www.icis.com/Articles/2009/03/16/ 9198664/biotech-funding-slows-as-investors-conserve-cash.html, 6-21-11, AH)

Biotech companies are preparing for tougher times, as funding slows for all but primary projects and the most promising research. Small start-up biotech firms are especially suffering as investors look to conserve as much cash as possible. "It's going to be a tough year coming up, and there are many companies that are facing cash shortfalls. 2009 is going to be challenging," says John Richert, vice president for business and technology development for the US-based North Carolina Biotechnology Center (NCBC). Investors, and venture funds in particular, that have already made investments in companies, will conserve their cash in order to continue making investments in these companies, according to Richert. The goal is to keep these companies going until the initial public offering (IPO) window opens up again. "What we don't expect to see are many first-time investments from venture funds, because they will be conserving cash and trying to support the companies they've already invested in. This will be a challenge for companies just getting started or that are looking for their seed-round or 'a' round funding," says Richert. There are still some venture funds that are making initial, or first-time, investments, but they are doing so in smaller amounts, Richert notes. "Instead of making a $5m [€4m] initial investment, they'll make a $3m initial investment, for example. And they'll do that based on the company meeting very specific milestones, so that they're not making as big a bet up front. They're making smaller bets to try and get companies to the point where they can make larger investments," Richert says. The biotechnology industry is one that is uniquely dependent on financing over a long period of time, given the average 10-15 year development cycle to get a biologic drug to market. "When the financial markets get tight, we become is particularly vulnerable, because we can't just start cranking out more product, so we are distressed right now, in that regard," says Jim Greenwood, president of the Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO) in a BIO podcast aired last November.

Biotech prevents extinction.

**Ewens 00** (Lara E, Boston College Law School, 9-21, http://www.bc.edu/bc\_org/avp/law/lwsch/ journals/bciclr/23\_2/05\_FMS.htm, 6-23-11, AH)

Note, however, that although biotechnology cannot create genetic traits after the loss of a species, it can help prevent extinction by numerically increasing failing species or inserting greater disease resistance into endangered plant species.

Growth Good – Health – Biotech – UQ

Funding for biotech companies is down.

Darce 11 (Keith, Biotechnology Writer, 6-14, http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2011/jun/14/best-times-worst-times-biotechs, 6-22-11, AH)

Funding for small early-stage biotechnology companies, such as the ones that populate much of the industry’s hub in San Diego County, remained in short supply in 2010 even as the broader sector racked up higher revenue and profits, according to a report released Tuesday. U.S. biotechs raised $20.7 billion last year, up from $18 billion in 2009, the consulting firm Ernst & Young reported in its annual survey of the global industry. However, nearly half of the 2010 amount came in the form of low-interest loans taken out by the sector’s profitable companies for debt refinancing, stock buybacks and acquisitions. New funding raised from venture capitalists and stock investors for drug research and development actually fell by 21 percent. At the same time, federal regulators are requiring companies to spend more time and money testing their drugs before clearing them for sale.

Growth Good – Health – Avian Flu

An avian flu pandemic would cost trillions; a strong economy is the best defense.

World Bank 6 (6-29, http://web.worldbank.org/ WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,, contentMDK:20979352~pagePK:64257043~piPK: 437376~theSitePK:4607,00.html, 6-21-11, AH)

The World Bank estimates a severe avian flu pandemic among humans could cost the global economy about 3.1% of world gross domestic product - around US$1.25 trillion on a world GDP of $40 trillion. The severe case scenario, prepared by the Bank’s Development Economic Prospects Group, was presented by the Bank’s lead economist for East Asia, Milan Brahmbhatt, in a speech to the First International Conference on Avian Influenza in Humans at the Institut Pasteur in Paris, France. Brahmbatt told the conference, the severe case scenario was based on a 1% mortality rate – or about 70 million people. He said mortality rates from a pandemic would be much higher in developing countries, with economic losses expected to be twice those of developed countries. To date, Brahmbatt says in most countries the impact of avian flu at the macroeconomic level has been relatively limited, mainly because the poultry sector is a relatively small part of the world economy.

Controlling avian flu has many direct and hidden costs; a booming economy is a must.

Packard 5 (Tu, Senior Economist at Moody's Analytics and Chief Editor of the World Workstation, 11-9, http://www.economy.com/dismal/article\_free.asp?cid=18829, 6-21-11, AH)

Other direct costs include those of prevention and control. The public sector must absorb the additional fiscal burden of having to finance the purchase of poultry vaccines and other medications, paying workers to carry out surveillance and diagnosis, culling and cleanup and, last but not least, providing adequate compensation to bird owners to dissuade them from hiding infected birds. Regarding potential indirect costs, the recent SARS experience is particularly instructive. The services sectors—tourism, mass transportation, retail sales, hotels and restaurants—took a massive hit as people tried to avoid becoming infected by reducing, as much as possible, contact with others. On the supply side, workplace absenteeism increased and firms were forced to employ more costly procedures to cope with emergency measures such as quarantines and restrictions on travel and trade. According to the World Bank, the economic cost of SARS was needlessly high: the initial lack of public information caused large numbers of people to panic and overreact because they significantly overestimated the risk of infection and death from SARS.

**Without control, bird flu pandemic could kill millions.**

**MSNBC News 5** (2-23, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6861065/ns/health-infectious\_diseases/t/who-bird-flu-pandemic-imminent, 6-23-11, AH)

World Health Organization officials urged governments on Wednesday to act swiftly to control the spread of bird flu, warning that the world is in grave danger of a deadly pandemic triggered by the virus. The illness has killed 45 people in Asia over the past year, in cases largely traced to contact with sick birds, and experts have warned the H5N1 virus could become far deadlier if it mutates into a form that can be easily transmitted among humans. A global pandemic could kill millions, they say. “We at WHO believe that the world is now in the gravest possible danger of a pandemic,” Dr. Shigeru Omi, the WHO’s Western Pacific regional director, said Wednesday. He said the world is “now overdue” for an influenza pandemic, since mass epidemics have occurred every 20 to 30 years. It has been nearly 40 years since the last one.

Growth Good – Health – Avian Flu – UQ

Avian flu is not under control, will take at least 10 more years.

Jakarta Globe 11 (4-21, http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/health/eradication-of-bird-flu-will-take-at-least-10-years/436730, 6-22-11, AHhttp://www.thejakartaglobe.com/health/eradication-of-bird-flu-will-take-at-least-10-years/436730)

It will take at least 10 years to eradicate the H5N1 bird flu virus, which has killed scores of humans, from poultry in the six countries where it is endemic, a UN agency said on Thursday. The strain of the avian influenza virus was reported in 60 countries at its peak in 2006 but most had managed to stamp it out, the Food and Agriculture Organisation said in a report. It however remained "firmly entrenched" in Bangladesh, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia and Vietnam, including because of the nature of their production and market chains, and quality of veterinary services**,** it said. Another factor was that in these countries "fear of H5N1 does not necessarily translate into concrete plans for virus control and elimination," the report said. The H5N1 strain of avian influenza has killed around 320 people worldwide since 2003. "Eliminating the highly pathogenic H5N1 avian influenza virus from poultry in the six countries where it remains endemic will take 10 or more years," the agency said in a statement. It made recommendations for each country regarding measures they should take over the next five years to enable them to eliminate the virus. "They contain a mix of measures aimed at outbreak control and response, gathering and analysing information, and disease prevention and risk reduction," it said.

Avian flu is still a threat today.

Cold Flu Guide 06 (4-18, http://coldfluguide.info/Dangers-Of-The-Avian-Flu.html, 6-22-11, AH)

Avian flu has taught many people a variety of things in regards to not only the avian flu but also other pandemic potential threats and that is that no one is safe and no one holds all the facts. Even the governments which hide very important facts in regards to the various health issues can barely help their own much less everyone else and yet no one will share all that they know on this pandemic waiting to erupt. The avian flu may not break out and kill hundreds of thousands of people but it has brought into light the fact that flu similar to (if not) the avian flu definitely holds the potential to do it.

**Avian flu has propagated largely out of control.**

**Miller 5** (Paul G., PhD, 12-5, http://www.albertaclassic.net/chalmers3.php, 6-22-11, AH)

Over the past few years, H5N1 itself has undergone some changes. Just as pigeons are subject to the laws of Genetics, so are viruses, and just as pigeon genes are subject to genetic mutations, so are viral genes subject to mutation. Influenza is an RNA virus, and such viruses tend to have a relatively high rate of mutation. Once a mutation has occurred, the persistence of that mutation is subject to the selection forces in the environment; a favorable pigeon mutation is selected for by the pigeon fancier to produce a winning flier or a show winner. An unfavorable mutation is selected against and culled. Viruses work similarly, but with environmental forces doing the selection: virulent viruses more effectively infect their host, and are spread more efficiently. Less virulent viruses are outnumbered and crowded out. Hence, without any opposition or control, a virus would naturally tend to build up mutations enhancing virulence and it would increase in virulence, propagating more effectively within its host, transmitting more efficiently to another susceptible host and, possibly, even expanding its host range. On the contrary, a situation in which the virus is not allowed to propagate widely would obviously not be favorable for any of this, and establishing a new viral mutation would be a very remote possibility. This is exactly the situation with the H5N1 virus itself. The H5N1 virus is found world wide, both in North America and in Eurasia. Since the group of species of birds inhabiting North America is distinct from the group of species inhabiting Eurasia, these two groups of birds can be thought of as separate, distinct populations. Also there is very little contact between birds endemic to these two areas; thus, these two populations of birds (American and Eurasian) can be thought of as entirely distinct populations of birds, each with its own unique environment. Also, in each of these populations, the H5N1 virus experiences entirely different selective forces, and hence we have emerging two distinct strains of the H5N1 virus. Just as there are different strains of racing pigeons (e.g. Sions vs Jansens), there are emerging different strains of the H5N1 virus. In particular, as we have seen above, in Asia, there has been very little effective control over the H5N1 situation, so it has propagated largely out of control, and hence become a distinct, more virulent strain of the H5N1 virus; thus the Eurasian strain of H5N1 has now been specifically named 'Asian H5N1 HPAI'. (The 'HPAI' stands for Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza). The Asian H5N1 HPAI strain lives up to its name very well. It is pathogenic in its natural hosts (waterfowl and shore birds) and, can still infect humans, cause disease and even death. Unfortunately, it has also extended its host range to now include pigeons. **This** does not mean that pigeons have become its natural host, but it now can infect pigeons and cause disease in them. Pigeons are still insignificant players in the Eurasian H5N1 scene, but they are now in the host range.

**Growth Good – Famine**

Economic advancement is a key component of food security.

**Timmer 4** (Peter, Center for Global Development,“Food Security And Economic Growth: An Asian Perspective” Heinz W. Arndt Memorial Lecture, Canberra, November 22, 2004 accessed 6/21/11 JF)

There is a different way to pose the question, however. **Rather than asking how to cope with hunger and famine, the question might be how to escape from their threat altogether**. As Fogel (1991) has emphasised, **this is a modern question that is only partly answered by the institutional and technological innovations that are at the heart of modern economic growth** (Kuznets 1966). **Without these innovations, the modern escape from hunger to food security would not have been possible. But the record of economic growth for the developing countries since the 1950s shows that, even in countries with relatively low levels of per capita income, government interventions to enhance food security can lift the threat of hunger and famine.** The countries most successful at this task are in East and Southeast Asia, although the experience in South Asia has been instructive as well (Timmer 2000). This article has a main premise: an early escape from hunger—achieving food security at the societal level—is not just the result of oneway causation from economic growth generated by private decisions in response to market forces. Improved food security stems directly from a set of government policies that integrates the food economy into a development strategy that seeks rapid economic growth with improved income distribution (Timmer, Falcon and Pearson 1983). **With such policies, economic growth and food security are mutually reinforcing.** Countries in East and Southeast Asia offer evidence that poor countries using this strategy can escape from hunger in two decades or less — that is, in the space of a single generation.

Economic growth is the only solution to famine
**Mahder 8** (Ethiopian Development Website, “Addressing the root cause of famine and poverty in Ethiopia,” September 27, 2008,
http://mahder.com/pdf/Addressing\_the\_root\_cause\_of\_famine\_and\_poverty\_in\_Ethiopia..pdf, AD: 7-6-9)

It is well established that there is a strong correlation between famine and economic development or growth. Economic growth leads to development and reduction in poverty and famine. Real economic growth embracing and benefiting all the citizens of a country produces safety mechanisms which are of vital importance in alleviating or avoiding displacements and live destruction emanating from famine. The suffering and significant loss of lives resulting from persistent famines which are hitting Ethiopia could not be avoided or even mitigated owing to the shrinking economy or increasing poverty in the country. On the other hand, one can can not avoid but face the irony of Ethiopia failing to be self sufficient and feed its population despite possessing all the potential to do so. Thus a critical examination of the major stumbling block or factor acting as a bottleneck and preventing the country from eradicating or even coping with famine is necessary.

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)

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.

Growth Good – Prolif

Economic growth solves proliferation

Burrows and Windram 94 (William & Robert, Critical Mass, p. 491-492) LL

Economics is in many respects proliferation’s catalyst. As we have noted, economic desperation drives Russia and some of the former Warsaw Pact nations to peddle weapons and technology. The possibility of considerable profits or at least balanced international payments also prompts Third World countries like China, Brazil, and Israel to do the same. Economics, as well as such related issues as overpopulation, drive proliferation just as surely as do purely political motives. Unfortunately, that subject is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that, all things being equal, well-of, relatively secure societies like today’s Japan are less likely to buy or sell superweapon technology than those that are insecure, needy, or desperate. Ultimately, solving economic problems, especially as they are driven by population pressure, is the surest way to defuse proliferation and enhance true national security.

Economic affluence deters proliferation – NK proves

Japan Times 8 (October 23, Lexis) LL

South Korea, which is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, is becoming increasingly uncomfortable with North Koreans' economic despair. Probably no two neighboring countries have such a huge economic gap, let alone countries that share the same ethnic and historical background. The danger is that such a discrepancy can become a source of instability and conflict. To overcome its economic deficiencies and attain social stability, the North has no choice but to abandon its nuclear weapons program and move toward reform and greater openness. South Korea is trying to persuade the North to make this strategic decision. We are more than willing to help the North achieve economic growth, which is almost always the source of peace and security. As such, North Korea's economic recovery is vital for an enduring peace on the Korean Peninsula.

And, prolif causes extinction from arms races and miscalculations

Utgoff 2 (Deputy Director of the Strategy Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses, Victor, “Proliferation, Missile Defence, and American Ambitions,” Survival, Volume 44, Number 2, Summer) ET

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the, late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

Growth Good – Terrorism

Economic collapse leads to terrorism

Bremmer 9(Ian, - President of the Eurasia Group, sr. fellow @ World Policy Institute, , 3/4/09, *Foreign Policy,* http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/03/04/the\_global\_recession\_heightens\_terrorist\_risks) ET

But there's another reason why the financial crisis heightens the risk of global terrorism. Militants thrive in places where no one is fully in charge. The global recession threatens to create more such places. No matter how cohesive and determined a terrorist organization, it needs a supportive environment in which to flourish. That means a location that provides a steady stream of funds and recruits and the support (or at least acceptance) of the local population. Much of the counter-terrorist success we've seen in Iraq's al Anbar province over the past two years is a direct result of an increased willingness of local Iraqis to help the Iraqi army and US troops oust the militants operating there. In part, that's because the area's tribal leaders have their own incentives (including payment in cash and weaponry) for cooperating with occupation forces. But it's also because foreign militants have alienated the locals. The security deterioration of the past year in Pakistan and Afghanistan reflects exactly the opposite phenomenon. In the region along both sides of their shared border, local tribal leaders have yet to express much interest in helping Pakistani and NATO soldiers target local or foreign militants. For those with the power to either protect or betray the senior al-Qaeda leaders believed to be hiding in the region, NATO and Pakistani authorities have yet to find either sweet enough carrots or sharp enough sticks to shift allegiances. The slowdown threatens to slow the progress of a number of developing countries. Most states don't provide ground as fertile for militancy as places like Afghanistan, Somalia, and Yemen. But as more people lose their jobs, their homes, and opportunities for prosperity -- in emerging market countries or even within minority communities inside developed states -- it becomes easier for local militants to find volunteers. This is why the growing risk of attack from suicide bombers and well-trained gunmen in Pakistan creates risks that extend beyond South Asia. This is a country that is home to lawless regions where local and international militants thrive, nuclear weapons and material, a history of nuclear smuggling, a cash-starved government, and a deteriorating economy. Pakistan is far from the only country in which terrorism threatens to spill across borders.

Growth solves terrorism

Schaefer 1 (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 Good – Terrorism

Econ decline leads to terrorism

Bremmer 9 (Ian , president of Eurasia Group, a political-risk consultancy, *Foreign Affairs*, 3.4.9, <http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/03/04/the_global_recession_heightens_terrorist_risks>) ET

In the Pakistani city of Lahore on Tuesday, a dozen gunmen attacked a bus carrying members of Sri Lanka's cricket team, killing six policemen and a driver and injuring several of the athletes. Press accounts of the assault suggest a level of coordination similar to that used by the Pakistan-based militants who killed 173 people at several sites in Mumbai in September. Across Pakistan, suicide bombers killed two people in 2005, six in 2006, 56 in 2007, and 61 in 2008. Suicide attackers killed more people in Pakistan last year than in either Iraq or Afghanistan. There are two important reasons why the threat of global terrorism is growing. The first is long-term and structural. The second is more directly tied to the global financial crisis. Both have everything to do with what's happening in Pakistan. First, a report released in December from the U.S. Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction, Proliferation, and Terrorism hints at both sets of problems. The report notes an increasing supply of nuclear technology and material around the world and warns that "without greater urgency and decisive action by the world community, it is more likely than not that a weapon of mass destruction will be used in a terrorist attack somewhere in the world by the end of 2013."Destructive (and potentially destructive) technologies are now more accessible than at any time in history for small groups and even individuals. This will dramatically increase the baseline threat of disruptive violence from non-state actors over time. It's not just biological and nuclear material. GPS tracking devices help pirates operating off Somalia's coast venture further from shore and undertake increasingly ambitious attacks on private and commercial vessels. Second, it's unlikely that we'll see the "greater urgency and decisive action by the world community" called for in the report. For the moment, political leaders around the world are too busy wrestling with the effects of the global financial crisis on their domestic economies (and their political standing) to coordinate action against such a diffuse threat. But there's another reason why the financial crisis heightens the risk of global terrorism. Militants thrive in places where no one is fully in charge. The global recession threatens to create more such places. No matter how cohesive and determined a terrorist organization, it needs a supportive environment in which to flourish. That means a location that provides a steady stream of funds and recruits and the support (or at least acceptance) of the local population. Much of the counter-terrorist success we've seen in Iraq's al Anbar province over the past two years is a direct result of an increased willingness of local Iraqis to help the Iraqi army and US troops oust the militants operating there. In part, that's because the area's tribal leaders have their own incentives (including payment in cash and weaponry) for cooperating with occupation forces. But it's also because foreign militants have alienated the locals. The security deterioration of the past year in Pakistan and Afghanistan reflects exactly the opposite phenomenon. In the region along both sides of their shared border, local tribal leaders have yet to express much interest in helping Pakistani and NATO soldiers target local or foreign militants. For those with the power to either protect or betray the senior al-Qaeda leaders believed to be hiding in the region, NATO and Pakistani authorities have yet to find either sweet enough carrots or sharp enough sticks to shift allegiances. The slowdown threatens to slow the progress of a number of developing countries. Most states don't provide ground as fertile for militancy as places like Afghanistan, Somalia, and Yemen. But as more people lose their jobs, their homes, and opportunities for prosperity -- in emerging market countries or even within minority communities inside developed states -- it becomes easier for local militants to find volunteers. This is why the growing risk of attack from suicide bombers and well-trained gunmen in Pakistan creates risks that extend beyond South Asia. This is a country that is home to lawless regions where local and international militants thrive, nuclear weapons and material, a history of nuclear smuggling, a cash-starved government, and a deteriorating economy. Pakistan is far from the only country in which terrorism threatens to spill across borders. But there's a reason why the security threats flowing back and forth across the Afghan-Pakistani border rank so highly on Eurasia Group's list of top political risks for 2009 -- and why they remain near the top of the Obama administration's security agenda.

Growth Good – Terrorism

Economic decline leads to increased risk of nuclear terrorism

Warrick, 8 (Joby, staff writer, *Washington Post*, 11/15/08)

Intelligence officials are warning that the deepening global financial crisis could weaken fragile governments in the world's most dangerous areas and undermine the ability of the United States and its allies to respond to a new wave of security threats. U.S. government officials and private analysts say the economic turmoil has heightened the short-term risk of a terrorist attack, as radical groups probe for weakening border protections and new gaps in defenses. A protracted financial crisis could threaten the survival of friendly regimes from Pakistan to the Middle East while forcing Western nations to cut spending on defense, intelligence and foreign aid, the sources said. The crisis could also accelerate the shift to a more Asia-centric globe, as rising powers such as China gain more leverage over international financial institutions and greater influence in world capitals. Some of the more troubling and immediate scenarios analysts are weighing involve nuclear-armed Pakistan, which already was being battered by inflation and unemployment before the global financial tsunami hit. Since September, Pakistan has seen its national currency devalued and its hard-currency reserves nearly wiped out. Analysts also worry about the impact of plummeting crude prices on oil-dependent nations such as Yemen, which has a large population of unemployed youths and a history of support for militant Islamic groups. The underlying problems and trends -- especially regional instability and the waning influence of the West -- were already well established, but they are now "being accelerated by the current global financial crisis," the nation's top intelligence official, Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell, said in a recent speech. McConnell is among several top U.S. intelligence officials warning that deep cuts in military and intelligence budgets could undermine the country's ability to anticipate and defend against new threats.

Growth Good – Heg

Downturn in econ causes spending cuts that destroy heg

Thompson 9 (Loren, chief executive officer of Lexington, Armed Forces Journal, Mar 9, <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2009/03/3922551>) ET

As if all this were not enough, the parts of the defense program that are politically easiest to cut — the investment accounts — are the parts that contribute most tangibly to long-term military power. If military pay and benefits are slashed, the consequences are felt quickly in the field and on Capitol Hill. The same is true if readiness accounts are cut. With military health care costs having risen 144 percent during the present decade, there are compelling reasons to try to restrain their further growth (one Pentagon panel called cost increases in military health care an “existential threat” to the future defense posture). But investment in the future is almost always easier to cut than current consumption, because the near-term consequences in the field are imperceptible, and the domestic impact is felt in only a handful of congressional districts. The bottom line, then, is that the current defense program will probably not be sustainable if the decline of the economy continues, and when the cutting begins to bring military outlays into closer alignment with available resources, the first items to go will be those that contribute most to the nation’s long-term military power. In other words, the erosion of national economic power will be paced by the erosion of national military power.

Economic downturn destroys heg

Pape 9 (Robert , poli sci @u of Chicago, *Chicago Tribune*, 3.8.9, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-perspec0308diplomacymar08,0,4785661.story) ET

For nearly two decades, [the U.S.](http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/politics/government/national-government/united-states-ORGOV0000001.topic) has been viewed as a global hegemon—vastly more powerful than any major country in the world. Since 2000, however, our global dominance has fallen dramatically. During the Bush administration, the self-inflicted wounds of the Iraq war, growing government debt, increasingly negative current account balances and other internal economic weaknesses cost the U.S. real power in a world of rapidly spreading knowledge and technology. Simply put, the main legacy of the Bush years has been to leave the U.S. as a declining power.  From Rome to the United States today, the rise and fall of great nations have been driven primarily by economic strength. At any given moment, a state's power depends on the size and quality of its military forces and other power assets. Over time, however, power is a result of economic strength—the prerequisite for building and modernizing military forces. And so the size of the economy relative to potential rivals ultimately determines the limits of power in international politics. The power position of the U.S. is crucial to the foreign policy aims that it can achieve. Since the Cold War, America has maintained a vast array of overseas commitments, seeking to ensure peace and stability not just in its own neighborhood, the Western hemisphere, but also in Europe, Asia and the oil-rich Persian Gulf. Maintaining these commitments requires enormous resources, but American leaders in recent years chose to pursue far more ambitious goals than merely maintaining the status quo.

And, hegemonic decline leads to transition wars – the impact is extinction

Nye 90 (Joe, Sultan of Oman Professor of International Relations and former Dean of the Kennedy School at Harvard and one of the most influential and respected contemporary IR scholars, pg 17) ET

Perceptions of change in the relative power of nations are of critical importance to understanding the relationship between decline and war. One of the oldest generalizations about international politics attributes the onset of major wars to shifts in power among the leading nations. Thus Thucydides accounted for the onset of the Peloponnesian War which destroyed the power of ancient Athens. The history of the interstate system since 1500 is punctuated by severe wars in which one country struggled to surpass another as the leading state. If as Robert Gilpin argues, international politics has not changed fundamentally over the millennia, “the implications for the future are bleak. And if fears about shifting power precipitate a major war in a world with 50,000 nuclear weapons, history as we know it may end.

Growth Good – Heg

**Economic growth is key to heg—history proves.**

Pietroburgo 9 (Anthony, Political Scientist, Apr 10, 9, http://ezinearticles.com/?The-End-of-American-Hegemony&id=2207395: Ad 7-6-9) BL

However we can learn from past hegemonic states, all of which, withered away with time just as the American one is currently in the process of doing. Great Britain was perhaps the last true hegemon before that of the United States. Back in 1890 the collapse of their empire had just began. David A. Lake's research on the issue is work that should be greatly analyzed due to the illustrious similarities between the British recession in to retirement and the United States' as well. For much of the 19th century Great Britain was dominating in the same fields as the U.S. did so in the 1950's through the late 1970's. Soon in the later 1800's The United States and Germany moved to a protectionist system to plant their economic seeds and soon after were surpassing British industries and abilities. The industrial base of Great Britain crumbled and forced them to invest heavily in the service, shipping and insurance sectors of the economy just to break-even when concerning their balance of payment statistics. For the time being the British were able to carry on with the pound as the dominant world currency. The frail system was already on the thinnest of ice, when WWI confounded the weak British economy (Lake 122). At the time of Great Britain's reign of power they also pursued operations to completely open up and liberalize the world economy. This did lead to substantial brief economic abundance but eventually the struggles of remaining a strong enough power to be considered an absolute hegemon wore off. Hegemonic powers are only sustainable during periods of constant economic growth. When growth is no longer the complete and utter status of the hegemony's economic functionality the power ceases to be consistent. We see this to be the case with Great Britain, as other world powers emerged and caught up in terms of economic status and influence, British power that was exerted was much more explicit and coercive, just like it was during the American hegemonic era under President Nixon (Lake 121). It is safe to say that the U.S. is headed down the same path that will eventually end up being the ultimate de-throning of the American empire and it's hegemonic capabilities. If you think back to all the complications that the United States is experiencing in this very moment concerning obvious financial difficulties and others in the areas of education, technological innovation and healthcare respectively. Other nations have clearly started their own catch up phase and are impeding on American power as we speak. The irony between the situations leading up to the collapse of the British hegemonic state and the current burdens that are being placed upon a contemptuous American hegemon are too similar for coincidence. It took the disaster of WWI to finally destabilize the British hegemon and the United States is one major crisis away from experiencing the same fate (Bartilow Lecture).

Economic growth is key to hegemony

Hunt 7 (Michael, Professor of History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 5.21.7, http://hnn.us/articles/37486.html) ET

If in the U.S. case empire is genetic, hegemony is an acquired characteristic. Hegemony was made possible by a rate of economic growth over the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that had no precedent in human history. This achievement created the preconditions for a U.S.-inspired, designed, and regulated international system that took shape during the first two thirds of the twentieth century. American economic and cultural clout remade societies and reshaped the practices of daily life around the world.

Growth Good – Poverty

Growth helps the poor—historical stats prove.

Deaton 5 (Angus, Woodrow Wilson School @ Princeton, “Measuring Poverty In A Growing World” The Review of Economics and Statistics 87.1 February 2005 accessed 6/21/11 JF)

Yet the controversies are no more settled than they were 30 years ago, although there is certainly more common ground among economists than there is in the world at large. **The professional consensus**, based on the DS data and on work by them and many others, **is that**, contrary to Kuznets's hypothesis, and contrary to beliefs in the 1970s, **there is no general relationship between inequality and growth**, **and certainly not one in which growth systematically widens inequality, as would be the case of growth left the poor behind.** From this, two important propositions follow. First**, at least on average** (and much depends on whether we are averaging over countries or people), **growth is good for the poor** (Dollar & Kraay, 2002; Ravallion, 2001), **as is the growth that is arguably generated by greater openness** (Berg & Krueger, 2003). Second, and again on average, **the fraction of people in poverty should decline as if growth were neutrally distributed.** In particular, the relatively rapid growth in the developing world from 1980 to 2000 must have brought about a rapid reduction in the fraction of the world's population that is poor. And indeed, **calculations** using the Penn World Tables combined with inequality measures - the technique first used by Ahluwalia et al. (1979) - **show rapid poverty reduction in the 1980s and 1990s**; see Bhalla (2002), Sala-i-Martin (2002), and Bourguignon and Morrisson (2002). **According to these calculations, not only has the proportion of poor in the world declined, but the decline has been rapid enough to offset population growth, so that the actual number of poor people in the world has fallen**. According to Bhalla, the first of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, halving the number of people living on less than $1 a day between 1990 and 2015, had already been met when the goal was announced.

Growth solves poverty

Fraser 7 (Andrew, political correspondent, “Economic Growth Cuts Poverty: PM” Canberra Times (Australia) 9/5/7 accessed 6/21/11 JF)

**Only economic growth could have delivered the dramatic reduction in poverty that** Australia's **APEC** guests had **achieved** over two decades of the forum's existence, the Government claimed yesterday. Both Prime Minister John Howard and Foreign Minister Alexander Downer dwelt on what Mr Howard called "quite astonishing" figures as the APEC meeting in Sydney went to its highest security level with the arrival of United States President George W.Bush. Issuing a booklet, APEC and the rise of the global middle class, Mr Howard said the number of people in absolute poverty in East Asia and the Pacific had gone from 500 million people in 1990 to 200 million in 2003, with the hope that it could be further cut to only 20 million by 2030. He said there were two trends: "the unprecedented concentration of middle-class spending power in the world's emerging economies", and the huge reduction in poverty. The document suggested there could be 2billion people with "significant discretionary spending power" by 2030, with 800 million of them living in China alone. The figures "underlined the uninformed pig- headedness of those who demonstrate against APEC in the name of helping the poor and the dispossessed and the alienated". "The truth is that economic growth is the sure path out of poverty rather than being a process of condemning people to poverty.

Ongoing global poverty outweighs nuclear war- only our ev is comparative.

Spina 2k (Stephanie Urso, Ph.D. candidate in social/personality psychology at the Graduate School of the City University of New York, Smoke and Mirrors: The Hidden Context of Violence in Schools and Society, p. 201)

This sad fact is not limited to the United States. Globally, 18 million deaths a year are caused by structural violence, compared to 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. That is, approximately every five years, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths, and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war or genocide, perpetuated on the weak and the poor every year of every decade, throughout the world.

Growth Good – Democracy

Democracy depends directly on economic growth.

**Barro 99** (Robert, prof of econ @ Harvard U,“Determinants of Democracy”, *Journal of Political Economy* Vol. 107:6 December 1999 Pg. 163, 179,182, JF)

Inspection of the cross-country data suggests that countries at low levels of economic development typically do not sustain democracy. For example, the political freedoms installed in most of the newly independent African states in the early 1960s did not tend to last. Conversely, nondemocratic places that experience substantial economic development tend to become more dramatic. Examples include Chile, South Korea, Taiwan, Spain, and Portugal. Moreover, the countries of central and eastern Europe—which have been reasonably advanced economically for some time, especially in terms of education—eventually became more democratic. Thus a casual view of the data seems to support the Lipset/Aristotle hypothesis.

**A surge of democratization since the late 1980s meant that many of the countries in sub-Saharan Africa became more democratic than predicted by 1995.** This group includes Benin, Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Malawi, Mali, Niger, and Zambia. In some of these cases, the democratization may be explicable from the pressures and rewards exerted by international organizations, such as the IMF and the World Bank. (The recent U.S. efforts in Haiti are analogous.) In any case, **the regression analysis predicts that, as with the African experience of the 1960s, democracy that gets well ahead of economic development will not last**. As a possible indicator of this process, Niger had a military coup in January 1996 and then became nondemocratic.

The data for a large panel of countries conﬁrm the Lipset/Aristotle hypothesis, which says that **a higher standard of living promotes democracy. This relation shows up when democracy is represented by electoral rights or civil liberties and when the standard of living is measured by per capita GDP,** primary school attainment, the gap between male and female primary schooling (which enters negatively), and the importance of the middle class. Democracy does not relate signiﬁcantly to school attainment at the secondary and higher levels. For a given standard of living, democracy tends to fall with urbanization and a greater reliance on natural resources but has little relation to country size.

Democracy solves several scenarios for extinction.

Diamond 95 (Larry, Prof @ Stanford University, Promoting Democracy in the 1990’s”)

The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically “cleanse” their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

\*\*De-Dev Bad\*\*

De-Dev Bad – Backlash

Elite backlash

Kassiola 90 (Joel, Prof of Poli-Sci @ Brooklyn College, “The death of industrial civilization,” p. 194, jam)

Moreover, as a result of disappointment, Wildean tragedy, and value erosion, the postindustrial elite (the current members of the beneficiary class within the dominant, postindustrial social paradigm and structure) might come to a realization unique in history. The elite, postindustrial consciousness may be shocked into change by increasingly conspicuous limits to growth as well as by the profoundly challenging nature of the limits-to-growth literature: the futility, insecurity, and disaster looming in our foreseeable future (unlike the predicted long-range disaster of our sun burning up in several billion years), and a future filled with the preoccupation of seeking to maintain their relative advantages and ceaselessly fend off all of the others seeking to replace them. The enjoyment of the elite’s present success seems short-lived, unstable, and increasingly inadequate relative to both the concern and effort expended in attaining such “success” in the first place, and the rising costs of maintaining their celebrated position on top.

De-Dev Bad – Trainer Indicts

Trainer’s a hack and resources are infinite

**Jackson 7** (Gerard, Brookes News Economic Editor, Apr 16, [http://www.brookesnews.com/071604trainer1.html] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

If anyone doubts for a moment that Marxism is a cult they need look no further than Ted Trainer. Full-blooded Marxism has been an utterly brutal failure that killed more than 100,000,000 people (The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression, Harvard University Press,1999) yet Trainer remains so blind to historical facts that he proposes a Marxism solution to the non-problem of economic growth and natural resources. According to the learned Mr Trainer: The fundamental cause of the big global problems threatening us now is simply over-consumption. The rate at which we in rich countries are using up resources is grossly unsustainable. It’s far beyond levels that can be kept up for long or that could be spread to all people. (The Age, ) Let me first deal with Trainer’s absurd notion that we are running out of resources. The following table clearly show that from a human perspective mineral resources are infinite. So much for Trainer’s easily refuted idea of over-consumption. (In economic theory over-production would be defined as capital consumption). However, what the above table does not reveal is that resources are basically a function of technology. Oil was a just a smelly nuisance, a liability that reduced the value of a farmer’s land. In 1886, when the Burma Oil Company of Britain first started to commercially pump oil, it bought thousands of barrels of oil from 24 families at Yenangyaung. In English it means “the creek of stinking waters”. (James Dale Davidson & Lord Rees-Mogg, Blood in the Streets, Sidgwick & Jackson Limited, 1988). Farming families in Pennsylvania experienced the same good fortune more than 25 years earlier, as did Arab sheiks at a much later date. This, and many other examples from economic history, demonstrates that genuine growth is actually a resource-generating process. It also needs to be stressed that mineral and oil reserves are a function of prices. As prices rise so do reserves. This is why Ali Al-Naimi, Saudi Minister of Petroleum and Mineral Resources, was able to tell an international conference in April 2004 that his countries proven oil reserves have been greatly under-estimated and that the country “has 1.2 trillion barrels of estimated reserve” — four times what is usually estimated. No wonder that Peter Odell of Rotterdam’s Erasmus University was able to observe that since 1971, over 1,500 billion barrels have been added to reserves. Over the same 35-year period, under 800 billion barrels were consumed. One can argue for a world which has been ‘running into oil’ rather than ‘out of it’. (The Economist, 30 April 2005). Not only are we running out of mineral resources we are also facing eventual famine because “the average per capita area of productive land available on the planet is only about 1.3 hectares”. This is called “cherry picking”. Let’s forget the “cherries” and concentrate of the sort of facts that lefties hate. In 1960 it took about 1500 million acres to produce the world’s supply of grain; today it still only takes about 1500 million acres. Without this 134 per cent increase in productivity we would now need about 3.5 billion acres for grain production.

Trainer’s wrong – there’ll never be resource shortages

Jackson 7 (Gerard, Brookes News Economic Editor, Apr 16, [http://www.brookesnews.com/071604trainer1.html] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

But our “radically green anarchist ” (his own description) is not going to let a little thing like facts and economics challenge his calcified ideology. This is why he makes the patently absurd assertion that we need to cut resource use by “90 per cent” and share “ the remaining energy among 9 billion people.” This Marxist cultist seems unaware of the scientific fact that there can never be an energy shortage. Energy is neither created nor destroyed. What is scarce is the capital — material means of production that can be used to turn energy into a useful work. And that is why we build power stations — or used to. He then made the idiotic claim that once we had virtually abolished our use of natural resources and slashed our consumption of energy to a suicidal level we could all enjoy a ... simpler [and] far more satisfying way of life.. [and be] able to live well on two days work for money a week, without any threat of unemployment, or insecurity in old age, in a supportive community. To the conventional mind such claims are insanely impossible. Only a certifiable idiot could possible think that one could reduce energy use to the level of a medieval peasant and still enjoy a 21st century lifestyle. Revealing his extensive knowledge of economic history and his profound grasp of economic theory Trainer also claimed that an average rate of growth of 3 per cent from now until 2070 would mean that “total world economic output each year would be 60 times as great as it is now” then it is at present if the economic expectations of the “then the 9 billion people” are to be satisfied. Gee! How terrible! How will our grand children and great grand children manage if they are going to be 60 times richer than their grandparents?

De-Dev Bad – Human Nature

**Human kind feels they are supposed to fulfill destiny- makes growth inevitable**

Zey 1 (Dr. Michael G., Ph.D. in Sociology at Rutgers University, [http://www.zey.com/perspective.htm] AD: 6-23-11)

The Theory in a Nutshell. The Expansionary Theory posits that the human species is a unique entity that can and will play a special role in the greater cosmological framework. According to this theory, over the eons, humankind will apply its ingenuity to overcoming the forces of entropy. The theory synthesizes ideas from astronomy, cosmology, anthropology, physics, sociology, and other fields, and borrows from Kaku, Dyson, Darwin, Teilhard de Chardin, Gribbins, Rees, Moravec, Kurzweil, the Russian Cosmism school, and others. This theoretic synthesis incorporates ideas such as the Anthropic principle, complexity theory, and the Big Bang theory, and reflects recent discoveries in physics, astronomy, and astrobiology. Our current and future breakthroughs in biotechnology, aerospace, and computers will hasten humankind's achievement of its destiny. This section will be expanded over the coming weeks and months. THE EXPANSIONARY VISION OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT Humanity is on a quest to improve the species, marshal the forces of nature, and reshape the universe. Through such processes as biogenesis, cybergenesis, species coalescence, and dominionization, our species has prepared itself for the achievement of its ultimate destiny, vitalization. The question that still remains unanswered is, of course, why? What motivates humankind to feverishly prepare itself for what seems to be a grand mission? Humankind, a species residing on an infinitesimal island in a corner of the universe, dares to believe that the fate and future of the universe lie in its hands. What act of pride do we commit, what hubris do we exhibit to entertain the notion that we even have a destiny, let alone such a lofty one? And who are we to believe that we not only possess such a magnificent destiny, but also are capable of mastering the skills and knowledge necessary to fulfill such a mandate.

Growth inevitable- hardwired in human psyche

Zey 1 (Dr. Michael G., 2001, “THE EXPANSIONARY THEORY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT”, http://www.zey.com/perspective.htm, ) ET

The emerging picture of early Earth is one of a planet brimming with activity, virtually forcing life into existence. As soon as the molecules had the chance, they attempted to establish the conditions for life. This self-organization of molecules made life, and the evolution of life forms, possible. It is the contention here that the same inclination to self-organize, to intentionally evolve oneself from the simple to the complex, exists on the biological level as well as the molecular. And the human species is the finest example of this process. Alfred Russell Wallace, a contemporary of Darwin who concurrently developed a similar theory of natural selection, discussed a major mystery in human evolution. It seems that between Homo habilis and Homo erectus the human brain undergoes a gigantic jump in its size. The earlier hominid has a brain only slightly larger than that of an ape. Homo erectus, which existed for a million years starting around 1.5 million years ago, has a cortex as large as ours. Wallace contends that the human brain was overdesigned for its primitive uses and thus could not have been a production of natural selection. He said that natural selection could only have endowed savage man with a brain a few degrees superior to that of an ape, whereas he actually possesses one very little inferior to that of a philosopher. Robert Orenstein, a biologist specializing in brain research, is similarly curious about why Homo erectus possessed a brain that he ostensibly had little use for. Our brain expanded to a size for which there was little functional use at the time. According to Orenstein, (in his book The Evolution of Consciousness) Homo erectus' brain was complex enough to invent a microprocessor, even though all that was needed at the time was a brain that could figure out how to hammer out the first few stone tools. "Why be able to fly to the moon when no one has even understood how to make iron?", Orenstein asks.

De-Dev Bad – Growth Inevitable

Growth inevitable

Gibson-Graham 6 (JK, Feminist Economic Geographers at the Australian National U, “The End Of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, jam)

Though divorced from its association with an evolutionary narrative of capitalism’s inevitable breakdown and supersession, accumulation brings its other meanings to the stories of Fordism and post-Fordism, which its status as a central process and systemic imperative cannot help but reinforce. Most prominently here I am thinking of the growth imperative that is traditionally associated with capitalist economies. If the regulationists have dispensed with the inevitability of capitalist breakdown, they have no dispensed with the inevitability of growth. Growth remains an unquestioned “law” of capitalist development, with the implication for progressive activists that politics must at least accommodate and at most foster capitalist expansion (the alternative to the “necessary” process of growth being a crisis of accumulation).

Trainer’s simpler world is fantasy – capitalist growth will always occur

Isbister 1 (John, prof of econ at the U of California at Santa Cruz, “Capitalism and Justice,” p. 46, jam)

Some in the capitalist world try to retain or re-create the best parts of precapitalism. Some Amish and Mennonite communities are based on precapitalist values, as are some other faith-based groups. The 1960s and 1970s saw the creation of secular alternative rural communes, communities whose members tried to eliminate all marks of distinction between them, to be self-sufficient, and to live simply. The communes had some successes, but most eventually collapsed. Communities such as these have attempted to embody precapitalist values, but none has succeeded in cutting itself off from capitalist influences: from the market, from the media, from the legal system, and from other influences of the modern world. While we can learn from our antecedent societies, we cannot return to them. The door has been closed.

De-Dev Bad – Inevitable- Brain Chem

Consumption inevitable – brain chemistry

Allenby 7 (Brad, prof of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Arizona State U, Mar 7, [http://www.greenbiz.com/blog/2007/03/07/benefits-our-hardwired-need-consume], AD:6-23-11, jam)

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.

De-Dev Bad – Mindset

Dedev fails – fascist industrialists take over after the rev

Lewis 92 (Martin, prof in the School of the Environment and the Center for International Studies at Duke U, “Green Delusions”, p.170-171, jam)

While an explosive socioeconomic crisis in the near term is hardly likely the possibility certainly cannot be dismissed. Capitalism is an inherently unstable economic system, and periodic crises of some mag¬intude are inevitable. An outbreak of jingoistic economic nationalism throughout the world, moreover, could quickly result in virtual economic collapse. Under such circumstances we could indeed enter an epoch of revolutionary social turmoil. Yet I believe that there are good reasons to believe that the victors in such a struggle would be radicals not of the left but rather of the right. The extreme left, for all its intellectual strength, notably lacks the kind of power necessary to emerge victorious from a real revolution. A few old street radicals may still retain their militant ethos, but today’s college professors and their graduate students, the core marxist contingent, would be ineffective. The radical right, on the other hand, would present a very real threat. Populist right-wing paramilitary groups are well armed and well trained, while establishment-minded fascists probably have links with the American military, wherein lies the greatest concentration of destructive power this planet knows. Should a crisis strike so savagely as to splinter the American center and its political institutions, we could well experience a revolutionary movement simi¬lar to that of Germany in the 1930.

Mindset shift is impossible – the public won’t be convinced consumer culture is bad

Lewis 92 (Martin, prof in the School of the Environment and the Center for International Studies at Duke U, “Green Delusions”, p.11-12, jam)

Here I will argue that eco-radical political strategy, if one may call it that, is consummately self-defeating. The theoretical and empirical rejection of green radicalism is thus bolstered by a series of purely pragmatic objections. Many eco-radicals hope that a massive ideological campaign can transform popular perceptions, leading both to a fundamental change in life¬styles and to large-scale social reconstruction. Such a view is highly credulous. The notion that continued intellectual hectoring will even¬tually result in a mass conversion to environmental monasticism (Ros¬zak 1979:289)—marked by vows of poverty and nonprocreation—is dif¬ficult to accept. While radical views have come to dominate many environmental circles, their effect on the populace at large has been minimal. Despite the greening of European politics that recently gave stalwarts considerable hope, the more recent green plunge suggests that even the European electorate lacks commitment to environmental radi¬calism. In the United States several decades of preaching the same eco¬radical gospel have had little appreciable effect; the public remains, as before, wedded to consumer culture and creature comforts. The stubborn hope that nonetheless continues to inform green ex¬tremism stems from a pervasive philosophical error in radical environ¬mentalism. As David Pepper (1989) shows, most eco-radical thought is mired in idealism: in this case the belief that the roots of the ecological crisis lie ultimately in ideas about nature and humanity As Dobson (1990:37) puts it: “Central to the theoretical canon of Green politics is the belief that our social, political, and economic problems are substan¬tially caused by our intellectual relationship with the world” (see also Milbrath 1989:338). If only such ideas would change, many aver, all would be well. Such a belief has inspired the writing of eloquent jere¬miads; it is less conducive to designing concrete strategies for effective social and economic change. It is certainly not my belief that ideas are insignificant or that attempt¬ing to change others’ opinions is a futile endeavor. If that were true I would hardly feel compelled to write a polemic work of this kind. But I am also convinced that changing ideas alone is insufficient. Widespread ideological conversion, even if it were to occur, would hardly be adequate for genuine social transformation. Specific policies must still be formu¬lated, and specific political plans must be devised if those policies are ever to be realized.

De-Dev Bad – A2: Recession

No mindset shift – recession left the system in tact

Harrison 10 (Edward, Credit Write downs, mar 10, http://www.creditwritedowns.com/2010/03/the-mindset-will-not-change-a-depressionary-relapse-may-be-coming.html )

As for Xie’s views on the U.S., optimistically, he entitles his latest piece “A Change of Mindset,” as if to say the bailout mentality has come to an end:We are hearing the first major departure from the mainstream consensus; US President Barack Obama has just announced a proposal to limit proprietary trading on Wall Street. This is his first major step to address the root cause of the crisis. The crisis happened because financial professionals had incentives to bet other people’s money in a game they could not lose. With so many getting in on the act, the liquidity they threw into the trades made them effective, turning bankers into heroes, but only for a while. The crisis showed that their behavior was indeed rational: while the losses to shareholders and taxpayers surpassed all the accounting profits that Wall Street reported during the bubble, those who made the trades are still rich, because they paid themselves bonuses in cash, not derivatives. Obama has not been well-advised. His so-called accomplishment — stabilizing the financial system — comes from throwing trillions of taxpayers’ dollars at financial firms. He has behaved like a Wall Street trader: spending other people’s money with no thought of consequences. Anyone can do that. Hopefully Obama has fundamentally changed his approach. Reform, not stimulus, is the solution. Only by limiting financial speculation can the foundations be laid for a healthy recovery, and to prevent another crisis. I am glad he is hopeful that Obama sees the folly in more bailouts and malinvestment. Perhaps he is on to something. However, I do not expect the mindset to change whatsoever. Bank profits are back at record levels and the worst of the panic is now over. You don’t get a change in mindset in that environment. More likely, you get a victory lap.

De-Dev Bad – Hypergrowth

Decreased growth leads to rapid and unrestrained rebounds supercharging their reasons why growth is bad

Bronson 6 (Bob, Bronson Capital Markets Research, LLC, May 16, [http://www.financialsense.com/editorials/bronson/2006/0517.html] AD: 6-23-11, jm)

The reasons behind the investor psychology of an “echo-mania” are the stuff of the field of behavioral finance. Quite simply, investors haven’t had enough of the easy money made in the original mania, even though much, if not all, of that money was lost in the first downleg (A) of the Supercycle Bear Market. The eagerness for quick riches is hard to squelch, and so they rush in to buy all over again, creating a second, or “echo” bubble. They tell themselves they’ve “learned a lesson” and “won’t make the same mistake twice” by holding on to their hot stocks too long. They think they’ll sell in time to avoid the next market collapse, but empirical evidence shows they don’t. In fact, their eventual “herding,” when the decline is well underway and they finally “get it” and decide to sell en masse, usually causes a more severe second downleg than the first. Experiments conducted by George Mason University professor Vernon Smith, who shared in the 2002 Nobel Prize for economics, confirmed this behavior. Participants traded a dividend-paying “stock” with a very clear fundamental value. A bubble invariably forms, then bursts. If the experiment is repeated with the same people, a bubble forms again. The second time, though, participants think they will be able to sell their stock before trouble strikes. They then express surprise that, in fact, they weren’t able to get out before the second collapse, which leads to their total disdain for investing in stocks. This collective investor disillusionment is both a necessary and sufficient condition for bringing about the selling that results in the extreme fundamental undervaluation that finally ends the Supercycle Bear Market Period. We have seen exactly this behavior at work since the stock market began its rebound from the October 2002 and March 2003 lows. We expect that the recent “echo-mania” will end like the original mania and like the good professor’s experiment: badly for the investors speculating once again on highly overvalued stock and believing they’re now a better-than-average investor.

Dislocations make the boom-bust cycle go crazy, allowing us to access all of their impacts

Fekete 3 (Alan, Memorial U of Newfoundland, Nov 3, [http://www.shoemakerconsulting.com/GoldisFreedom/Archives/goldsstability.htm] AD: 6-23-11)

The world economy has been in a deflationary mode since 1980, witness the dishoarding of marketable commodities that had been hoarded during the pre-1980 inflationary period (e.g., crude oil, grains, metals, lumber, etc.). In this context "hoarding" should be understood in its broadest sense to include the creation of excess capacity to produce agricultural and industrial goods for consumption. Likewise, "dishoarding" also includes the dismantling of excess capacity causing what I call “job-drain” or the export of American jobs to Asia. The destabilization of the interest-rate structure is the single greatest economic dislocation that has wreaked the greatest havoc on the world, and was caused by government tampering with the right to own gold. Unless this right is carved in the stone of the Constitution, more damage will follow as the rate of interest can plunge to zero (hyper-deflation), or it can take a flight to infinity (hyper-inflation), and it is impossible to predict which should come first.

\*\*Growth Bad\*\*

Growth Bad – War

War is only sparked by upswings—we need to transition before 2025

Chase-Dunn & Bornschier 99 (Christopher, Director of the Institute for Research on World-Systems, U of California-Riverside, and Volker, prof at the University of Zurich, Switzerland, “The Future of Global Conflict”, Sage Publications, p. 43, jam)

While the onset of a period of hegemonic rivalry is in itself disturbing, the picture becomes even grimmer when the influence of long-term economic cycles is taken into account. As an extensive body of research documents (see especially Van Duijn, 1983), the 50 to 60 year business cycle known as the Kondratieff wave (K-wave) has been in synchronous operation on an international scale for at least the last two centuries. Utilizing data gathering by Levy (1983) on war severity, Goldstein (1988) demonstrates that there is a corresponding 50 to 60 year cycle in the number of battle deaths per year for the period 1495-1975. Beyond merely showing that the K-wave and the war cycle are linked in a systematic fashion, Goldstein’s research suggests that severe core wars are much more likely to occur late in the upswing phase of the K-wave. This finding is interpreted as showing that, while states always desire to go to war, they can afford to do so only when economic growth is providing them with sufficient resources. Modelski and Thompson (1996) present a more complex interpretation of the systemic relationship between economic and war cycles, but it closely resembles Goldstein’s hypothesis. In their analysis, a first economic upswing generates the economic resources required by an ascending core state to make a bid for hegemony; a second period of economic growth follows a period of global war and the establishment of a new period of hegemony. Here, again, specific economic upswings are associated with an increased likelihood of the outbreak of core war. It is widely accepted that the current K-wave, which entered a downturn around 1967-73, is probably now in the process of beginning a new upturn which will reach its apex around 2025. It is also widely accepted that by this period US hegemony, already unravelling, will have been definitively eroded. This convergence of a plateauing economic cycle with a period of political multicentricity within the core should, if history truly does repeat itself, result in the outbreak of full-scale warfare between the declining hegemon and the ascending core powers. Although both Goldstein (1991) and Modelski and Thompson (1996) assert that such a global war can (somehow) be avoided, other theorists consider that the possibility of such a core war is sufficiently high that serious steps should be taken to ensure that such collective suicide does not occur (Chase-Dunn and O’Reilly, 1989; Goldfrank, 1987).

Growth Bad – War

Economic growth and an increase of resources causes conflict – history proves

Meir Kohn 5 (11-?- 5, Economic Development and the Evolution of Government in Pre-Industrial Europe, P1, Dartmouth College, Dpt of Economics, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=866986) LE

In pre-industrial Europe, government and the economy developed together, each influencing the other. The development of each was shaped by competition. Governments competed for territory, principally by means of war. Their success depended primarily on their ability to mobilize resources. So governments that could tap the resources of thriving economies had an advantage over governments that could not. Of course, whether or not an economy thrived depended to no small extent on the nature and conduct of its government. This nexus of government, war, and economy generated a sort of cycle. A period of peace allowed economies to develop and grow. This economic growth increased the resources available to governments, enabling them to embark on military adventures. War and the means used to finance it depressed economic activity and eventually starved governments of resources. This made it impossible for them to continue fighting. Peace then returned and the economy slowly recovered. This set the scene for another cycle. Economic growth and war were both self-limiting. It is this political-economic cycle much more than the demographic-economic cycle of Malthus that has been the main obstacle to sustained economic progress.

Growth catalyzes war

Boehmer 10 (Charles R., Ph.D Pennsylvania State U in IR, associate prof @ U of Texas at El Paso, Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 21(3), June, pp.249-268, EBSCO, AD: 6-22-11, jm)

Still, states often experience economic growth, whereas violent interstate conflicts are rare events. I do not argue that economic growth is a general and direct source of conflict between states. I contend instead that growth acts as a catalyst, pouring fuel on fires where conflicts have already commenced. Economic growth should influence the perceptions state leaders have about their state’s performance. I argue that economic growth acts as a catalyst for violent interstate conflicts by increasing the willingness of states to use military force in foreign policy, particularly to reciprocate militarized threats and uses of force or to escalate conflicts in a violent manner. Most and Starr (1989: 22) define willingness as “the willingness to choose (even if the choice is no action), and to employ available capabilities to further some policy option over others.” Most and Starr situate willingness against a background of ‘opportunity’. Naturally, not all states have the same opportunity to realistically choose policies that lead to interstate violence or war, at least with an equal chance of victory.

Data proves growth causes war

Boehmer 10 (Charles R., Ph.D Pennsylvania State U in IR, associate prof @ U of Texas at El Paso, Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 21(3), June, pp.249-268, EBSCO, AD: 6-22-11, jm)

The theory set forth earlier theorizes that economic growth increases perceptions of state strength, increasing the likelihood of violent interstate conflicts. Economic growth appears to increase the resolve of leaders to stand against challenges and the willingness to escalate disputes. A non-random pattern exists where higher rates of GDP growth over multiple years are positively and significantly related to the most severe international conflicts, whereas this is not true for overall conflict initiations. Moreover, growth of military expenditures, as a measure of the war chest proposition, does not offer any explanation for violent interstate conflicts. This is not to say that growth of military expenditures never has any effect on the occurrence of war, although such a link is not generally true in the aggregate using a large sample of states. In comparison, higher rates of economic growth are significantly related to violent interstate conflicts in the aggregate. States with growing economies are more apt to reciprocate military challenges by other states and become involved in violent interstate conflicts.

Growth Bad – War

Numerous historical examples prove

Cashman 2k (Greg, prof in the Department of Political Science at Salisbury U in Salisbury, Maryland, "What causes war?: an introduction to theories of international conflict," book, p. 135-136, jm)

Several scholars argue the opposite point of view—that the depths of the economic cycle do not instigate international conflict but serve instead to constrain the pursuit of war. Blainey cites this as a major factor in preventing Austria from attempting to recapture Silesia in 1749 and for delaying the Japanese invasion of Korea in 1873.38 In fact, several analysts suggest that it isn't depression that leads to war, but economic recovery. In other words, it is the up side of the business cycle, not the down side, that is most frequently associated with war. The most famous argument is probably that of A. L. Macfie, who published in 1938 a study of the effects of the British business cycle on twelve wars from 1850 to 1914. (The British themselves were only involved in three of these wars, but it is assumed that the fluctuations present in the British economy reflected a truly international business cycle, thus justifying the use of British economic statistics with the war behavior of several countries.) Matching annual statistics on employment against the onset of war, he concluded that wars were most likely when an economic recovery was in its later stages.39 A recent study of global economic cycles (called "long cycles") and war from 1495 to 1975 by Joshua Goldstein finds a strong and consistent correlation between the severity of war and economic upswings.40 Although wars have occurred in roughly equal numbers throughout history in the upswing and downswing phases, the most severe wars have taken place in upswing phases. From 1495 until 1918 each peak in war severity occurred near the end of an upswine phase.

Economic growth spurs belligerence which empirically causes war

Cashman 2k (Greg, prof in the Department of Political Science at Salisbury U in Salisbury, Maryland, "What causes war?: an introduction to theories of international conflict," book, p. 135-136, jm)

A psychological explanation for the relationship between war and economic upturns is also frequently made. Indeed, both Macfie and Blainey, as well as Goldstein, suggest that economic recoveries are associated with a general mood of optimism, which is the real cause of war. Blainey argues, When trade is deteriorating and when unemployment is increasing the mood of governments tend to be cautious and apprehensive. Dwindling revenues and soaring claims for the state's aid aggravate the mood. On the other hand, when prosperity is high—and this time is the most dangerous to peace—there comes a sense of mastery of the environment.43 Blainey is describing here a collective national mood. This general feeling of optimism and confidence colors the judgment of both political leaders and common people.44 Blainey believes such a feeling of optimism and mastery was evident on the eve of the Crimean War, the Franco-Prussian War, the Boer War, and others.45 Dexter Perkins finds the American experience fits this general pattern. He contends that belligerent, prowar feelings in the United States coincided with recoveries from economic downswings. The War of 1812 followed hard on the heels of a commercial upturn; the Mexican War occurred after the depression of 1837-1842; the Spanish-American War took place after the return to prosperity following the depression of 1893; World War I followed the economic decline of 1913-1914; and World War II took place during the recovery from the Great Depression of the 1930s.46

Growth Bad – War – Long Waves

Economic growth breeds war- best empirical evidence throughout history

Goldstein 87 (Joshua S, Poli- Sci @ MIT *, Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol 31, No 4, Dec. 1987, http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156 , P. 591- 92) ET

Why should an upturn in economic growth lead, about a decade later, to an upturn in great power war? My answer is based on the cost of wars. The biggest wars occur only when the core countries can afford them, which is after a sustained period of economic growth (Farrar, 1977; Vayrynen, 1983). When treasuries are full, countries will be able to wage big wars; when they are empty, countries will not wage such wars.21 Thus, when the growth of production accelerates, the war-supporting capacity of the system increases, and bigger wars ensue. Throughout history, wars have cost money. In preindustrial times, most European wars were fought by mercenaries hired by monarchs. A favorite phrase in this era was "money is the nerves of war." If the mercenaries were not paid, they would not fight-or, worse, they would turn on their masters. Braudel (1972) describes fifteenth- to seventeenthcentury European wars as moving in surges-the economy recovered from one war and was in turn drained by the next.22

High growth wars are the most frequent and largest scale

Goldstein 87 (Joshua S, Poli- Sci @ MIT*, Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol 31, No 4, Dec. 1987, http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156 , P. 590) ET

The lagged correlations reported here suggest a new theory of the long wave, based on a two-way causal relationship between economic and political variables. Sustained economic growth both promotes (enables) war and is disrupted by war. Figure 10 illustrates the cyclical sequence of production and war in this theory. Faster growth gives rise to increased great power war severity. Higher war severity in turn dampens long-term economic growth. Lower growth leads to less severe war, which in turn allows faster economic growth. This sequence takes roughly 50 years-one long wave-to complete. While war and economic growth are the driving variables, prices react to war, and real wages react to war and prices.

High growth wars are the most severe

Goldstein 87 (Joshua S, Poli- Sci @ MIT *, Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol 31, No 4, Dec. 1987, http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156 , P. 592-93) ET

This effect of economic growth on the severity of war may be augmented by a "lateral pressure" effect (North and Lagerstrom, 1971; Choucri and North, 1975; Strickland, 1982). During production upswings, the great powers grow more rapidly-heightening competition for world resources and markets, and raising the stakes for international competition and conflict. Kondratieff himself (I928/ 1984: 95) attributes the correlation of major wars with long wave upswings to a process much like lateral pressure: The upward movement in business conditions, and the growth of productive forces, cause a sharpening of the struggle for new markets-in particular, raw materials markets.. .. [This] makes for an aggravation of international political relations, an increase in the occasions for military conflicts, and military conflicts themselves. Lasswell (1935/1965: 121) likewise argues that "prosperity expands markets, intensifies contact, sharpens conflict and war."

Growth Bad – War – Long Waves

Economic growth incentivizes war psychologically and financially

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, International Studies Quarterly vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, p. 415, jm )

There are strong theoretical reasons for long economic waves and recurring major wars to be linked with each other. Causality could potentially run in both directions. Long-term economic upswings could increase the likelihood of war through several mechanisms: (1) the expansionary upswing phase could heighten competition for markets, resources and strategic territory, raising the likelihood of international conflict and war (North and Lagerstrom, 1971); (2) long-term prosperity could support higher military expenditures, arms races, and the costs of war (Farrar, 1977); and (3) prosperity could create an aggressive, expansionist psychological mood conducive to war (Lasswell, 1935: 116-121).13 Conversely, major wars can affect the world-economy, especially prices. Heavy expenditures for war goods raise the overall level of demand, while prolonged wars often reduce the overall level of production (especially in front-line countries) due to war damage, labor shortages, blockades, etc. (Bernstein, 1940). Hence prices tend to rise, and inflation becomes globalized (even affecting neutrals) during a major war. Thompson and Zuk (1982) analyze the effect ofwars on British and US wholesale prices (1750-1938 and 1816-1977, respectively). They find a statistically significant increase in prices following the onset of major wars, and report that 'an impressive proportion of the [Kondratiefi] price upswings' can be accounted for by such wars. In addition to prices, wars may also affect other economic variables such as production, capital investment, innovation, and employment.14

Economic growth empirically causes great power war

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, International Studies Quarterly vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, p. 421- 423, jm)

Columns 5 and 6 show the incidence of war years during upswings and downswings- column 5 measuring as a war year any year in which a great power war was in progress; column 6 measuring only years in which very major wars were in progress. The first measure matches the upswing/downswing pattern from 1595 on, except for two periods (1747-1761 and 1917-1939). Overall, 71 percent of the upswing years saw great power wars in progress, as compared with 50 percent of the downswing year The correlation is stronger for the incidence of very major wars (column 6). There were no wars this severe before 1595, but after 1595 the upswing/downswing pattern matches the ups and downs of war incidence with only one exception (1917-1939 slightly higher than 1893-1916). Of the upswing years, 40 percent saw very major great power war in progress, as compared with only 6 percent of the downswing years

Growth causes power differentials that lead to war

Goldstein, 85 [Joshua, International studies quarterly, v29, n4, p411-444, “Kondratieff Waves as War Cycles,” jstor, jm]

3. The 'power transition' school (Organski, 1958; Farrar, 1977 ;Organski and Kugler, 1980; Doran and Parsons, 1980; Gilpin, 1981) holds that differences in the growth and development of national capabilities lead to shifts in the relative power of the world's major nations. One nation holds the most powerful position in the international order, while rising powers (with growing capabilities) try to establish anew place for themselves in that international order. When a rising challenger has been locked out of the established order, or a leading power fears losing its position to a challenger, war may be used to change or preserve the international order. The power transition model is not explicitly cyclical, except in Doran's 'power cycle' variant, and even in that case is not linked to the economic long wave. It could, however, help to explain the tendency of major wars to recur regularly. After a major war, the international order is restructured around winners and lossers. A long period must then elapse before the losers (or new entrants) can equalize their capabilities with those of the dominant power (which emerged from the war with a head start)-even if all countries have long since recovered economically from the war.

Growth Bad – War – Long Waves

Any war goes nuclear

Goldstein, 85 [Joshua, International studies quarterly, v29, n4, p411-444, “Kondratieff Waves as War Cycles,” jstor, jm]

First, the incidence of great power war is declining-more and more 'peace' years separate the great power wars. Second, and related, the great power wars are becoming shorter. Third, however, those wars are becoming more severe-annual fatalities during war increasing more than a hundred- fold over the five centuries. Fourth (and more tentatively), the war cycle may be gradually lengthening in each successive era, from about 40 years in the first era to about 60 years in the third. The presence of nuclear weapons has continued these trends in great power war from the past five centuries-any great power wars in this era will likely be fewer, shorter and much more deadly.

History proves long wave theory is true

Goldstein 5 (Josh, poli sci @ MIT, NATO Conference, Feb 5, http://www.joshuagoldstein.com/jgkond.htm, jm )

Looking forward, moving clockwise around Figure 2, I projected that an upturn in production, marking a change from the “stagnation” quarter-cycle to the “rebirth” phase, would be the next development, perhaps starting in the mid-1990s (I would now say 1992). Specifically, the “stagnation” phase (running from 1980 to 1991) was defined as follows: “production growth is low and uneven; investment is low; war severity declines; inflation is low (or prices even decline); innovations begin rising; real wages fall.” The subsequent “rebirth” phase starting by the mid-1990s was defined thus: “production growth picks up again, investment follows; prices are low; war severity is low; innovation is high; real wages are high. During that rebirth phase, according to my theory, great-power war and military spending would continue a downward trend that I dated from the late 1970s, while inflation remained in check but production growth accelerated. Barron’s magazine in 1988 subtitled an interview, “Joshua Goldstein Looks to the Nifty ‘90s.” These projections of an upcoming phase of prosperity and peace ran counter to the short-term trends and conventional wisdom in the late 1980s. President Ronald Reagan had reversed the post-Vietnam trend by sharply increasing military spending, while “Cold War II” had replaced an earlier period of détente. These trends were “counter-cyclical,” I wrote. The idealized long wave scheme in Figure 2 was not intended to track long-wave phase timing exactly, but in fact it tracks quite well. Taking literally the timing of the sequence shown in Figure 2, we may set the “price peak” at the top to 1980 – the last firm point of reference at the time of writing in the late 1980s. The price peak indicates the end of a phase of higher inflation and, historically, a period of price deflation (as between the World Wars), or in recent times a period merely of lower inflation. At the same time, the real wage trough indicates a rising trend in real wages (which reflect inflation inversely). About twelve years into the cycle, or 1992, would be the production trough, indicating a pickup in the pace of production growth after a long sluggish period. In 1995, the investment trough marks a similar upturn in investment, and around nineteen year after the price peak, or 1999, innovations peak and begin a period of either decline or slower growth in innovation. Finally, out around 21 years into the cycle, or 2001, the war trough indicates a new upturn in military spending (historically an upturn in great-power war severity). The price trough (ending a half-cycle of low inflation) would come at “+/- 25" years, around 2005.

Empirically true

Goldstein 5 (Josh, poli sci @ MIT, NATO Conference, Feb 5, http://www.joshuagoldstein.com/jgkond.htm )

According to my long-wave sequence, sometime around 1977 should have marked the end of a war upswing period and the start of a downswing to last until roughly the turn of the century. The interesting thing about the projection in the late 1980s is that U.S. military spending had recently reversed a long trend of decline and risen somewhat (even as a percent of a rising GDP). The long-wave model projected a renewed downward trend, and that is what actually occurred (Figure 3). In terms of U.S. military spending, however, the 1977 date would seem somewhat late. (The 1940-80 war upswing has always been problematical in my scheme because of the huge war right at the start). In terms of long-wave timing, the new upturn in U.S. military spending since 2001(see Figure 3) is worrisome, as it could signal the starting gun for a new long-term upswing of rising military spending, an upswing that could even culminate in another ruinous great-power war in the coming decades.

Growth Bad – War – Long Waves

Statistical analysis proves growth causes war

Goldstein 87 (Joshua S, Poli- Sci @ MIT, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol 31, No 4, Dec. 1987, http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156 , intro, jm)

This article summarizes the main empirical findings of a research project on long waves of roughly 50 years length in political/economic life. The statistical analysis of 40 historical economic time series, along with data on great power wars, indicates that war plays a central role in the long wave, that "stagflation" can be seen as a phase of the long wave, and that war dampens economic growth. Since 1495, long waves are identified in great power war severity and in internationally synchronized trends of prices and real wages. Weaker long waves are found in world production since 1750, these phases leading the war phases by about a decade. A theoretical model consistent with these lagged correlations among variables is elaborated. Long waves are seen as arising from a two-way causality between war and economic growth.

Numerous historical examples prove growth causes severe war

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, International Studies Quarterly vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, intro, jm)

Kondratieff long economic waves are found in the core of the world- system, at least in synchronized price movements, from 1495 through 1945. These long economic waves are synchronous with a cycle of war between core nations, in which an escalatory war upswing recurs roughly every 50 years. These great power wars apparently play a central role in the economic long wave, especially in connection with inflationary periods on long wave upswings. The long waves of economics and war in the core of the world-system can be traced through ten repetitions since 1495; since around 1945, however, war, prices and production have diverged. Over five centuries, the war cycle has lengthened somewhat, the wars themselves have shortened, and their severity has increased a hundredfold.

Growth causes war

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, International Studies Quarterly vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, p. 419, jm)

Third, wars were correlated with economic phase periods in several ways. Each war was categorized as having occurred primarily in one phase period.26 These war categorizations are listed in Appendix 2. Fatalities from the wars in each phase period were summed, and expressed as an average annual fatality level for each phase period. Average fatalities on downswings and upswings could thus be compared, and it was hypothesized that they would be higher on the upswings. Average annual fatalities were also calculated for each phase period by a second method-cutting the fatality time series strictly at each turning point between phases. This method counts 'overlap' years from a war into an adjacent phase period, and (when compared to the first method) indicates sensitivity to the choice of turning points. Numbers of wars were also counted for each phase period

Growth Bad – War – Resources

Economic growth is unsustainable and inevitably causes resource wars

Trainer 2 (Ted, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, July, [ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D62IfYouWantAffluence.html] AD: 6-22-11, jam)

As is the case with the other major problems confronting the planet, such as environmental destruction, it is essential to understand the problem of global peace and conflict from the "limits to growth" perspective. This analysis focuses on the fact that the present living standards of the rich countries involve levels of production and consumption that are grossly unsustainable. Just to note two of the lines of argument documented in the large literature from the limits perspective, if all 9 billion people likely to live on earth by 2070 were to have the present rich world lifestyle and "footprint" we would need about 12 times the area of productive land that exists on the entire planet. Secondly if we were to cut greenhouse gas emissions sufficiently to prevent the carbon content of the atmosphere from increasing any more world per capita energy consumption would have to be cut to about one-eighteenth of its present amount If all 9 billion people likely by 2070 were to have the present rich world per capita resource consumption, resource production would have to be about 8 times the present rate. These multiples underline the magnitude of the overshoot. Sustainability will require enormous reductions in the volume of rich world production and consumption. Yet its supreme goal is economic growth, i.e., to increase the levels of production and consumption and GDP, constantly, rapidly and without any limit. That the absurdity of this is never recognised in conventional economic and political circles defies understanding. If we in rich countries average 3% economic growth to 2070 and by then all the world’s people had risen to the "living standards’ we would have by then, the total world economic output would be 60 times as great as the present grossly unsustainable level. If this limits to growth analysis is at all valid the implications for the problem of global peace and conflict and security are clear and savage. If we all remain determined to increase our living standards, our level of production and consumption, in a world where resources are already scarce, where only a few have affluent living standards but another 8 billion will be wanting them too, and which we the rich are determined to get richer without any limit, then nothing is more guaranteed than that there will be increasing levels of conflict and violence. To put it another way, if we insist on remaining affluent we will need to remain heavily armed.

Resource wars culminate in extinction

Heinberg 4 (Richard, Senior Fellow of the Post Carbon Institute in Santa Rosa, California, "Powerdown: Options and Actions for a Post-Carbon World," p. 111, jam)

The US is also uniquely positioned to lead the global energy transition. While it is the world's foremost energy user, the US also possesses advanced renewable-energy research facilities. And China, if it were to follow the model of Kerala or Cuba, rather than attempting to shift its economy in the direction of greater energy-resource dependency, could be a beacon to the less-industrialized nations of the world. However, currently neither nation is on the path to lead a global Powerdown. Indeed, present trends suggest that the US and China are on a collision course, as the energy appetites of both nations continue to grow in the context of deepening energy- resource depletion. For the sake of American readers, I will put the matter as bluntly as possible: A peaceful global Powerdown is possible only if the US leads the way. If current American domestic and foreign polices continue, Powerdown efforts on the part of other nations may result in improved survival options for the people of those nations, but for the world as a whole by far the most likely outcome will be devastating resource wars continuing until the resources themselves are exhausted, the human species is extinct, or the fabric of modern societies has been shredded to the point that anarchy - in the worst sense of the word - prevails nearly everywhere.

Growth Bad – War – Resources

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)

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.

Interdependence increases war by increasing the risk of resource conquests

Yee 99 (Tan Tan, Journal of the Singapore Armed Forces, Jan-Mar, http://www.mindef.gov.sg/safti/pointer/back/journals/1999/Vol25\_1/7.htm)JFS

Conversely, the realist view is that *ceteris paribus*, highly interdependent states are more likely to go to war with each other. Ironically, like liberals, realists also accept that economic interdependence is generally mutually beneficial to both parties. However, they argue that the security perspective of a state is rarely if ever defined solely in economic terms. In fact, states concerned with their security will want to avoid becoming too dependent in the first place, as it could mean imported goods being cut off in a crisis.20 This is particularly so for crucial imports like oil or raw materials, without which most modern economies would collapse. Consequently, it is argued that the more militarily powerful states have an increased incentive to go to war in order to assure themselves of continued access to vital goods. Such a course of action pre-supposes that there are no alternative supplies of the particular good from other sources or that the adjustment costs of doing so will be too high; otherwise, war may not be the most viable option. Kenneth Waltz puts across the point succinctly: whilst in theory states have little reason to fear the dependence that goes with specialisation and international trade, the anarchic structure of international politics engenders in states a heightened sense of vulnerability. This fosters the desire in states to constantly seek to increase the span of control and lessen the extent of their dependency.21 In fact, one can trace the roots of the modern realist's understanding of economic interdependence and war to the advent of imperialism in the 18th century. Imperialistic expansion and the acquisition of colonies by major colonial powers can be traced to the states' desire to secure ever-greater control over sources of supply and markets for its goods. In other words, the colonial empires were striving to reduce their fears and dependence on external specialization by increasing internal specialization within a now larger political realm.22
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Resource wars are inevitable in the status quo

Trainer 2 (Ted, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, July, [http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D62IfYouWantAffluence.html] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

Increased conflict in at least the following categories can be expected. Firstly the present conflict over resources between the rich elites and the poor majority in the Third World must increase, for example as "development" under globalisation takes more land, water and forests into export markets. Secondly there are conflicts between the Third World and the rich world, the major recent examples being the war between the US and Iraq over control of oil. Iraq invaded Kuwait and the US intervened, accompanied by much high-sounding rhetoric, (having found nothing unacceptable about Israel's invasions of Lebanon or the Indonesian invasion of East Timor.) As has often been noted, had Kuwait been one of the world's leading exporter of broccoli, rather than oil, it is doubtful whether the US would have been so eager to come to its defence. At the time of writing the US is at war in Central Asia over "terrorism". Few would doubt that a "collateral" outcome will be the establishment of regimes that will give the West access to the oil wealth of Central Asia. Following are some references to the connection many have recognised between rich world affluence and conflict. General M.D. Taylor, U.S. Army retired argued "...U.S. military priorities just be shifted towards insuring a steady flow of resources from the Third World." Taylor referred to "...fierce competition among industrial powers for the same raw materials markets sought by the United States" and "... growing hostility displayed by have-not nations towards their affluent counterparts."62 "Struggles are taking place, or are in the offing, between rich and poor nations over their share of the world product; within the industrial world over their share of industrial resources and markets".63 "That more than half of the people on this planet are poorly nourished while a small percentage live in historically unparalleled luxury is a sure recipe for continued and even escalating international conflict."64 The oil embargo placed on the US by OPEC in the early 1970s prompted the US to make it clear that it was prepared to go to war in order to secure supplies. "President Carter last week issued a clear warning that any attempt to gain control of the Persian Gulf would lead to war." It would "…be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States."65 "The US is ready to take military action if Russia threatens vital American interests in the Persian Gulf, the US Secretary of Defence, Mr. Brown, said yesterday."66 Klare's recent book Resource Wars discusses this theme in detail, stressing the coming significance of water as a source of international conflict. "Global demand for many key materials is growing at an unsustainable rate." "…the incidence of conflict over vital materials is sure to grow." "The wars of the future will largely be fought over the possession and control of vital economic goods." "…resource wars will become, in the years ahead, the most distinctive feature of the global security environment."67 Much of the rich world's participation in the conflicts taking place through out the world is driven by the determination to back a faction that will then look favourably on Western interests. In a report entitled, "The rich prize that is Shaba", Breeze begins, "Increasing rivalry over a share-out between France and Belgium of the mineral riches of Shaba Province lies behind the joint Franco-Belgian paratroop airlift to Zaire." "These mineral riches make the province a valuable prize and help explain the West’s extended diplomatic courtship,..."68 Then there is potential conflict between the rich nations who are after all the ones most dependent on securing large quantities of resources. "The resource and energy intensive modes of production employed in nearly all industries necessitate continuing armed coercion and competition to secure raw materials."69 "Struggles are taking place, or are in the offing, between rich and poor nations over their share of he world product, within the industrial world over their share of industrial resources and markets…"70

Growth Bad – War – North/South

The north-south divide over growth and technology is the source of conflict and environmental destruction.

Reuveny and Thompson 8 (Rafael and William, Indiana University, International Studies Quarterly 52 P. 601 accessed 6/22/11 JF)

Taking a broader view, the basic nature of contemporary international relations would change if the North–South gap evaporated. Much of the present-day turmoil is concentrated in the South. Wars, economic collapses, humanitarian crises, new diseases—the traditional four horsemen of the apocalypse—now take place, for the most part, in the South. While many Northerners might like to turn their backs on the problems of the global Southern ghetto, they cannot ignore the impacts. Population growth puts stress on the global environment and food supply. Many Southerners are drawn to Northern afﬂuence, if they can ﬁnd ways to penetrate Northern barriers to Southern migration. New diseases emerge in places where people have considerable contact with animals or where once inaccessible jungles are penetrated by the outside world; these new diseases then tend to spread around the planet. Northern targets are prime foci for Southern terrorism seeking the withdrawal of Northern troops and support for client states in the South. Southern humanitarian crises, involving famine, refugees, genocide, and natural disasters, no longer seem as remote as they once did. All in all, the North cannot ignore the South. The world would no doubt be a nicer place if the North–South gap disappeared. But it appears unlikely to go away anytime soon. The evidence suggests that whatever the case for global trickle-down, catching-up, and exploitation, there is a structural problem with the imperfections of technological diffusion. The liberal theory naivete´ assuming that technology is freely available to whoever might need it does not seem to hold. New technology developed by the lead economy diffuses mainly to the North. The Northern economies beneﬁt, while the Southern economies beneﬁt much less or stagnate.

Growth Bad – War – China – US Heg

Chinese economic growth endangers US heg

O'Connell 6 (Meghan, Research Associate at the Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity at Yale University, “China Threatens To Rival American Power Status,” United Press International, June 22, http://www.spacewar.com/reports/China\_Threatens\_To\_Rival\_American\_Power\_Status.html, AD: 7-6-9) ET

But the gap between America's dominance and China's power seems to be lessening. The debate is no longer about whether China has the military strength to pose a threat, but what to do about it, said Daniel Blumenthal, commissioner of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission. "China is probably the only country in the world that can compete with the United States militarily and actually pose a challenge to its hegemony," Blumenthal said, pointing to what he called a serious peacetime military buildup by China over the last 10 years. The United States has been shoring up its alliances around the region, he continued, with countries such as Japan, India, Vietnam and Mongolia all concerned about what China's military rise means. Because of the nation's military expansion, intervention should China attack Taiwan can no longer be accomplished at a low cost, said Randall Schriver, former deputy assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs. And though China has been bulking up its military presence along borders near Taiwan, Schriver said that the nation's vision extends far beyond the small island to regional and global contingencies. "The game is on in Asia, and the United States has to be engaged," Schriver said, emphasizing the growing global importance of Asia. According to the National Intelligence Council, Schriver said, by 2020, Asia will hold 56 percent of the world's population, six of the 10 largest militaries, three of the four largest economies, and six of the 10 largest energy consumers. By contrast, Schriver added, the NIC expects the population of the Middle East to compose only 4 percent of the world's total in 2020. "The whole center of gravity of the earth and human existence is moving to Asia," Schriver said, explaining that the United States needs a policy that will develop relations with the rest of Asia while confronting China. You get Asia right by getting China right and you get China right by getting Asia right, Schriver said. Yet in an age of globalization, any moves by China or the United States would have grand influence in areas beyond the military. "Economic setbacks and crises of confidence could slow China's emergence as a full-scale great power," the National Intelligence Council wrote in its 2020 Project report on global trends for the future. "Beijing's failure to maintain its economic growth would itself have a global impact."

U.S. hegemony prevents nuclear war

Khalilizad 95 (Zalmay Khalilizad, director of the Strategy and Doctrine Program @ RAND & former US Ambassador to Afghanistan) "Losing the Moment? The United States and the World After the Cold War," Washington Quarterly, Spring, Proquest, AD: 7-7-09 CS

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values — understood as democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.
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**Chinese growth destroys US heg**

Straka 9, (Toni, INDEPENDENT Certified Financial Analyst), The Prudent Investor, June 30, http://www.nuwireinvestor.com/blogs/investorcentric/2009/06/chinas-economic-strategy-to-become.html

China is taking advantage of the global recession to position themselves to eventually become the world's number 1 superpower. They are lending out massive amounts of money to countries like the US, and stockpiling gold in order to prepare for the possible fall of the dollar. Tony Straka from The Prudent Investor explains China's economic strategy and why we should all be watching very closely. Shocked by the fact that lamestream media and Twitter are all about Michael Jackson's death from what appears to be a drug overdose, I enjoy being the spoiler for a world that seemingly does not know how to set its priorities anymore. While 33 of the 42 commercial media I regularly read headline with Jacko, it is Chinese media that published the truly important news of the day. Here's the executive version of Chinese economic news picked from the English language People's Daily Online. 1. China takes public ownership as the main body and the other (issue) is to adhere to the common growth of economy belonging to diverse forms of ownership. 2. The People's Bank of China (PBoC) will stick to an appropriately easy monetary policy but will ensure reasonable growth in money and credit, the central bank said yesterday. 3. New credit in the first half of 2009 will definitely surpass 6 trillion yuan, and some experts even predict the figure to be up to 6.5 trillion yuan. This means that total credit in the first half of this year will be more than the total amount invested in any year since China was founded. 4. China should buy more gold because the dollar is poised for a fall and the metal is needed to support the greater international role envisaged for the yuan, a senior researcher with the ruling Communist Party said. You can now go back to watch CNN's US propaganda broadcast and remain in the "don't worry, be happy" camp which still has a solid majority in the Western world. Or would you prefer to gather a little more intel on the next #1 power in the world? Then read on. Bullet point #1 appears to point to a struggle of ideologies in the Chinese communist party. Chinese entrepreneurs certainly favor a more liberal business climate but one must not forget that there is still a gap as wide as the Amazon river between the Ferrari driving riches in towns and a rural hinterland where oxcarts and bicycles remain to be seen as signs of prosperity. In order to prevent social upheaval China needs to bridge this gap or it risks falling apart. The anonymous commenter in the People's Daily reminds the world that China still favors a hands-on approach:

Growth Bad – War – China – Aggression

**And Chinese economic growth would spur nationalism and US aggression**

Brzezkninski 5 (Zbigniew, Counselor @ Center 4 Strategic & Internt’l Studies, Jan/Feb 5, *Foreign Policy,*

, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=16538>) ET

China is rising—peacefully so far. For understandable reasons, China harbors resentment and even humiliation about some chapters of its history. Nationalism is an important force, and there are serious grievances regarding external issues, notably Taiwan. But conflict is not inevitable or even likely. China’s leadership is not inclined to challenge the United States militarily, and its focus remains on economic development and winning acceptance as a great power. China is preoccupied, and almost fascinated, with the trajectory of its own ascent. When I met with the top leadership not long ago, what struck me was the frequency with which I was asked for predictions about the next 15 or 20 years. Not long ago, the Chinese Politburo invited two distinguished, Western-trained professors to a special meeting. Their task was to analyze nine major powers since the 15th century to see why they rose and fell. It’s an interesting exercise for the top leadership of a massive and complex country. This focus on the experience of past great powers could lead to the conclusion that the iron laws of political theory and history point to some inevitable collision or conflict. But there are other political realities. In the next five years, China will host several events that will restrain the conduct of its foreign policy. The 2008 Olympic Games is the most important, of course. The scale of the economic and psychological investment in the Beijing games is staggering. My expectation is that they will be magnificently organized. And make no mistake, China intends to win at the Olympics. A second date is 2010, when China will hold the World Expo in Shanghai. Successfully organizing these international gatherings is important to China and suggests that a cautious foreign policy will prevail. More broadly, China is determined to sustain its economic growth. A confrontational foreign policy could disrupt that growth, harm hundreds of millions of Chinese, and threaten the Communist Party’s hold on power. China’s leadership appears rational, calculating, and conscious not only of China’s rise but also of its continued weakness.

US – China war would escalate into nuclear extinction

Straits Times 2k ( Strait Times, 6.25.2k) ET

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities**.** Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option.A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass**,** we would see the destruction of civilisation.
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Economic growth causes China war

Boehmer 10 (Charles R., Ph.D Pennsylvania State U in IR, associate prof @ U of Texas at El Paso, Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 21(3), June, pp.249-268, EBSCO, AD: 6-22-11, jm)

Economic growth is an indicator to leaders that their state may be strong and may win international conflicts, although this may be more perception than fact. Iraq’s GDP growth averaged 16% between 1974 and 1979 before Saddam Hussein’s regime initiated the Iraq–Iran War in 1980, although the war became an eight-year struggle of attrition nonetheless. Turning back to the Chinese example, policy-makers may view Chinese growth through different lenses. Those that are Realists, pessimistic, or generally fearful of Chinese power may see such growth in GDP and military expenditures as a threat, whereas others that are Liberal may see the creation of an economy of scale and increasing economic interaction with the West that has resulted in a booming economy. Predictions of future bellicose Chinese foreign policy must be evaluated against a background of opportunity. As China develops, it may face fewer severe conflicts, which threaten war with its main trading partners, and also with its bordering states with whom there may be competing territorial claims, although as a major power it faces a higher potential for conflict compared with a state such as Slovakia or Costa Rica. In addition, its proximity to numerous other states means there are more potential rivals or enemies compared with what New Zealand, for example, faces in its neighborhood. The point here is to make it clear that war need not be a result of economic growth but that when growth does contribute to interstate violence it does so by serving as a catalyst of willingness against a backdrop of opportunities. Chinese leaders may be less likely to back away from violent interstate conflict if a crisis occurs during a period of economic growth than they would before economic growth, and this risk is higher for China because its major power status and region provide more opportunities relative to most other states.

Growth will make China aggressive – that causes war

Boehmer 10 (Charles R., Ph.D Pennsylvania State U in IR, associate prof @ U of Texas at El Paso, Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 21(3), June, pp.249-268, EBSCO, AD: 6-22-11, jm)

The contribution of this article has been to examine propositions about economic growth in a global study. Most existing studies on this topic focus on only the United States, samples of countries that are more developed on average (due to data availability in the past), or are based on historical information and not economic GDP data. While I have shown that there is no strong evidence linking military expenditures to violent interstate conflicts at the state level of 12 If one divides the sample between major and minor powers, the effect of GDP growth affects positively participation in Fatal MIDs by both major and minor powers, although the effect is stronger for minor powers. The opposite is true, however, for participation in wars, where the effect of GDP growth is stronger for major powers relative to minor powers. analysis, much of the remaining Growth-as-Catalyst perspective is grounded in propositions that are not directly germane to questions about state conflict behavior, such as those linking state behavior to long-cycles, or those that remain at the systemic level. What answer remains linking economic growth to war once we eliminate military expenditures as an explanation? Considering that the concept of foreign policy mood is difficult to identify and measure, and that the bulk of the literature relies solely on the American historical experience, I do not rely on that concept. It is still possible that such moods affect some decision-makers. Instead, similar to Blainey, I find that economic growth, when sustained over a stretch of years, has its strongest effect on states once they find themselves in an international crisis. The results of this study suggest that states such as China, which have a higher level of opportunity to become involved in violent interstate conflicts due to their capabilities, geographic location, history of conflict, and so on, should also have a higher willingness to fight after enjoying multiple years of recent economic growth. One does not have to assume that an aggressive China will emerge from growth. If conflicts do present themselves, then China may be more likely to escalate a war given its recent national performance. Future research is necessary on the relationship between economic growth and violent interstate conflicts. This study shows that sustained economic growth is generally related to state participation in war and other violent disputes. Evidence here also supports the proposition that economic growth increases the resolve of states to reciprocate threats and uses of force. The next steps in this project will examine whether economic growth affects strategic behavior between states, which necessitates an extension on the theory presented here. In addition, the results of this study suggest that regions containing numerous growing states may be at more risk of experiencing conflict and war. This is also a relevant issue for future research
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**Chinese economic growth is used to increase defense budgets and build up military**

Shah 7/7 (Anup, founder of global issues, 7.7.10, *global issues,* http://www.globalissues.org/article/75/world-military-spending*,*) ET

Also, “China and India, the world’s two emerging economic powers, are demonstrating a sustained increase in their military expenditure and contribute to the growth in world military spending. In absolute terms their current spending is only a fraction of the USA’s. Their increases are largely commensurate with their economic growth.”

Chinese economic growth allows it to spend more on weapons- 2008 proves

Shah 7/7 (Anup, founder of global issues, 7.7.10, *global issues,* http://www.globalissues.org/article/75/world-military-spending*,*) ET

The last point refers to rapidly developing nations like China and India that have seen their economies boom in recent years. In addition, high and rising world market prices for minerals and fossil fuels (at least until recently) have also enabled some nations to spend more on their militaries. China, for the first time, ranked number 2 in spending in 2008.

Arms races cause global war

Cross 6/17 (Giles, *Our Future Planet*, 6.17.10, http://www.ourfutureplanet.org/news/400-war-the-global-arms-race-is-one-of-the-more-shocking-aspects-of-humanity- ) ET

There are plenty of campaigning organisations out there looking to put an end to profit from war. Among them is the International Crisis Group (ICS), which works to put an end to worldwide conflict. Back in 2008 the group reported on how and why arms races can potentially boil over; ‘Two states wedged between Europe and Iran are locked in an arms race and preparing for war. The international community, particularly the EU, might be able to slow down Armenia and Azerbaijan’s slide toward another devastating conflict. ‘Attempts to broker peace over the past dozen years have failed, and worse, a massive arms build up has started. Boosted by oil revenues, Azerbaijan increased its military spending by a record 51 per cent in 2004/05, and then raised it a further 82 per cent in 2006. ‘The shopping spree has so far included large numbers of multi launch rocket systems, new artillery, tanks and both F-15 and Mig-29 fighters. In 2007 President Ilham Aliyev promised to make Azerbaijan’s military spending equal to Armenia’s entire state budget. ‘But Armenia is hardly a tortoise in this race. Though its military budget is only about a quarter of its neighbour’s, it last year spent some $280 million on weapons, another record.’

More recently, in March 2009, the same group reported on fears that a space arms race was developing in Korea. ‘Space race dynamics are among the likely Pyongyang motivations for the Taepodong-2 launch.’ explained the report, describing North Korean aspirations. ICS reckoned every advance in technology and development raised the risks of an arms race.

Growth Bad – War – China – Arms Races

**Economic growth in china leads it to build up its military**

Shah 7/7 (Anup, founder of global issues, 7.7.10, *global issues,* http://www.globalissues.org/article/75/world-military-spending*,*) ET

Some nations like China and India have not experienced a downturn, but instead enjoyed economic growth Most developed (and some larger developing) countries have boosted public spending to tackle the recession using large economic stimulus packages. Military spending, though not a large part of it, has been part of that general public expenditure attention (some also call this “Military Keynesianism” Geopolitics and strategic interests to project or maintain power: “rising military spending for the USA, as the only superpower, and for other major or intermediate powers, such as Brazil, China, Russia and India, appears to represent a strategic choice in their long-term quest for global and regional influence; one that they may be loath to go without, even in hard economic times”, SIPRI adds.

And, china spends half their defense budget on weapons- increases in defense budget directly increase weapons

Global Security.org 10 (Mar. 5, *Global Security.org,* http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/china/budget.htm) ET

United States Department of Defense officials in 1986 estimated Chinese defense spending by resources and force categories for the 1967 to 1983 period. Roughly 50 percent of defense expenditures were for weapons, equipment, and new facilities; 35 percent for operating costs; and 15 percent for research, development, and testing and evaluation. By service, these costs broke down to 25 percent for the ground forces; 15 percent for the Navy; 15 percent for strategic air defenses; 5 percent for ballistic missile forces; 5 percent for tactical air forces; and about 35 percent for command, logistics, personnel, intelligence, medical care, administration, research, development, testing and evaluation, and other support. Beginning in the late 1970s, China devoted more resources to its Strategic Missile Force, indicating an effort to increase its strategic security while modernizing the economy, and to national command and support activities, reflecting an emphasis on modernization of the defense structure

Growth Bad – War – China – **US/ China Rels**

Chinese Economic growth causes US/ China conflict over power- escalation ensured

Hileman 7/5 (Garrick, financial consultant and trader for private corporations, 7.5.10, *Seeking Alpha*, http://seekingalpha.com/article/213101-is-a-u-s-china-economic-war-on-its-way ) ET

The Chinese have been driving a very hard bargain with the rest of the world with their managed currency policy. China has benefitted tremendously from joining the open world economy. However, free trade is not an inalienable sovereign right. China's growing economic power comes with the role of being a responsible global actor by playing by the same rules as its trading partners. The U.S. has grown weary of waiting for the Chinese government to come around at a time when it is also economically weakened. In short, the time has come for the renminbi to be revalued upward or U.S. action will occur. What is China's realpolitik calculation? China's leadership, emboldened for example by the failure of the U.S. to navigate the world away from a near financial collapse and Google's recent blink, is growing more confident. It is reasonable to assume that China will increasingly flex its economic muscles and may reject the U.S.'s request for a change in its currency policy. The Chinese government stubbornly detests public pressure from foreign government officials. Yet the Chinese leadership appears to only move when they are forced to do so. And often when they do finally make a change, as with the most recent renminbi move, they barely budge. At the same time, it is highly unlikely the U.S. will quietly surrender its role as the world's dominant superpower. And the pressure is growing to take swift, assertive action on the renminbi as calls to "do something" grow louder in the face of a deteriorating domestic economy.

US – China war would escalate into nuclear extinction

Straits Times 2k ( *Strait Times,* 6.25.2k) ET

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities**.** Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option.A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass**,** we would see the destruction of civilisation.

Growth Bad – War – Environment

The environment is the root cause of war

Homer-Dixon 94 (Thomas F., Ph.D. from MIT in international relations and defense and arms control policy, *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 1, Summer, pp. 5-40, jm)

If such "environmental scarcities" become severe, could they precipitate violent civil or international conflict? I have previously surveyed the issues and evidence surrounding this question and proposed an agenda for further research. 1 Here I report the results of an international research project guided by this agenda.2 Following a brief review of my original hypotheses and the project's research design, I present several general findings of this research that led me to revise the original hypotheses. The article continues with an account of empirical evidence for and against the revised hypotheses, and it concludes with an assessment of the implications of environmentally induced conflict for international security. In brief, our research showed that environmental scarcities are already contributing to violent conflicts in many parts of the developing world. These conflicts are probably the early signs of an upsurge of violence in the coming decades that will be induced or aggravated by scarcity. The violence will usually be sub-national, persistent, and diffuse. Poor societies will be partic- ularly affected since they are less able to buffer themselves from environ- mental scarcities and the social crises they cause. These societies are, in fact, already suffering acute hardship from shortages of water, forests, and es- pecially fertile land. Social conflict is not always a bad thing: mass mobilization and civil strife can produce opportunities for beneficial change in the distribution of land and wealth and in processes of governance. But fast-moving, unpredictable, and complex environmental problems can overwhelm efforts at constructive social reform. Moreover, scarcity can sharply increase demands on key in- stitutions, such as the state, while it simultaneously reduces their capacity to meet those demands. These pressures increase the chance that the state will either fragment or become more authoritarian. The negative effects of severe environmental scarcity are therefore likely to outweigh the positive.

**Growth Bad – Environment – Extinction**

**Growth causes ecological destruction because it is the inevitable regression of the environment.**

Bookchin 89 (Murray, dir. emeritus Institute for Social Ecology @ Plainfield, *The Progressive*, August 1989, pp. 19-23. accessed 6/22/11 JF)

What environmentalists must emphasize is that the global ecological crisis is systemic not simply the product of random mishaps. If the Exxon Valdez disaster is treated merely as an "accident" as were Chernobyl and Three Mile Island-we will have deflected public attention from a social crisis of historic proportions: We do not simp1y live in a world of problems but in a highly problematical world, an inherently anti-ecological society. This anti-ecological world will not be healed by acts of statesmanship or passage of piecemeal legislation. It is a world that is direly in need of far-reaching structural change.Perhaps the most obvious of our systemic problems is uncontrollable growth. I use the word "uncontrollable" advisedly, in preference to "uncontrolled." The growth of which I speak is not humanity's colonization of the planet over millennia of history. It is rather an inexorable material reality that is unique to our era: namely, that unlimited economic growth is assumed to be evidence of human progress. We have taken this notion so much for granted over the past few generations that it is as immutably fixed in our consciousness as the sanctity of property itself. Growth is, in fact, almost synonymous with the market economy that prevails today. That fact finds its clearest expression in the marketplace maxim, "Grow or die." We live in a competitive world in which rivalry is a law of economic life; profit, a social as well as personal desideratum; limit or restraint, an archaism; and the commodity, a substitute for the traditional medium for establishing economic relationships-namely, the gift. It's not enough, however, to blame our environmental problems on the obsession with growth. A system of deeply entrenched structures-of which growth is merely a surface manifestation-makes up our society. These structures are beyond moral control, much as the flow of adrenaline is beyond the control of a frightened creature This system has, in effect, the commanding quality of natural law.In a national or international market society (be it of the corporate kind found in the West or the bureaucratic kind found in the East), competition itself generates a need for growth. Growth is each enterprise's defense against the threat of absorption by a rival. Moral issues have no bearing on this compelling adversarial relationship. To the extent that a market economy becomes so pervasive that it turns society itself into a marketplace-a vast shopping mall-it dictates the moral parameters of-human life and makes growth synonymous with personal as well as social progress. One's personality, love life, income, or body of beliefs, no less than an enterprise, must grow or die. We now sense that unlimited growth is literally recycling the complex organic products of natural evolution into the simple mineral constituents of the Earth at the dawn of life billions of years ago. Soil that was in the making for millennia is being tunned into sand; richly forested regions filled with complex life-forms are being reduced to barren moonscapes; rivers, lakes, and even vast oceanic regions are becoming noxious and lethal sewers, radio nuclides, together with an endless and ever-increasing array of toxicants, are invading the air we breathe, the water we drink, and almost every food item on the dinner table. Not even sealed, air-conditioned, and sanitized offices are immune to this poisonous deluge.**Growth is only the most immediate cause of this pushing back of the evolutionary clock to a more primordial** and mineralized **world. And calling for "limits to growth" is merely the first step toward bringing the magnitude of our environmental problems under public purview. Unless growth is traced to its basic source-competition in a grow-or-die market society-the demand for controlling growth is meaningless as well as unattainable. We can no more arrest growth while leaving the market intact than we can arrest egoism while leaving rivalry intact.**

Growth Bad – Environment - General

The global ecosystem is worsening

Sarkar 11 (Christian, freelance writer, Jun 16, [www.harvesth2o.com/ecowarning.shtml] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

A landmark study released today reveals that approximately 60 percent of the ecosystem services that support life on Earth – such as fresh water, capture fisheries, air and water regulation, and the regulation of regional climate, natural hazards and pests – are being degraded or used unsustainably. Scientists warn that the harmful consequences of this degradation could grow significantly worse in the next 50 years. “Any progress achieved in addressing the goals of poverty and hunger eradication, improved health, and environmental protection is unlikely to be sustained if most of the ecosystem services on which humanity relies continue to be degraded,” said the study, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) Synthesis Report, conducted by 1,300 experts from 95 countries. It specifically states that the ongoing degradation of ecosystem services is a road block to the Millennium Development Goals agreed to by the world leaders at the United Nations in 2000. Although evidence remains incomplete, there is enough for the experts to warn that the ongoing degradation of 15 of the 24 ecosystem services examined is increasing the likelihood of potentially abrupt changes that will seriously affect human well-being.

Economic downturn provides motivation to invest in environmental prospects

AFP 8 (http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5jG0UqOyZ\_VSEN1i8jCsCzwhQr6uA, da: 6-21-2011, dw: 9-18-2008, lido)

The global economic downturn and the crisis in the US financial markets offers the chance for investment in green energy, former US vice-president Al Gore said Thursday. Central banks have thrown billions of dollars at the global credit storm, which has seen stock markets plunge and scalped big banks exposed to the ongoing effects of last year's collapse of the US sub-prime mortgage market. Speaking via satellite-link at the launch of Live Earth India concert, where proceeds will go to solar energy projects, the environmental campaigner said the world was at a turning point. Asked by AFP whether the financial crisis would mean less money for projects to cut greenhouse gases blamed for global warming, Gore said the time was now right to stimulate the right kinds of investment to kickstart economies. "In the United States, the largest amount of debt has been pulled up because of the purchase of foreign oil," he told a news conference. "We need to substitute renewable sources of energy -- solar energy, wind energy and others -- in place of the very expensive and dirty oil and coal that's contributing to the debt crisis and the general financial crisis. "It (the global financial slump) is in some ways a great opportunity for us to have these technologies before us... to revive economies."

Growth drives environmental unsustainability

Trainer 10 (Ted, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/TheEnvProb.html, dw: 9-24-2010, da: 6-21-2011, lido)

The crucial point with which a satisfactory understanding of the environmental situation and its solution must begin is that the destruction of the environment is being caused by volumes of producing and consuming are far beyond sustainable levels. Natural resources are being taken from the planet’s ecosystems, and wastes are being dumped back into them, at rates that Footprint analysis shows would take 1.4 planet earths to provide sustainably. (World Wildlife Fund, 2009.) Most of these resource flows are going only to the few who live in rich countries. If all 9 billion people expected to be living on the planet by 2050 were to have present Australian lifestyles then consumption of basic resource items would be 6 – 10 times as great as at present. For instance Australia’s per capita use of productive land, 8 ha, is 10 times as great as will be possible for all people in 2050. (This is assuming that the 8 billion ha of productive land will remain available, which is disputable in view of current soil loss rates etc.) What is important in this figure is the magnitude of the overshoot, the level of unsustainability. It indicates that it will not be possible for all the world’s expected people to rise to more than a small fraction of the productive land use, resource consumption rates or “living standards” we have in rich countries at present. Most people concerned about the fate of the planet are familiar with these kinds of facts and figures, but generally do not seem to recognise their significance. Either the evidence requires heroically optimistic assumptions regarding the potential of technical advance to reduce impacts (see below), or it requires accepting the need for dramatic reductions in present rich world per capita rates of production and consumption.

Growth Bad – Environment - General

Study proves – greater trade means a greater eco footprint

Ozler and Obach, profs, 9 (S. Ilgu and Brian, Global Environmental Politics, ebsco, dw: 2-1-2009, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

Other factors associated with a state’s level of capitalism, including trade, monetary policy, ªnancial policy, and property rights all have positive, but slightly lower coefªcients. The coefªcients suggest that a one point increase in the trade measure is associated with a 0.7 percent increase in ecological footprint. This means that a move from the minimum level of trade freedom (0) to the mean level (64.69) is anticipated to yield a 45 percent increase in the per capita ecological footprint. Private property protection has a similar inºuence, as do other variables, though to a lesser extent. The monetary, investment, and ªnancial variables all yielded a larger per capita ecological footprint as policies more closely reºected the capitalist ideal. An increase from the minimum to mean score yields an anticipated 28 percent increase in per capita footprint for the monetary and investment variables, and a 25 percent increase for the ªnancial variable controlling, for other factors. In regard to the corruption measure, we expected to ªnd a negative relationship, that is, the freer a country is of corruption, the smaller the state’s per capita ecological footprint.

Every aspect of capitalist growth kills the environment

Ozler and Obach, profs, 9 (S. Ilgu and Brian, Global Environmental Politics, ebsco, dw: 2-1-2009, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

Despite this exception, our central findings indicate that capitalism and its associated state policies correlate with poor environmental performance. This is relevant to a number of theories that link economic institutions to environmental outcomes. This study provides further evidence for those perspectives that see negative ecological implications for unrestrained market practices and presents a direct challenge to those who make broad claims about the ability of the free market to address environmental threats. Ecological modernization theorists and others who place faith in capitalism to move us toward ecological sustainability should reconsider their opposition to command-based regulatory mechanisms and their embrace of market-oriented reforms. Although capitalism generally appears detrimental to environmental protection, the policy subcomponents that make up the broader economic order require additional consideration. The findings in regard to trade provide a supplement to analyses put forth by world systems, dependency, and unequal ecological exchange theorists. These theories focus on the maldistribution of wealth and other social and economic outcomes that result from trade in a world characterized by inequalities of economic development and power. These injustices extend into the environmental realm when considering who bears the burdens of resource depletion and exposure to environmental hazards. This study demonstrates that the negative ecological outcomes found by these theories appear to be aggravated by free trade policies. While others have examined the costs and benefits experienced by countries integrated into the global trade system, this study indicates that state policies regarding trade have an independent effect on the environmental outcomes of that integration. These findings suggest that states can restrict trade in ways that limit environmental damage. This study also lends significant support to treadmill of production theory and its sharp critique of capitalism.

Growth Bad – Environment – AT: Tech Solves

Tech doesn’t solve – there are limits

MacKenzie 8 (Debora, award-winning reporter for New Scientist, Apr 2, [www.planetthoughts.org/?pg=pt/Whole&qid=2737] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

Tipping points Lester Brown thinks we are fast running out of time. "The world can no longer afford to waste a day. We need a Great Mobilisation, as we had in wartime," he says. "There has been tremendous progress in just the past few years. For the first time, I am starting to see how an alternative economy might emerge. But it's now a race between tipping points - which will come first, a switch to sustainable technology, or collapse?" Tainter is not convinced that even new technology will save civilisation in the long run. "I sometimes think of this as a 'faith-based' approach to the future," he says. Even a society reinvigorated by cheap new energy sources will eventually face the problem of diminishing returns once more. Innovation itself might be subject to diminishing returns, or perhaps absolute limits. Studies of the way cities grow by Luis Bettencourt of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico, support this idea. His team's work suggests that an ever-faster rate of innovation is required to keep cities growing and prevent stagnation or collapse, and in the long run this cannot be sustainable.

Infinite growth impossible – the economy is a subsystem of the earth’s ecosystem which is limited

Daly 96 (Herman E., former World Bank economist, former prof of econ at Louisiana State U, [alginermacgregor.com/daly.htm] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

Impossibility statements are the very foundation of science. In science, many things are impossible. By respecting impossibility theorems we avoid wasting resources on projects that are bound to fail. Economists should therefore be very interested in impossibility theorems, especially if they demonstrate that it is impossible for the world economy to grow its way out of poverty and environmental degradation. In other words, sustainable growth is impossible. The economy is an open subsystem of earth's ecosystem, which is finite, non-growing. The economy incorporates an ever greater proportion of the total ecosystem into itself and thus must reach a limit. Therefore its growth is not sustainable. The term sustainable growth when applied to the economy is an oxymoron. Economists will complain that growth in GNP is a mixture of quantitative and qualitative increase and therefore not strictly subject to physical laws. Yes, quantitative and qualitative changes are very different and so best kept separate and with different names. To grow means "to increase naturally in size by the addition of material through assimilation or accretion." To develop means "to expand or realize the potentials of; to bring gradually to a fuller, greater, or better state." When something grows it gets bigger. When something develops it gets different. The earth's ecosystem develops (evolves) but does not grow. Its subsystem, the economy, must eventually stop growing but can continue to develop. The term sustainable development therefore makes sense for the economy but only if understood as development without growth--qualitative improvement of a physical economic base that is maintained in a steady state by a throughput of matter-energy that is within the regenerative and assimilative capacities of the ecosystem. Currently, the term sustainable development is used as a synonym for sustainable growth. It must be saved from this perdition. In the past two centuries we have developed a culture dependent on exponential growth for its economic stability. Sustainable development is a cultural adaptation made by society as it becomes aware of the emerging necessity of non-growth. Even "green growth" is not sustainable. There is a limit to the population of trees the earth can support, just as there is a limit to the populations of humans and of automobiles. If the economy cannot grow forever, can it grow by enough to give everyone in the world a standard of per capita resource use equal to that of the average American? That would turn out to be a factor of seven, a figure that is neatly bracketed by the United Nations' Commission on Environment and Development [UNCED] in its call for the expansion of the world economy by a factor of five to ten. The problem is that even expansion by a factor of four is impossible if Vitousek and others (1986) are correct in their calculation then the human economy currently preempts one-fourth of the global net primary product (NPP) of photosynthesis. We cannot go beyond 100 percent, and it is unlikely that we will increase NPP since historical tendency up to now is for economic growth to reduce global photosynthesis. Since land-based ecosystems are the more relevant, and we preempt 40% of land based NPP, even the factor of four is an overestimate. Also, reaching 100 percent is unrealistic, since we are incapable of bringing under direct human management all the species that make up the ecosystems upon which we depend. Furthermore, it is ridiculous to urge the preservation of biodiversity without being willing to halt the economic growth that requires human takeover of all places in the sun now occupied by other species. If growth up to the factor of five to ten recommended by the UNCED Commission is impossible, then what about just sustaining the present scale--that is, what about zero net growth? Every day we read about stress-induced feedbacks from the ecosystem to the economy, such as greenhouse buildup, ozone layer depletion, acid rain, and so on, which constitute evidence that even the present scale is unsustainable. How then can people keep on talking about "sustainable growth" when (1) the present scale of the economy shows clear signs of being unsustainable, (2) multiplying that scale by a factor of five to ten, as recommended by the UNCED Commission, would move us from unsustainability to imminent collapse, and (3) the concept itself is logically self-contradictory in a finite, non-growing ecosystem? Yet sustainable growth is the buzzword of our time. Occasionally it becomes truly ludicrous, as when writers gravely speak of "sustainable growth in the rate of increase of economic activity." Not only must we grow forever, we must accelerate forever! This is hollow political verbiage, totally disconnected from reality.

Growth Bad – Environment – AT: Tech Solves

Our alternative does not preclude modern technology—advancements will still exist in the world of sustainability

Trainer 7(Ted, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the school of Social Work, University of New South Wales, “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain a Consumer Society”, pg 142-3, jam)

The Simpler Way is not opposed to modem technology. In fact there will be more resources available for research and development of the things that matter, such as better medical services and windmill design, than there are now, when the vast sums presently wasted on unnecessary products, and arms, cease being spent. However it is a mistake to think better technology is important in solving global problems, let alone the key. Most of the things we need in The Simpler Way can be produced by traditional technologies. Hand tools can produce excellent food, clothes, furniture, houses, etc., and craft production is in general the most satisfying way. Of course we will use machinery where that makes sense and many basic items could be mass produced in automated factories. There would also be intensive research into improving crops and techniques, especially for deriving chemicals, drugs and materials from local plant sources. There will also be more resources than at present to invest in realms that have "spiritual" significance rather than economic value, such as astronomy, history, philosophy, the arts and humanities.

Growth Bad – Environment – Warming Module

Growth causes warming

Barry 8 (Glen, phd, personal blog, http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2008/01/economic-collapse-and-global-ecology.html, dw: 1-12-2008, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

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.

**Warming will cause extinction in 30-50 years**

Henderson 6 (Bill, counter currents, http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson190806.htm, dw: 8-19-2006, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

Runaway global warming: there are 'carbon bombs': carbon in soils, carbon in warming temperate and boreal forests and in a drought struck Amazon, methane in Arctic peat bogs and in methane hydrates melting in warming ocean waters. For several decades it has been hypothesized that rising temperatures from increased greenhouse gases in the atmosphere due to burning fossil fuels could be releasing some of and eventually all of these stored carbon stocks to add substantually more potent greenhouse gases to the atmosphere.. Given time lags of 30-50 years, we might have already put enough extra greenhouse gases into the atmosphere to long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with have crossed a threshold to these bombs exploding, their released greenhouse gases leading to ever accelerating global warming with future global temperatures maybe tens of degrees higher than our norms of human habitation and therefor extinction or very near extinction of humanity.

Growth Bad – Environment – Warming – UQ

Climate change now

Jamail 6-23 (Dahr, Al-Jazeera, staff, http://english.aljazeera.net/indepth/features/2011/06/2011622132049568952.html, dw: 6-23-2011, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

Brian Schwartz is a professor in the Department of Environmental Health Sciences at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. "Increasing temperatures cause direct health effects related to heat; there will be more common events like the 30,000 to 50,000 persons who died in Europe in 2003 due to the heat wave there," Professor Schwartz told Al Jazeera, "Increasing temperatures also cause more air pollution, due to photochemical reactions that increase with higher temperatures. This will cause more morbidity and mortality from pulmonary and cardiovascular diseases." Schwartz, who is also the co-director of the Programme on Global Sustainability and Health, said that lack of clean water, a phenomenon that is also a product of climate change, will lead to increases in morbidity and mortality from a variety of water-borne diseases. In addition, vector-borne diseases, diseases in which the pathogenic microorganism is transmitted from an infected individual to another individual by an arthropod or other agent, will change in their distribution as the climate changes. "Populations will be on the move as food and water production is threatened; these so-called environmental refugees, that the world has already seen, suffer a variety of increased health risks," added Schwartz, "How climate change affects economies and sociopolitical systems will contribute to other physical and mental health stresses for populations."

Growth Bad – Environment – Warming

Economic growth causes species loss, deforestation, and soil erosion – all that accelerates warming and imperils food production

Djordjevic 98 (Johnny, BA Global Econ, Paper in Global Sustainability @ UC, Irvine, March, [www.dbc.uci.edu/sustain/global/sensem/djordj98.html] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

The environment is in danger from our pursuit of affluence. Serious worries come from predictions about the atmosphere. The burning of fossil fuels will raise temperatures and result in climatic effects. Rising temperatures could have horrific effects. First of all, food production could seriously be imperiled even by increases of only one degree celcius. If the temperature should increase by five degrees scientists predict the coastal island nations would be submerged and possibly trigger the next ice age. Another environmental concern deals with the soil. Our agricultural practices disregard the value of recycling food waste. Also, the use of pesticides and chemicals in agriculture lead to the poisoning of the soil and topsoil loss through erosion. Yields per acre for grain are falling and "we do not produce food in ways that can be continued for centuries"(Trainer, 1985). Even more disturbing is the deforestation of rainforests. This results in the extinction of many species, concentration of carbon dioxide, the loss of many potential medical breakthroughs, and possibly the disruption of rainfall. Opponents of the deforestation fail to realize that our expensive way of life and greedy economic system are the driving forces. "Nothing can be achieved by fighting to save this forest or that species if in the long term we do not change the economic system which demands ever-increasing production and consumption of non-necessities"(Trainer, 1985).

There is an invisible threshold – each species lost risks destruction of all life.

Wapner 94 (Paul, Department of Int'l Politics and Foreign Policy at American U, *Politics and Life Sciences*, August, p. 177, jam)

Massive extinction of species is dangerous then because one cannot predict which species are expendable to the system as a whole. As Philip Hoose remarks, "Plants and animals cannot tell us what they mean to each other." One can never be sure which species holds up fundamental biological relationships in the planetary ecosystem. And, because removing species is an irreversible act, it may be too late to save the system after the extinction of key plants or animals. According to the US National Research council, "the ramifications of an ecological change of this magnitude [vast extinction of species] are so far reaching that no one on earth will escape them." Trifling with the "lives" of species is like playing Russian roulette with our collective future as the stakes.

Growth Bad – Environment – Warming

Economic decline solves warming – means consumption of less resources

Klare, Professor at Hampshire College, 8 (Michael, Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-t-klare/the-economic-crisis-and-t\_b\_135631.html, da: 6-21-2011, dw: 10-17-2008, lido)

The good news is that economic hard times will cause people to drive less, fly less, and otherwise consume less energy, thus lowering expectations for greenhouse-gas emissions. According to the most recent projections from the International Energy Agency (IEA) in Paris, global oil demand in 2008 will be 240,000 barrels per day less than in its earlier predictions, and 440,000 barrels per day less than in its predictions for 2009. Many experts believe, moreover, that demand will drop even further in the weeks and months ahead as the economic crisis deepens and consumers around the world cut back on their travel and energy use — and the less oil consumed, the less CO2 emitted. As petroleum consumption declines, the price of oil is also likely to drop — thereby discouraging investment in many costly and environmental hazardous energy projects. Already, the price of oil has plunged by nearly half over the past three months, from $140 to $70 a barrel, and some experts see prices going even lower. Fifty dollars a barrel "is now within the realm of possibilities," according to oil analyst Stephen Schork. At these prices, it may no longer be profitable to advance some of the more technologically challenging energy projects with a significant environmental risk, such as the development of Canadian tar sands or Rocky Mountain shale oil. These projects might make economic sense when oil is $80 per barrel or more — despite strong objections from environmentalists — but won't attract support from investors when the price of oil slips much below this level.

Economic down turn solves warming

Kambas, Reuters, 8 (Michele, writer, dw: 10-7-2008, da: 6-21-2011, http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/10/07/us-summit-financial-idUSTRE4966A220081007, lido)

Atmospheric scientist Paul J Crutzen, who has in the past floated the possibility of blitzing the stratosphere with sulfur particles to cool the earth, said clouds gathering over the world economy could ease the earth's environmental burden. Slower economic growth worldwide could help slow growth of carbon dioxide emissions and trigger more careful use of energy resources, though the global economic turmoil may also divert focus from efforts to counter climate change, said Crutzen, winner of the 1995 Nobel Prize in Chemistry for his work on the depletion of the ozone layer. "It's a cruel thing to say ... but if we are looking at a slowdown in the economy, there will be less fossil fuels burning, so for the climate it could be an advantage," Crutzen told Reuters in an interview. "We could have a much slower increase of CO2 emissions in the atmosphere ... people will start saving (on energy use) ... but things may get worse if there is less money available for research and that would be serious." CO2 emissions, released by the burning of fossil fuels in power stations, factories, homes and vehicles, are growing at almost 3.0 percent a year. The U.N. Panel on Climate Change estimates that world temperatures may rise by between 1.8 and 4.0 degrees Celsius (3.2-7.2 degrees Fahrenheit) this century. The Group of Eight industrial nations agreed in July to a goal of halving world emissions by 2050. Crutzen was in Cyprus for a lecture organized by the Cyprus Institute, a research foundation. He caused a stir with the publication of a paper in 2006 suggesting that injecting the common pollutant sulfur into the stratosphere some 10 miles above the earth could snuff out the greenhouse effect.
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Economic growth drives climate change

Trainer 10 (Ted, UNSW, dw: 9-16-2010, da: 6-21-2011, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html, lido)

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.) If this limits to growth analysis is valid we must work for radical system change, from consumer-capitalist society, that is, for an eventual transition to ways of life and to an economy that will enable all to have a high quality of life on far lower levels of resource consumption, perhaps to 1/10 of present levels.. Such ways are available, and attractive, and easily developed -- if enough of us want to adopt them. (See The Sustainable Alternative Society.)
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Growth causes warming – all other theories are outdated

Shekhar 9 (Manisha, Prof @ Saxena college, Ecommerce Journal, http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/articles/12807\_environment\_does\_not\_allow\_further\_economic\_growth\_in\_the\_world, dw: 1-30-2009, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

Unfortunately, all dominant economic theories fail to take into account the environmental concerns and long-term sustainability of society. The established economic theories—which guide decision-makers from all over the world and from most kinds of ideological backgrounds—regard the economic system in isolation from ecosystems. As ecological services are not owned, their degradation and abuse are not accounted for and consequently neither show up in GDP nor function as disincentives to continued exploitation. In fact, environmental destruction usually improves the look of the national accounts, since all economic activity (destructive, as well as constructive) add to the gross domestic product while none of the reduced carrying capacity of the ecosystem is taken into account. Thus, the economic activity following both the Bhopal gas accident and the Chernobyl nuclear disaster improved the national accounting in India and the USSR respectively, although considerable real natural wealth and human lives were destroyed. The dominant economic theory has explicitly encouraged excessive extraction, consumption and waste—all in the exalted cause of expanding the. The failure of mainstream economics to consider environmental constraints is clearly one of the most serious causes of the present environment and health crisis. Excessive focus on economic growth Built into the established economic theories is a supposition that unending economic growth is both possible and desirable. In fact, growth and increasing consumption are two of the main objectives of capitalism. Yet, from an environmental perspective, this excessive focus on economic growth is both undesirable and unrealistic, especially in the rich, industrialized countries. It is impossible for the world economy to grow its way out of poverty and environmental degradation. Instead, wealth must be redistributed and the world’s economic systems be kept at a sustainable level. Exponential growth is impossible in the long run. Rather than hoping for everlasting economic growth—which will unavoidably lead to increasing burdens on the earth’s already strained ecosys- David Werner tems—there is a need to find the optimal scale of the economy and then develop sustainable economies. Such economies would not be static or stagnant: ‘An economy in sustainable development adapts and improves in knowledge, organization, technical efficiency, and wisdom; and it do this without assimilating or accreting, beyond some point, an ever greater percentage of the matter energy of the ecosystem itself….’ Yet, in the short and medium term, environmentalists agree on the need for economic growth in the South. Few people would dispute the need for economic growth and industrial development in the economically poorer countries. However, unless these processes are based on environmental regeneration rather than Continued environmental degradation, they will not be sustainable and will undermine the South’s populations’ conditions of survival. The eradication of both poverty and excessive affluence needs to be put firmly on the long-term agenda of humanity. From a policy point of view, such economic thinking is totally absent from current decision-making. Reliance on growth means many unpleasant decisions can be avoided. Dividing a growing pie is easier than redistributing what there already is. And the notion of growth is deeply ingrained in concepts such as progress and development. Yet, to come to grips with the environment and health crisis one needs the courage to question established truths, which may in the end turn out to be ‘lies’. The excessive focus on economic growth is likely to be just that.
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Growth via a capitalist system kills clean drinking water, Tanzania proves

Arusha Times 6 (dw: 8-19-2006, lexis, da: 6-21-2011, lido)

The fact is that much of the developing world is unlikely to see the wealth that western nations already have. For capitalism to work there must be continuous growth and for the wealthy to exist, there must be the poor. The wealth of the developed world was built on the poverty of the developing world, through slavery and exploitation of its resources and it still is in less explicit ways. It is true that some have found wealth in developing nations but this wealth is simply built upon the poor in the same way. The continuous growth of capitalism is unrealistic anyway as the earth has finite resources. Polluted air, lack of clean drinking water and human-induced climate change simply shows how capitalism is already stretching the earth's ability to support it. Julius Nyerere once said of Tanzania "we are trying to overcome our economic weakness by using the weapons of the economically strong". He realised that that it was not wealth that people should strive for but sufficiency. He said that people and their labour, not money, would bring about development in Tanzania. Wealthy countries still live in poverty in their own way. For example, Britons are less happy now than they were 50 years ago in spite of their increasing wealth. Drug and alcohol problems are on the increase. In fact, according to some surveys, people in many developing nations are happier than in developed countries. Many people live in a poverty of mind where they are never satisfied by their lives. They live by capitalism, to always strive for more, so they will never have what they want and there is always someone else with more than them for them to compare themselves to. This is known as the poverty of comparison. It is perhaps our definition of wealth that is a problem. It has been created by capitalism and that definition is money, lots of it and more and more. Also our definition of what we see as poverty may be a problem. Subsistence lifestyles produce all that a person needs to survive but to the wealthy may be seen as steeped in poverty. Globalisation is failing because it simply serves to increase the disparity between the rich and the poor. Globalisation's attempts to "regress the balance" for Tanzania meant that the country's markets were left open to foreign investment, which can flee the country at a moment's notice if the economic or political situation worsens. Further to this, foreign goods have to be imported at high costs and cheaper home grown produce must be exported to raise enough dollars to service debt from loans. So as expensive goods enter the country, affordable ones leave, resulting in an intensification of poverty. For example, this can be seen on the shores of Lake Victoria where many poor people struggle to find food, while the abundant waters of the lake are fished only for the produce to be processed, frozen and shipped to Europe. Supporters of globalisation and capitalism may testify that this is not the case and that all over the world many people earn more money than they did before. This may be true but it does not account for the millions of people who didn't need to earn money to survive before capitalism and globalisation entered their lives. It doesn't account for the people that were forced in to the global economy, when they were told that the commons was no longer theirs to live off and that they had to pay for that right. Capitalism has destroyed forests, clean waters and a self-sufficient way of living.
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Drinking water key to life on earth

Jackson and Carpenter 1 (Robert, Stephen, Clifford Dahm, Diane McKnight, Robert Naiman, Sandra Postel, Steven Running, Issues in Ecology, http://www.biology.duke.edu/jackson/issues9.pdf, dw: Spring 2001, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

Life on earth depends on the continuous flow of materials through the air, water, soil, and food webs of the biosphere. The movement of water through the hydrological cycle comprises the largest of these flows, delivering an estimated 110,000 cubic kilometers (km3) of water to the land each year as snow and rainfall. Solar energy drives the hydrological cycle, vaporizing water from the surface of oceans, lakes, and rivers as well as from soils and plants (evapotranspiration). Water vapor rises into the atmosphere where it cools, condenses, and eventually rains down anew. This renewable freshwater supply sustains life on the land, in estuaries, and in the freshwater ecosystems of the earth. Renewable fresh water provides many services essential to human health and well being, including water for drinking, industrial production, and irrigation, and the production of fish, waterfowl, and shellfish. Fresh water also provides many benefits while it remains in its channels (nonextractive or instream benefits), including flood control, transportation, recreation, waste processing, hydroelectric power, and habitat for aquatic plants and animals. Some benefits, such as irrigation and hydroelectric power, can be achieved only by damming, diverting, or creating other major changes to natural water flows. Such changes often diminish or preclude other instream benefits of fresh water, such as providing habitat for aquatic life or maintaining suitable water quality for human use. The ecological, social, and economic benefits that freshwater systems provide, and the trade-offs between consumptive and instream values, will change dramatically in the coming century. Already, over the past one hundred years, both the amount of water humans withdraw worldwide and the land area under irrigation have risen exponentially (Figure 1). Despite this greatly increased consumption, the basic water needs of many people in the world are not being met. Currently, 1.1 billion people lack access to safe drinking water, and 2.8 billion lack basic sanitation services. These deprivations cause approximately 250 million cases of water-related diseases and five to ten million deaths each year. Also, current unmet needs limit our ability to adapt to future changes in water supplies and distribution. Many current systems designed to provide water in relatively stable climatic conditions may be ill prepared to adapt to future changes in climate, consumption, and population. While a global perspective on water withdrawals is important for ensuring sustainable water use, it is insufficient for regional and local stability. How fresh water is managed in particular basins and in individual watersheds is the key to sustainable water management.
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Billion people without clean water now

Phillips 6-23 (Bianca, memphis flyer, http://www.memphisflyer.com/memphis/acts-of-kindness/Content?oid=2977625, dw: 6-23-2011, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

"We take our clean water for granted in Memphis," Spicer said. "We have great, plentiful water, but there's over a billion people around the world who don't have access to clean or safe drinking water."
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Growth kills clean water – privatization, people hatin

Environment Magazine 10 (EarthTalk: Private water? Genetically-modified food?, dw: 9-11-2010, da: 6-21-2011, lexis, lido)

In 2000 riots erupted in Cochabamba as hundreds of residents filled the streets, angry that a private, foreign entity was preventing them from accessing water. œThe violence shook the confidence of the local government and international investors, says World Savvy. œBechtel was forced out, resulting in not only chaos in water delivery in the area, but also in a serious blow to foreign investment in the country. Similar conflicts have played out in other parts of Bolivia as well as in Ghana, Uruguay and the United Kingdom. In the U.S., the federal government ensured the protection of waterways and drinking water in the 1970s through passage of the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act, which among other benefits increased funding for community water systems to help cities and towns maintain high standards and inexpensive access to fresh water. œHowever, since the 1980s, the federal government has been cutting back funding to communities for water infrastructure, with assistance falling to historic lows under the Bush administration, reports the non-profit Food & Water Watch. Without federal funding, communities that cant afford to keep fresh water supplies clean and safe are increasingly turning to private companies. But at what cost? Food & Water Watch cites dozens of examples from across the country where water privatization has gone woefully bad: œ[H]igh rates and bad service plague communities who transfer control of their water service to the hands of corporations. Common complaints include skyrocketing rates, sewage flooded basements, broken pipes, bad water quality, and cost overruns. œThe water barons prioritize stockholder returns over public wellbeing and leave municipalities to clean up the mess.

Growth hurts clean water – florida ‘tursm proves

Fleming, St. Petersburg Times, 11 (Gwen, lexis, dw: 2-8-2011, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

For years, the people of Florida have watched as many waterways once used for fishing, swimming and other everyday activities developed a coating of green sludge. The majority of Florida's impaired waters are affected by nitrogen and phosphorous pollution - carried by stormwater runoff from urbanized areas, discharges from wastewater treatment plants and fertilizer runoff from farms. What helps plants thrive on land causes harmful algae blooms when it reaches the water. These blooms have made residents sick, caused property values to plummet and turned tourists away from the state's treasured waters. To ensure the future health of Florida's residents and economy, EPA is setting clear, measurable standards to reduce pollution in Florida's treasured water bodies. Just three months ago we announced that we would take sensible steps to implement these standards and use a 15-month period before the standards take effect to sit down with state and local leaders and water utilities to make sure we are all prepared to achieve these objectives. These standards are not without their opponents, including many who claim that improved clean water standards will be too expensive and harm Florida's economy. In fact, the reverse is true. Less than 10 percent of Florida's farmland would need to be treated and the technology needed is already available. Expensive new technology is not required or necessary to keep our waters clean. But, if we fail to put the technology we have to use, the problem will only expand to more of Florida's waters. While the EPA is doing its best to address confusion and misinformation, we are more focused on the cooperation needed to protect our waters. We must find common ground because poor water quality directly affects not only public health and the environment, but also tourism and jobs. Florida's tourism industry - the state's No. 1 industry - employs nearly 1 million Floridians and pumps billions into the state's economy each year. In an average year, tourists spend more than $60 billion in the state - generating thousands upon thousands of jobs as well more than $3 billion in taxes. Many of these tourists come to Florida to fish, boat and ride water scooters. But if pollution kills aquatic life and makes the waters unclean and unsafe, fewer tourists will come. Floridians will not just lose one of their most precious natural resources, but also the dollars and jobs generated by a cornerstone of the statewide economy.
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Economic growth causes deforestation – Nigeria proves

Usman and Adefalu, University of Ilorin 10 (BA and LL, Biodiversity, Nigerian forestry, wildlife and protected areas: Status report, dw: 9-1-2010, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

First, there was the problem of increasing deforestation as a result of farming, construction and lumbering activities. There was therefore, the need to prevent the total destruction of forests in the country. Secondly, the rapid rate of soil degradation and desertification especially in marginal areas was another important reason for a positive action towards conserving the natural environment. Cultivation, cutting of firewood, and firing of the bush for farming and game was destroying the natural vegetation cover and exposing the soil to erosion. Thirdly, there was the need to control the rapid rate of destruction of wild animals especially with the increasing danger of extinction of some species. Finally, it was realized that creation of game reserves could turn such areas into tourist centres. The total forest area of all types in Nigeria was Nigerian forestry, wildlife and protected areas: estimated at 360,000 square km in 1975. With the reckless destruction of forests at the rate of about 600,000 hectares per year, there was the fear that timber resources would be depleted in the next few years (NEST 1992).

Deforestation causes extinction

Gatto 8 (Tim, The Agonist, staff, http://agonist.org/timgatto/20080425/the\_tipping\_point\_and\_critical\_mass\_are\_we\_there\_yet, dw: 4-25-2008, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

Just what are these issues that are such a threat to mankind’s continued existence? While many people and governments attempt to remain blithely ignorant of the situation, global climate change threatens to destroy upwards to half of all species of life on this planet. The irresponsible behavior of mankind towards the Earth is criminal in nature. The Amazon rain forest, which supplies twenty percent of the planets oxygen as well as removing nearly the same amount of carbon dioxide, is being destroyed at a rate which translates to an area the size of Belgium, being destroyed yearly. The Amazon rainforest which can be likened to the lungs of our planet can never be replaced. The discharge of fresh water from the mouth of this largest of rivers, makes up twenty percent of the fresh water discharged into the oceans. In fact, one minute of fresh water discharge from the Amazon into the Atlantic could provide New York City with its entire water needs for sixty years. The habitat of plants that haven’t yet been discovered, plants that could contain medicinal properties and cure disease, are being destroyed before scientists can evaluate their properties and possible uses. Once a species is gone from the Earth, it is gone forever. In this regard, there is no second chance.
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Loss of biodiversity and land is caused primarily by humans expanding capital

Asafu-Adjaye 3 (John, prof @ univ of queensland, Contemporary Economic Policy vol 21, proquest, dw: apr 2003, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

Although environmental factors such as climate contribute to biodiversity decline, by far the major causes are conversion and degradation of natural habitats. Habitat loss affects all three of the principal levels of biodiversity (i.e., genetic, species, and ecosystem biodiversity). Conversion refers to the transformation of a natural form of a resource into another form suitable for human use. This can occur in various ways. For example, conversion occurs when an excessive amount of the main constituents of an ecosystem is withdrawn (e.g., clear felling of a forest). Another instance is when too much of an introduced element (artificial or natural) is added to the ecosystem. Conversion occurs mainly to supply the needs of a growing human population. One of the consequences of conversion is that the available habitat becomes fragmented. Over time, the isolated fragments are unable to support the remnants, resulting in species loss. Vitousek et al. (1986) estimated that the human species uses about 40% of potential terrestrial net primary product based on an estimate of 5 billion people (1990 population) and a daily consumption of 2500 calories per capita. The United Nations predicts that world population growth would rise to 10 billion people by 2050 (UN Population Division, 1993). Given the projected increase in the world's population, it will be a major challenge to avoid a staggering loss of biodiversity in the future. Given that biodiversity is a public good whose benefits cannot be appropriated by individuals, the rate of conversion and thus the rate of biodiversity decline is higher than is socially desirable (Krautkraemer, 1995). The decline of biodiversity resources is also due to the fact that the value of these resources is underestimated or ignored in decision-making processes. Another unique feature of biodiversity compared to other public goods is that whereas the costs are borne locally, the benefits accrue globally. Therefore, the incentive to supply (or conserve) biodiversity may be lesser than for other public goods. Although government policies are supposed to correct the market failure associated with biodiversity, there are numerous cases in which government policies have actually promoted biodiversity decline. Examples include the pricing of logs in tropical forests and subsidization of land clearing and export commodities. In the following section the framework for modeling biodiversity decline is discussed together with the econometric specification of the relationship between biodiversity and various socioeconomic variables.
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Growth kills species

Trainer 10 (Ted, UNSW, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html, dw: 9-16-2010, da: 6-21-2011, lido)

Perhaps the most worrying limits we are encountering are not to do with minerals or energy. Water: There are already serious water shortages in about 80 countries. Access to water will probably be the major source of conflict in the world in coming years. About 480 million people are fed by food produced from water pumped from underground. The water tables are falling fast and the petrol to run the pumps might not be available soon. In Australia overuse of water has led to serious problems, e.g., salinity in the Murray. The greenhouse problem will make these problems worse. By 2050 the volume of water in the Murray-Darling system might be cut by 50%. Food and land. Food prices and shortages are already serious problems, causing riots in some countries. If all people will soon have on earth had an American diet, which takes about .5 ha of cropland alone, we would need 4.5b ha, but there are only 1.4 b ha in use. That area will decline as ecosystems deteriorate, water supply declines, pressure to produce increases, land is used to produce bio-fuels, and as global warming has its effects. Timber: If all 9 billion people were to use timber at the US rate we would need 4 times the world’s forest area. Pressures from population growth and corporations is reducing tropical rainforests, where most species live. Fish: Nearly all fisheries are being over-fished and the oceans are being polluted. World fish catch is likely to go down from here on. The mass of big fish in the oceans, such as shark and tuna, is now only 10% of what it was some decades ago. Species loss; At least 10% of species of fish, plants, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals are threatened with extinction. The loss rate among lower forms is probably much greater. We seem to be entering a period of large scale extinction.

Loss of biodiversity leads to extinction

Diner 94 (Major David N.; Instructor, Administrative and Civil Law Division, The Judge Advocate General's School, United States Army) "The Army and the Endangered Species Act: Who's Endangering Whom?" 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161l/n WBW

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." 79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, 80 mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.
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Species loss happening rapidly now

Leahy 10 (Stephen, International Environmental Journalist, Jan 13, [ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=49964] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

UXBRIDGE, Canada, Jan 13, 2010 (IPS) - Humanity is destroying the network of living things that comprise our life support system. While this sawing-through-the-branch-we're-perched-on is largely unintentional, world leaders can't say they didn't know what's going on: 123 countries promised to take urgent action in 2003 but have done little to stem the rising tide of extinctions in what's known as the extinction or biodiversity crisis. Species are going extinct at 1,000 times their natural pace due to human activity, recent science has documented, with 35 to 40 species vanishing each day, never to be seen again. "The question of preserving biological diversity is on the same scale as climate protection," German Chancellor Angela Merkel said in a speech in Berlin Monday at the official launch of the United Nations' International Year of Biodiversity. This week's official launch will be followed by the first major event of the International Year, a high-profile meeting at the Paris headquarters of the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Jan. 20-21. "We need a sea change. Here, now, immediately - not some time in the future," Merkel said.

Species loss happening rapidly now

Leahy 10 (Stephen, International Environmental Journalist, Jan 13, [ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=49964] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

UXBRIDGE, Canada, Jan 13, 2010 (IPS) - Humanity is destroying the network of living things that comprise our life support system. While this sawing-through-the-branch-we're-perched-on is largely unintentional, world leaders can't say they didn't know what's going on: 123 countries promised to take urgent action in 2003 but have done little to stem the rising tide of extinctions in what's known as the extinction or biodiversity crisis. Species are going extinct at 1,000 times their natural pace due to human activity, recent science has documented, with 35 to 40 species vanishing each day, never to be seen again. "The question of preserving biological diversity is on the same scale as climate protection," German Chancellor Angela Merkel said in a speech in Berlin Monday at the official launch of the United Nations' International Year of Biodiversity. This week's official launch will be followed by the first major event of the International Year, a high-profile meeting at the Paris headquarters of the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Jan. 20-21. "We need a sea change. Here, now, immediately - not some time in the future," Merkel said.
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Growth drives species loss

Trainer 10 (Ted, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/TheEnvProb.html, dw: 9-24-2010, da: 6-21-2011, lido)

We are probably entering a period of rapid and massive loss of species. This is primarily because one species, out of the possibly 30 million on the planet is taking so much of the planet’s area and biological production. The mass of big animals in the sea is down to 10% of its original value. Most fisheries are being harvested beyond sustainable limits. Many rivers such as the Colorado and the Murray are dying because humans are taking far more water than these ecosystems can tolerate. Water tables are falling. Forests are reducing by perhaps 20 million ha p.a. Melbourne’s growth plan includes destruction of a large area of scarce remaining native grassland. Soils are being eroded or otherwise lost. A general index of these kinds of impacts is evident in Vitousek’s conclusion that humans are taking about 40% of the net primary productivity of all the land on the planet. (Vitousek et al., 1997.) This figure indicates the extent to which humans are taking, converting and eliminating habitats. The loss of habitats is the main factor responsible for species loss. Of the c. 8 billion ha of productive land on the planet humans have taken 1.4 billion ha for cropland, 3+ billion for pastures, and much of the productivity of the 3+ billion ha under forest cover. As the footprint analyses make clear we are harvesting from habitats other species once lived in a rate that is around 1.4 times that which might be maintained continually. Not only are we expropriating the sustainable surplus that could be harvested from nature, we are increasingly harvesting the stocks needed to produce that surplus. Again consider the probable future of habitats in view of the multiples stated above. What will the availability of habitats be if 9 billion live as affluently as Australians do now, or as affluently as they expect to with 3% economic growth? Enormous areas would have to be returned to nature in order to restore habitats to quantities and qualities that might halt species loss. This cannot be done without dramatic reduction in the amount of resources humans take from nature and the associated amount of wastes they dump back into nature. This in turn would not be possible without either cutting production and consumption dramatically, or achieving enormous technical advance which firstly brings the impacts down to tolerable levels and secondly holds them there despite constant increase in economic output.

Market economies put biodiversity at the buyers disposal – economic growth would encourage more to degrade biodiversity

Ayoo 8 (Collins, Department of Economics, University of Calgary, Management of Environmental Quality iss 5, dw: 2008 is, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

Market and charge systems are intended to correct the distortions and weaknesses in prices and markets that provide wrong signals to producers and consumers and encourage them to degrade biodiversity. Implementing market and charge systems fosters trade in biodiversity goods and services and enables biodiversity to be priced in a way that reflects its relative scarcity, costs, and benefits. Creating markets has the advantage of ensuring that biological resources are allocated efficiently and put to their best use. By creating the ability to buy, sell, or trade in biodiversity or to exchange biodiversity damaging economic activities between sites, it is possible to encourage biodiversity conservation and discourage activities that result in biodiversity loss. Revenues can also be generated by assigning charges or prices to biodiversity goods and services. Some examples of market and charge systems that can be used to protect biodiversity are the direct creation of markets through the purchase and sale of biodiversity goods and services and value-added products where there is demand on the part of consumers; the establishment of tradeable rights, shares, and quotas in biological resources and environmental quality; setting new charges or rationalizing existing charges; and introducing charges for biodiversity goods and services which are currently received free. Improving the way markets work provides incentives to producers and consumers and ensures that their choices are based on a sound knowledge about the effects of their decisions on biodiversity. Indirect incentives to take pressure off biodiversity can also be provided by establishing new markets for biological resources themselves or their alternatives. Market incentives can be used to promote biodiversity conservation by ensuring that the prices and markets for biological resources themselves incorporate efficiency and scarcity concerns. These principles have recently been implemented in Kenya where the prices of timber and royalty rates have been rationalized to reflect the true costs of forest management and the relative scarcity of indigenous species ([13] Emerton, 2000).

Growth Bad – Environment – Species

Growth consumes biodiversity

Ayoo 8 (Collins, Department of Economics, University of Calgary, Management of Environmental Quality iss 5, dw: 2008 is, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

Closely connected to the unsustainable utilization of biological resources is the use of destructive harvesting and production techniques. These techniques are often used to maximize the harvests and fail to take into consideration the impacts of on biodiversity. Some examples of these practices are the illegal use of destructive fishing gear which is widespread in several fisheries in developing countries, timber harvesting that is indiscriminate and not directed towards trees that maximize the economic returns, slash and burn agriculture, and the unselective exploitation of wild species ([13] Emerton, 2000). The greatest threat to biodiversity is, however, due to the conversion, modification, and fragmentation of natural ecosystems to alternative uses which do not maintain a diverse pool of natural species or which undermine the provision of vital ecological functions ([22] Koziell, 2000; [12] Ehrlich and Kremen, 2001). These changes in land use are often driven by the perception that employing land in alternative uses would generate higher economic returns ([28] Norton-Griffiths and Southey, 1995). They often result in permanent changes to the habitat whose natural systems and component species are destroyed and replaced ([12] Ehrlich and Kremen, 2001). Examples include the conversion of wetlands to agriculture, mariculture, settlement or mining. Part of the reason for this widespread trend is that cost-benefit analyses of such land use conversions invariably fail to adequately account for important non-market costs and benefits. It is also to some extent due to the use of high discount rates in the assessment of land use alternatives. Other activities that threaten biodiversity are those that alter the environmental quality and the ecological functions that are required to maintain biodiversity and ecosystems ([13] Emerton, 2000). These include production and consumption activities that generate waste or by-products that harm the natural resource base. Notable examples are untreated domestic waste, the use of hazardous or toxic chemicals or the disposal of industrial effluents or by-products into land, air and water. Although the above forces are the major direct threats to biodiversity loss, they are to a large extent driven by economic factors. This claim is predicated on the fact that close links exist between economic policies and the actions of economic agents. According to [38] UNEP (2004), activities that lead to biodiversity degradation are permitted or even encouraged to occur because of failures and distortions in markets, laws, policies and institutions that govern the use of biological resources. [38] UNEP (2004) further notes that these failures and distortions make it seem more profitable to degrade biodiversity in the course of economic activities. These economic causes act as incentives that encourage economic agents to degrade biodiversity, or as disincentives that discourage biodiversity conservation.

Economic policy causes governments to kill biodiversity

Ayoo 8 (Collins, Department of Economics, University of Calgary, Management of Environmental Quality iss 5, dw: 2008 is, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

It is usually the case that governments formulate and implement policies that are aimed at stimulating economic activity and meeting particular national or sectoral goals. These are often accompanied by legislations to regulate the behavior and/or actions of economic agents so as to achieve stated economic goals. These policies and laws are invariably accompanied by instruments such as subsidies, taxes, fees, and fines. Many of these instruments encourage economic agents to degrade biodiversity either because they stimulate activities that lead to biodiversity loss or because they fail to contain and/or enforce checks against biodiversity degradation. Some examples include agricultural policies that encourage high-input arable production, and industrial and urban policies that encourage development and settlement in ecologically sensitive areas or contain inadequate consideration of waste management and pollution control ([13] Emerton, 2000). Figure 2 [Figure omitted. See Article Image.] illustrates how subsidies can harm the environment by encouraging the overuse of environmental amenities or by causing the artificial expansion of industries that make use of the environment as an input

Growth Bad – Environment – Oceans

The ocean ecosystem is on the brink of collapse

Black 6/20 (Richard, environment correspondent, BBC News, 2011, [www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-13796479] AD: 6-22-11, jm)

Carbon dioxide levels are now so high, it says, that ways of pulling the gas out of the atmosphere need to be researched urgently - but not using techniques, such as iron fertilisation, that lead to more CO2 entering the oceans. "We have to bring down CO2 emissions to zero within about 20 years," Professor Hoegh-Guldberg told BBC News. "If we don't do that, we're going to see steady acidification of the seas, heat events that are wiping out things like kelp forests and coral reefs, and we'll see a very different ocean." Another of the report's authors, Dan Laffoley, marine chair of the World Commission on Protected Areas and an adviser to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), admitted the challenges were vast. "But unlike previous generations, we know what now needs to happen," he said. "The time to protect the blue heart of our planet is now."

**Oceans collapsing now – Growth is the cause**

CBS 6-21 (http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2011/06/20/scitech/main20072805.shtml, dw: 6-21-2011, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

The group's report focuses on four case studies. The first involves the potentially deadly trio of factors -- warming, acidification and anoxia -- affecting today's oceans. The second involved the disappearing coral reefs around the world. The third looked at the problem of pollution in the ocean. The fourth focused on the notoriously bad problem of overfishing. In the first case study, the report concludes that "Most, if not all, of the five global mass extinctions in Earth's history carry the fingerprints of the main symptoms of...global warming, ocean acidification and anoxia or lack of oxygen. It is these three factors -- the 'deadly trio' -- which are present in the ocean today. In fact, (the situation) is unprecedented in the Earth's history because of the high rate and speed of change." In the case of coral reefs, the report concludes that there exist "multiple threats (that) reefs are facing, that are now acting together to have a greater impact than if they were occurring on their own. This suggests that existing scientific projections of how coral reefs will respond to global warming have been highly conservative and must now be modified." Pollution in the oceans is not a new concern to scientists, but the panel discovered that there is currently "a wide range of novel chemicals now being found in marine ecosystems...suspected to be harmful to marine life." As for overfishing, there are already examples of humans nearly wiping out entire species due to their popularity on the dinner table. In the case of a fish called Chinese bahaba, "It has taken less than seventy years for this giant fish to become critically endangered after it was first described by scientists in the 1930s." The group of scientists concluded that "urgent and unequivocal action" must be taken "to halt further declines in ocean health."

Ocean collapse causes extinction

Craig 3 (Robin, prof of law, McGeorge review, p. 155, vol 34, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

The worlds oceans contain many resources and provide many services that humans consider valuable. “Occupying more than seventy percent of the earth’s surface and ninety-five percent of the biosphere,” oceans provide food; marketable goods such as shells, aquarium fish and pharmaceuticals; life support processes, including carbon sequestering, nutrient cycling, and weather mechanics; and quality of life, both aesthetic and economic, for millions of people worldwide. Indeed, it is difficult to overestimate the importance of the ocean to humanity’s well-being: “The Ocean is the crade of life on our planet, and it remains the axis of existence, the locus of planetary biodiversity, and the engine of the chemical and hydrological cycles that create and maintain our atmosphere and climate.” Ocean and coastal ecosystem services have been calculated to be worth over twenty billion dollars per year, worldwide. In addition, many people assign heritage and existence value to the ocean and its creatures, viewing the world’s heritage and existence value to the ocean and existence value to the ocean and its creatures, viewing the world’s seas as a common legacy to be passed on relatively intact future generations.

Growth Bad – Environment – Overpopulation

Overpopulation causes extinction

Kolankiewicz 10 (Lean, Progressives for immigration reform, writer, http://www.progressivesforimmigrationreform.org/2010/03/05/from-big-to-bigger-how-mass-immigration-and-population-growth-have-exacerbated-americas-ecological-footprint/, dw: 3-2010, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

In essence, if we American “Bigfeet” do not opt for a different demographic path than the one we are treading now, Ecological Footprint analysis indicates unequivocally that we will continue plodding ever deeper into the forbidden zone of Ecological Overshoot, trampling our prospects for a sustainable future. Incidentally, we would also be trampling the survival prospects for many hundreds of endangered species with which we share our country. These birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, reptiles, butterflies, mussels, and other taxa are menaced with extinction by our aggressive exploitation of nearly every ecological niche, nook, and cranny. In nature, no organism in overshoot remains there for long. Sooner or later, ecosystem and/or population collapse ensues. Are we humans, because of our unique scientific acumen, immune from the laws of nature that dictate the implacable terms of existence to all other species on the planet? Our political, economic, and cultural elites seem to think so, and en masse, we certainly act so. Yet ironically, many scientists themselves believe otherwise: that all-too-human hubris, unless checked by collective wisdom and self-restraint, will prove to be our undoing, and that civilization as we know it may unravel.44

Growth causes overpopulation – more people consume more resources

Ramphal 1 (Shridath, Co-Chairman of the Commission on Global Governance, UNEP, http://www.unep.org/ourplanet/imgversn/91/ramphal.html, dw: 2-1-2001, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

In the review of progress now being undertaken by the international community, there is a case for weighing up developments on all the separate issues that together make up the environmental problem facing the world - and for being concerned with the detail. But there is also a danger that, engrossed in the detail, we may miss the larger picture, and that in focusing on a number of issues, however important, we might lose sight of the big one. The big issue posed by the challenge of environment is that of resources versus consumption. The crux of sustainable development is to order global development in such a way that its impact on the Earth's resources does not imperil the life chances of those who will follow us. We who live now do not have freehold rights to the Earth's ecological capital: we are only tenants with temporary custody and the moral obligation to act as responsible trustees. We say this almost rhetorically; we do not live by its precepts. Resources, and how we use them, are at the heart of most of our environmental problems. There are questions about the world's continuing capacity to produce the food - grain, fish, meat - needed for an expanding population. There has been worry that water scarcities could become dangerously acute. There are signs that the modern world's love affair with the motor vehicle is coming under strain. Concern has been expressed about land, energy, raw materials, wastes, pollution. Environmental disquiet has undoubtedly spurred action on all these - and other - fronts. But the push for growth, the drive to increase the gross domestic product, goes inexorably on, as if it had no link to all these other issues. It is assumed without question that people in even the most affluent countries must have a higher standard of material well-being year after year - and that this process of enrichment must go on without interruption, without end. The impulse to achieve economic growth is natural and necessary in poorer countries. Living standards are, on average, much lower, and many hundreds of millions of their people are still to be lifted out of the most abject poverty and deprivation. The dazzling performance of some developing nations, primarily the 'Asian Tigers', has tended to obscure the stubborn persistence of poverty. The success of these countries notwithstanding, the poor are not only still with us, but now with us in larger numbers than ever. Globalization may have transformed the world economy in many respects but there are parts it has not reached, people it has not touched, and others it has affected not to enrich, but to impoverish. As many as 1.6 billion people - more than a fourth of the world population - are poorer than they were 15 years ago, says the United Nations Development Programme. In 19 countries, people are poorer than they were 35 years ago. Not for them the easy assumption that living standards would continue to improve from year to year; the hard reality has been that their incomes, meagre as they are, have gone on falling, year after year. Roughly three-quarters of the world's people live in developing countries - but, because they are poor, they account for only a quarter of the world's consumption. Their living standards urgently demand to be raised, not least so that their basic needs of food, health, education and shelter may not remain unfulfilled. They have as much right to the use of the world's resources as any other of the world's people. But if total world consumption cannot be increased without running down the world's ecological capital, poor countries can only have a larger slice of the pie if rich countries are ready to countenance a different distribution - and adjust to a smaller share for themselves.

Growth Bad – Environment – Overpopulation

Growth is the root cause of overpop – distribution of resources

Shekhar 9 (Manisha, Prof @ Saxena college, Ecommerce Journal, http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/articles/12807\_environment\_does\_not\_allow\_further\_economic\_growth\_in\_the\_world, dw: 1-30-2009, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

The relation between consumption, poverty, environmental destruction and population has long been one of the most controversial issues in the environmental debate. Some environmentalists argue that the growing population of the world (especially in the South) is a root cause to the global environmental destruction and one of the most serious threats. They say that the world is rapidly reaching the maximum number of people that it can feed. Every additional person will mean increased environmental destruction and overuse of natural resources. They see the Third World population growth as a ticking bomb, and argue that it must be curbed by drastic means. Although it is true that there is a limit to how many people the earth can sustain, the above reasoning has some fundamental flaws. First, looking at the number of people without also taking into account each person’s consumption gives the wrong message. In fact, over consumption and affluence in the rich world and among the world’s elites is a more serious problem than the number of children that poor people have. Currently the richer fifth of the world consumes four fifths of the world’s resources and is responsible for the majority of the pollution and waste. On average, a child born in the United States will be a 50-100 times larger burden to the Earth’s ecosystems than a child born in the Third World. Therefore, population should be as much of a Northern concern as a Southern concern. With their current lifestyles, most of the Northern countries are already ‘over-populated’. Second, concentrating on numbers is to focus too much on symptoms of much larger, underlying problems. Those worried about the rapidly growing human population have too often seen ‘technical’ approaches such as family planning and coercive population control measures as solutions. Yet, it is clear that the most important factors behind the reduction of population growth are the improvement of social conditions, women’s status, education and reproductive rights, and overall equity in society. Availability of contraceptives is just a necessary condition, but far from the solution. Even if one focuses on numbers, the best way to reduce population growth is to fight for social Justice.

Economic prosperity drives overpopulation – worse off countries produce more

Trainer 10 (Ted, UNSW, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html, dw: 9-16-2010, da: 6-21-2011, lido)

The rich countries with about one-fifth of the world's population are consuming around four-fifths of the world's energy production. The rich world average per capita consumption is about 17 times that of the poorest half of the world's people. It is important to recognize that these figures significantly underestimate the inequality in resource use, because they include only raw materials used in the rich countries and do not include the large volumes of materials embodied in imported goods. Rich countries now do not carry out much manufacturing but import most of the manufactured goods they use from Third World factories. So figures on use in or by rich countries do not include all the energy used to produce these goods. Similarly their environmental impact statistics do not include the damage done in Third World countries in producing the goods the rich countries import. POPULATION The world's population in 2009 was around 6.7 billion. It is expected to peak at 9 billion around 2070. Most of the increase will be in the poor countries. Third World people are often criticised for having such large families when they are too poor to provide for them. However, the economic conditions of poverty make it important for poor people to have large families. When there are no age pensions people will have no one to look after them in their old age if they do not have surviving children. Also when infant death rates are high it is necessary to have many children in order to be sure some reach adulthood. These are powerful economic incentives to have large families and they will only be removed by satisfactory development which enables pensions and safe water supplies in villages etc. Many believe the world is presently far beyond a sustainable population, and that this might be only .5 - 2 billion people. We now feed only about 1.5 billion people well, but might soon have to provide for 9 billion. Indicators of the biological productivity of the planet are falling and many agricultural indicators are worrying (e.g. falling water tables), even without the probable effects of global warming. Over-population is therefore a very serious problem, but there is a much more serious problem; that is over-consumption on the part of the rich countries…and the goal the rest have of rising to our “living standards”. Population is likely to rise by about 50% but if all rise to the present rich world rates of consumption world resource use and footprint will be about 8 – 10 times as great as they are now.

Growth Bad – Environment – Overpopulation – UQ

Resources depleting and population increasing now

Heinberg 6-1 (Richard, Oil Price, http://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/An-End-to-Growth-The-Environments-Impact-on-our-Economic-Decline.html, dw: 6-1-2011, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

As resource extraction moves from higher-quality to lower-quality ores and deposits, we must expect worse environmental impacts and accidents along the way. There are several current or planned extraction projects in remote and/or environmentally sensitive regions that could each result in severe global impacts equaling or even surpassing the Deepwater Horizon blowout. These include oil drilling in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas; oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; coal mining in the Utukok River Upland, Arctic Alaska; tar sands production in Alberta; shale oil production in the Rocky Mountains; and mountaintop-removal coal mining in Appalachia.

Growth Bad – Environment – Ozone

Ozone depletion solves life on earth

Greenpeace 1 (http://archive.greenpeace.org/ozone/holes/holebg.html, dw: 2-1-2001, da: 6-23-2011, lido)

When chemists Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina first postulated a link between chlorofluorocarbons and ozone layer depletion in 1974, the news was greeted with scepticism, but taken seriously nonetheless. The vast majority of credible scientists have since confirmed this hypothesis. The ozone layer around the Earth shields us all from harmful ultraviolet radiation from the sun. Without the ozone layer, life on earth would not exist. Exposure to increased levels of ultraviolet radiation can cause cataracts, skin cancer, and immune system suppression in humans as well as innumerable effects on other living systems. This is why Rowland's and Molina's theory was taken so seriously, so quickly - the stakes are literally the continuation of life on earth.

Growth Bad – Environment - AT: Tech

Tech can’t solve – barriers, small amount, cant use tech in warming

Trainer 10 (Ted, UNSW, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html,dw: 9-16-2010, da: 6-21-2011, lido)

Most people are "technical fix optimists", assuming that technical advance will make it unnecessary for us to change to simpler lifestyles and very different systems and a zero-growth economy. The belief is that better ways will enable higher "living standards" to be continued with reduced total resource use and environmental impact. They assume this will be possible because of better recycling, improved energy efficiency, stronger legislation on pollution and waste, and more public education. Large reductions in resource use per unit of output are likely to be achieved in the near future, given that in past decades abundant cheap energy has not prompted efficiency effort. However the “low hanging fruit”, the easy gains will soon have been made and further progress in reducing will be increasingly difficult. There is also a tendency for a “Jeavons” effect; for efficiency gains to lower costs which then prompts increased use. Some people (notably Weisacker and Lovins, 1997, Factor Four, and Hawken, Lovins and Lovins, 2000, Natural Capital) argue that in general we could produce things with only 1/4 (or perhaps eventually 1/10) of the resources and energy now needed. Even if this is so the reduction would be far less than would be necessary to enable all people to have present rich world living standards. Let us just assume that we have to halve resource and environmental impacts per unit of output (the above figures indicate much higher reductions are required.) If by 2050 9 billion have risen to the “living standards” we in Australia would then have given 3% p.a. economic growth, meaning world output would be 30 times as great as it is now … then we would have to achieve a Factor 60 reduction in impact per unit of output! A Factor 4 reduction would be insignificant. (For a detailed critique of the book Natural Capitalism see Trainer, "Natural Capitalism can not overcome resource limits."  ) Discussions of technical advance and economic growth have generally failed to focus on the significance of increased energy use. Often greater output etc. has been achieved primarily through increased use of energy (and switching to more effective fuels, such as from coal to gas.) Agriculture is a realm where technical advance has been predominantly a matter of increased energy use. Over the last half century productivity measured in terms of yields per ha or per worker have risen dramatically, but these have been mostly due to even greater increases in the amount of energy being poured into agriculture, on the farm, in the production of machinery, in the transport, pesticide, fertilizer, irrigation, packaging and marketing sectors, and in getting the food from the supermarket to the front door and then dealing with the waste packaging. Less than 2% of the US workforce is now on farms, but agriculture accounts for around 17% of all energy used (not including several of the factors listed above.) The “Green Revolution” has depended largely on ways that involve greater energy use.

Growth Bad – Environment - AT: Motive

Financial attampts at solving BioD fail

Ayoo 8 (Collins, Department of Economics, University of Calgary, Management of Environmental Quality iss 5, dw: 2008 is, da: 6-22-2011, lido)

The motivation for using financial instruments to conserve biodiversity is that biodiversity conservation is a costly undertaking that gives rise to significant costs that are borne by governments, the private sector, individuals, households, and local communities. Funds therefore need to be provided to offset and compensate for these costs so that those affected can have sufficient incentive to conserve biodiversity. [28] Norton-Griffiths and Southey (1995) support this view and claim, based on their study of biodiversity conservation in Kenya, that the net revenues from biodiversity conservation were inadequate to cover the opportunity costs to land. Their other significant findings were that the government of Kenya was subsidizing conservation activities whose chief values were all indirect and external to Kenya; that due to the high opportunity costs of conservation the government needed to consider degazettting parks and reserves; that due to the global nature of the benefits of Kenya's conservation efforts, it was inappropriate that much of the cost of conservation was borne by Kenya; and that the magnitude of the opportunity cost of conservation was sufficient to drive the conversion of land used for biodiversity conservation to settlement and agriculture.

Motive doesn’t solve

Trainer 10 (Ted, UNSW, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html, dw: 9-16-2010, da: 6-21-2011, lido)

This is a very seductive argument, but it is mistaken and misleading. There is little doubt that in future energy and other resources will become much more expensive, but conventional economists reason that as economic growth continues to raise GDP and to lift incomes we will have no difficulty paying much more for energy, for scarcer resources and fixing the environment. The fault in the argument is the fact that if the price of crucial resources such as energy rises greatly, the GDP will not rise…indeed the entire economy might crash. An economy cannot increase GDP at a normal 3% p.a. unless many conditions and inputs remain as increasingly favourable as they were. For instance an economy that grows to 2080 at 3% p.a. would then be producing 8 times as much every year, but that would not be possible unless it could get many more times the inputs of resources and energy that it does now and could deal with many times the environmental impact. So whether or not we can have the growth and become richer depends on resource and environmental conditions, and whether these inputs can grow at the rate required to enable the economic growth assumed. And this of course is what the limits to growth analysis shows will not be possible…or will be possible for a small number for a limited time as they take and use up most of the accessible resources.

Growth Bad – Environment - AT: Service Industry

Services Industry won’t take over is wrong – SQ disproves and materialization uses energy anyways

Trainer 10 (Ted, UNSW, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html, dw: 9-16-2010, da: 6-21-2011, lido)

-Some people assume that the economy can continue to grow in the service and information sectors, without increasing use of materials and energy. This is also known as the “de-materialisation” thesis, -that technical advance is now enabling the economy to grow without increasing the demand for materials and energy. However services already make up about 75% of our economic activity. Services are quite resource intensive. Common (1995) estimates that they account for 27% of Australia's energy use. Several, such as transport, tourism and construction, involve high energy use. Several others such as retailing, insurance and advertising, depend on production and consumption of material goods. All require lighting, offices, electricity etc. It is not plausible that the overall volume of economic activity could multiply many times, without large increases in energy use. In addition there are many resource-intensive activities that will not be reduced if more of the economic growth takes place mostly in the service sector, including defence and the large household sector of the economy. Certainly materials and energy use per unit of GDP in rich countries is falling, but this is misleading. It seems to be due to a) shift to higher quality fuels such as electricity and gas (more value can be derived from a unit of energy in the form of oil than in the form of coal, because coal use involves higher costs for transport etc.), and b) manufactured goods increasingly coming from the Third World, as distinct from being produced in rich countries and having their energy costs recorded there. Trade figures seem to show that this is what is happening. (See Trainer, “The Dematerialisation Myth”, and web reference at end.) Aadrianse (1997) concludes that materials used per capita in rich countries are still increasing. Morrow (p.172.)finds that even though about 80% of a rich economy is to do with services, resource consumption is still increasing at 1% p.a. A good measure of materials consumption is the volume of garbage we throw out, and in rich countries this is increasing fast. (However it does not include materials built into structures, or turned into pollution flows.) The claim that de-materialisation is occurring therefore seems to be invalid. It is likely that considerable de-materialisation is possible, but the scope for it and the limits to what it might achieve are not at all clear at present. In any case no realistic de-materialisation would enable a sufficient reduction to permit the economy to grow continually at say 3% p.a. while our use of materials and energy falls. (For a more detailed discussion see The Dematerialisation Myth)

Growth Bad – Health – General

Economic growth is bad for environment.

Elkins 5 (Jules R, U of Illinois, http://paa2005.princeton.edu/download.aspx?submissionId=50706, 6-23-11, AH)

The type of industrialization underway in today’s developing countries provides a poignant example of the pernicious side of economic growth. It is a process marked by rapid urbanization, crowding, poor access to clean water, and high levels of industrial pollution. The adverse health consequences of these by-products of industrial growth have proven difficult to accurately measure, since industrialization also has positive effects, the most salient of which lie in rising incomes. Moreover, there is little available data from developing countries to analyze this relationship. But it is an important relationship, given the rapid pace of industrialization in many developing countries over the last several decades.

Bad environment is bad for health.

Elkins 5 (Jules R, U of Illinois, http://paa2005.princeton.edu/download.aspx?submissionId=50706, 6-23-11, AH)

Results from the quasi-experimental design show that the change in incidence of all respiratory problems, coughing, and breathing difficulty was positively correlated with the sub-district’s change in pollution, and was significant at the one percent level. Other health problems, including fever, headache, flu, accidents, mortality, disruptions of daily activities, doctor visits, and medication were insignificant or negative, except for the change in incidence of diarrhea (significant at 1 percent) and overall poor health (barely significant at 5 percent, t=2.05). Results from the quasi-experimental design tend to be insensitive to the inclusion of a wide variety of controls, which provides an indirect measure of the validity of the main assumption of this study design – that the treatment is close to randomly assigned.

Environmental destruction causes disease.

TFAH 8 (Trust for America’s Health, Oct, http://healthyamericans.org/assets/files/GermsGoGlobal.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

Deforestation and reforestation also can be factors in the spread and prevalence of certain emerging infectious diseases. Globally, rates of deforestation have grown significantly since the beginning of the 20th century. Driven by rapidly increasing human population numbers, large areas of tropical and temperate forests, as well as prairies, grasslands, and wetlands, have been converted to agricultural and ranching uses. The result has been an upsurge of certain infectious diseases, as the relationships between humans and disease vectors (carriers) shift. Deforestation, with subsequent changes in land use and human settlement patterns, has coincided with increased malaria prevalence in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.58 Conversely, reforestation in the Northeastern and the upper Midwest regions of the U.S. has promoted an increase in the population of the whitetailed deer, an important host for the ticks that carry Lyme disease.

Economic inequality causes mass disease

Djordjevic 98 (Johnny, BA Global Econ, Paper in Global Sustainability @ UC, Irvine, March, [www.dbc.uci.edu/sustain/global/sensem/djordj98.html] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

There also lies a problem in the Third World. Developed countries high living standards and quest for an ever-increasing quality of life lead to Third World poverty and the deprivation of the Third World's access to its own resources. As Third World countries get deprived of materials, the developed world consumes and imports over half of their resources. A few developed countries seem to be consuming the globe's resources and this consumption rate is always increasing. "The rich must live more simply that the poor may simply live"(Trainer, 1985). The Third World is exploited in many ways. One way is that the best land in a developing country is used for crops exported to developed countries, while citizens of the Third World starve and suffer. Another way is the poor working conditions of the Third World. A third exploitation can be overlooked but no less disgusting; "The world's greatest health problem could be simply by providing water for the perhaps 2.000 million people who now have to drink form rivers and wells contained by human and animal wastes. Technically it is a simple matter to set up plants for producing iron and plastic pipes. But most of the world's iron and plastic goes into the production of luxurious cars, soft-drink containers, office blocks and similar things in rich countries"(Trainer, 1985).

Growth Bad – Health – General

Growth causes prolif of disease.

TFAH 8 (Trust for America’s Health, Oct, http://healthyamericans.org/assets/files/GermsGoGlobal.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

Lower cost and efficient means of international transportation allow people to travel to more remote places and potential exposure to more infectious diseases. And the close proximity of passengers on passenger planes, trains, and cruise ships over the course of many hours puts people at risk for higher levels of exposure. If a person contracts a disease abroad, their symptoms may not emerge until they return home, having exposed others to the infection during their travels. In addition, planes and ships can themselves become breeding grounds for infectious diseases.

Growth causes disease.

WHO 4 (http://apps.who.int/tdr/publications/tdr-research-publications/globalization-infectious-diseases/pdf/seb\_topic3.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

Large-scale projects designed to stimulate economic growth, but with ecological consequences, are another common cause of migration in low-income countries. For instance, extensive migration often accompanies water resources projects as people are drawn to the economic opportunities created during construction and operation of the new development. In the early phases, much of this is temporary migration and involves single males. Apart from occupational hazards, these workers risk infections associated with crowding, poverty and sexual behaviour. Consequently, TB, gastroenteritis and STDs are common infections. Later, vector-borne diseases become more prominent as people move from non-endemic to endemic areas. People may be susceptible to parasitic diseases (e.g. malaria) that flourish at water project sites in tropical climates (Hunter et al., 1993); famously, construction of the Panama Canal was delayed for decades as a result of malaria, which decimated successive teams of engineers and labourers. Large lakes can also provide migratory routes for people, some of whom may spread infections from endemic to previously unaffected areas. In Ghana, the movement of people across Lake Volta led to the first cases of trypanosomiasis in southern parts of the country (Hunter et al„ 1993); similar problems have followed deforestation and other land clearance projects (see above). In addition, the economically-driven movement of domestic animals can spread vectors and pathogens. In Australia, this has extended the range of tick species that act as vectors of a variety of pathogens (Petney, 2001).

Disease causes armed conflict and civil war.

Letendre, Fincher, & Thornhill 10 (K, CL, & R, U.S. National Library of Medicine National Institutes of Health, 4-1, http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?term=%22Letendre %20K%22%5BAuthor%5D, 6-21-11, AH)

Geographic and cross-national variation in the frequency of intrastate armed conflict and civil war is a subject of great interest. Previous theory on this variation has focused on the influence on human behaviour of climate, resource competition, national wealth, and cultural characteristics. We present the parasite-stress model of intrastate conflict, which unites previous work on the correlates of intrastate conflict by linking frequency of the outbreak of such conflict, including civil war, to the intensity of infectious disease across countries of the world. High intensity of infectious disease leads to the emergence of xenophobic and ethnocentric cultural norms. These cultures suffer greater poverty and deprivation due to the morbidity and mortality caused by disease, and as a result of decreased investment in public health and welfare. Resource competition among xenophobic and ethnocentric groups within a nation leads to increased frequency of civil war. We present support for the parasite-stress model with regression analyses. We find support for a direct effect of infectious disease on intrastate armed conflict, and support for an indirect effect of infectious disease on the incidence of civil war via its negative effect on national wealth. We consider the entanglements of feedback of conflict into further reduced wealth and increased incidence of disease, and discuss implications for international warfare and global patterns of wealth and imperialism.
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Disease causes extinction.

Yu 9 (Victoria, Dartmouth Undergraduate Journal of Science, 5-22, http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate, 6-23-11)

A pandemic will kill off all humans. In the past, humans have indeed fallen victim to viruses. Perhaps the best-known case was the bubonic plague that killed up to one third of the European population in the mid-14th century (7). While vaccines have been developed for the plague and some other infectious diseases, new viral strains are constantly emerging — a process that maintains the possibility of a pandemic-facilitated human extinction. Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus. It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system. However, for more easily transmitted viruses such as influenza, the evolution of new strains could prove far more consequential. The simultaneous occurrence of antigenic drift (point mutations that lead to new strains) and antigenic shift (the inter-species transfer of disease) in the influenza virus could produce a new version of influenza for which scientists may not immediately find a cure. Since influenza can spread quickly, this lag time could potentially lead to a “global influenza pandemic,” according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (9). The most recent scare of this variety came in 1918 when bird flu managed to kill over 50 million people around the world in what is sometimes referred to as the Spanish flu pandemic. Perhaps even more frightening is the fact that only 25 mutations were required to convert the original viral strain — which could only infect birds — into a human-viable strain (10).
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Funding for global health efforts will increase despite the recession.

Cohen 11 (Jon, Science Magazine, 2-14, http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2011/02/white-house-proposes-modest-fund.html, 6-22-11, AH)

In the face of a Republican-led effort to slash funding for global health programs, the Obama Administration proposed budget for 2012 calls for slightly increasing the investment on its Global Health Initiative (GHI) by 11% to $9.8 billion. Although several programs go up or down by roughly 10%, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria would receive a 23% boost in its current budget, set in fiscal year 2010, to $1.3 billion. Congress is still formulating a continuing resolution that would fund the federal government through the rest of fiscal year 2011, which started 1 October. The increase “is good news in this funding environment—any boost is, especially if you compare to the level of cuts proposed in the House continuing resolution on Friday,” says Jirair Ratevosian, a policy analyst with the American Foundation for AIDS Research in Washington, D.C.

Funding for health is at an all time high.

Fitzpatrick 11 (Meagan, CBS News, 4-11, http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canadavotes2011/ realitycheck/2011/04/conservatives-health-funding-facts.html, 6-23-11, AH)

"Under Prime Minister Harper, health transfers to the provinces and territories have increased by 33 per cent - an all-time high," it said. The Tories use this line over and over again whenever they are asked about the health file. Health Minister Leona Aglukkaq knows it like the back of her hand, resorting to it every time she is challenged in the House of Commons about health-care funding and what the government's intentions are for post-2014

Growth Bad – Health – Avian Flu

**Growth causes disease, paves way for avian flu.**

TFAH 8 (Trust for America’s Health, Oct, http://healthyamericans.org/assets/files/GermsGoGlobal.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

Globalization, the worldwide movement toward economic, financial, trade, and communications integration, has impacted public health significantly. Technology and economic interdependence allow diseases to spread globally at rapid speeds. Experts believe that the increase in international travel and commerce, including the increasingly global nature of food handling, processing, and sales contribute to the spread of emerging infectious diseases.47 Increased global trade has also brought more and more people into contact with zoonosis -- diseases that originated in animals before jumping to humans. For example, in 2003, the monkeypox virus entered the U.S. through imported Gambian giant rats sold in the nation’s under-regulated exotic pet trade. The rats infected pet prairie dogs, which passed the virus along to humans.48 International smuggling of birds, brought into the U.S. without undergoing inspection and/or quarantine, is of particular concern to public health experts who worry that it may be a pathway for the H5N1 “bird flu” virus to enter the country.

**Without control, bird flu pandemic could kill millions.**

**MSNBC News 5** (2-23, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6861065/ns/health-infectious\_diseases/t/who-bird-flu-pandemic-imminent, 6-23-11, AH)

World Health Organization officials urged governments on Wednesday to act swiftly to control the spread of bird flu, warning that the world is in grave danger of a deadly pandemic triggered by the virus. The illness has killed 45 people in Asia over the past year, in cases largely traced to contact with sick birds, and experts have warned the H5N1 virus could become far deadlier if it mutates into a form that can be easily transmitted among humans. A global pandemic could kill millions, they say. “We at WHO believe that the world is now in the gravest possible danger of a pandemic,” Dr. Shigeru Omi, the WHO’s Western Pacific regional director, said Wednesday. He said the world is “now overdue” for an influenza pandemic, since mass epidemics have occurred every 20 to 30 years. It has been nearly 40 years since the last one.
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Avian flu is under control.

IRIN 11 (A Service of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, 4-18, http://www.trust.org/alertnet/news/cambodia-bird-flu-risk-under-control-say-health-experts, 6-22-11, AH)

"There is no cause for alarm," Chea Nora, a technical officer within the Emerging Disease Surveillance and Response unit at the World Health Organization (WHO) in Phnom Penh, told IRIN. "Even though Cambodia is the only country [in the Mekong region] that has had cases this year, H5N1 is well under control here." The four deaths, in February and March, were the first reported cases of H5N1 in Cambodia since April last year and raised the number of cases in the country to 14 since 2005, 12 of which have been fatal, according to the communicable disease department at Cambodia's Ministry of Health. [http://www. moh.gov.kh/?lang=en ] Nora said it was important to note that the cases occurred in different areas of the country, that laboratory tests indicated the virus was neither mutating nor getting stronger, and that the avian flu season, which corresponds with the dry season in Cambodia, from November to May, is nearing its end.

**Avian flu is under control now.**

**Sagita 11** (Dessy, Staff Writer for Jakarta Globe, 6-19, http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/home/ indonesia-says-bird-flu-is-under-control-expert-disagrees/361893, 6-22-11, AH)

The government is claiming success in its efforts to tackle avian flu despite almost half of all the deaths recorded around the world occurring in Indonesia. Bayu Krisnamurthi, executive chairman of the National Committee for Avian Influenza Control and Pandemic Influenza Preparedness (Komnas FBPI), told the Jakarta Globe on Wednesday that although Indonesia was leading the world in the number of recorded fatalities from bird flu, “the total number of reported cases keeps decreasing.” Since the virus first emerged in 2003, 138 people have died from infections in Indonesia, while the worldwide death toll is less than 300. In 2006 alone, more than 40 Indonesians succumbed to the H5N1 virus. In 2009, however, there were just 13 confirmed deaths from bird flu, the lowest number of fatalities since 2005. “The virus is still sometimes found in poultry and occasionally in humans, but now people already know how to react and respond to the problems,” Bayu said. He said the improved awareness was proof that the campaigns promoted by the government were working well, and that people were learning about how to prevent transmission and what to do in the event of an outbreak**.**

Growth Bad – Health – TB

Growth leads to globalization.

Garrett 6 (Geoffrey, Yale University Journal, 1-10, http://bev.berkeley.edu/ipe/readings/The%20 Causes%20of%20Globalization.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

Figures 2 and 3 show a strong correlation between the growth of international economic flows and the liberalization of foreign economic policies around the world. The correlation between global trade flows and (unweighted) average taxes on trade (revenues from tariffs, duties, etc. as a percentage of total trade) between 1973 and 1995 was –0.89. The reduction in tariff-type barriers was to some measure offset by increasing use of nontariff barriers—in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) at least (Garrett, 1998a, p. 811). Moreover, although trade taxes more than halved over the period, they still averaged 8% of total trade revenues in 1995. Nonetheless, the global trend line is surely indicative of the fact that global trade flows and trade liberalization around the world have moved in lock step in recent decades.

Globalization can spread drug-resistant TB.

TFAH 8 (Trust for America’s Health, Oct, http://healthyamericans.org/assets/files/GermsGoGlobal.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

The threats posed by XDR-TB garnered public attention in May 2007, when Andrew Speaker, a U.S. citizen with drug-resistant tuberculosis, led public health officials on a trans-Atlantic chase. The incident began when Speaker flew to Europe on a commercial airline for his wedding and honeymoon. He was aware that he had an active case of drug-resistant TB, but it was not until he was out of the U.S. that tests suggested he had XDR-TB. CDC officials tracked Speaker down in Rome and asked him to turn himself into Italian health officials. Instead, he and his wife flew commercially to Prague, then on to Montreal, and drove by car back into the U.S. Speaker claims he took these actions because CDC indicated that he would be held in Italian quarantine for up to 2 years. Out of concern that Speaker could have infected fellow travelers with the disease, health officials advised anyone who flew with him on the trans-Atlantic flights to be tested. Subsequently, Speaker was treated at the National Jewish Medical and Research Center in Denver, where it was announced that Speaker’s earlier diagnosis was incorrect and that he instead had the more treatable MDR-TB. CDC later confirmed this diagnosis. The incident raised serious questions about the effectiveness and timeliness of TB testing, U.S. border security, and the practicality of international restrictions on travel by people with infectious diseases. A Congressional investigation into the incident found significant security gaps, heightening concern about vulnerability to potential cases of pandemic influenza or smallpox.
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Growth spreads TB, AIDS, malaria, and cholera.

Fidler 96 (David P, Indiana University School of Law, April, http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/eid/vol2no2/ fidler.htm, 6-23-11, AH)

The assertion that emerging infections are a global problem requiring a global strategy echoes observations made in other spheres of public policy: the traditional distinctions between national and international political, social, and economic activities are losing their importance (4). Globalization is eroding traditional distinctions between domestic and foreign affairs. Globalization has been defined as the “process of denationalization of markets, laws, and politics in the sense of interlacing peoples and individuals for the sake of the common good” (5). Globalization is distinguished from internationalization, which is defined “as a means to enable nation-states to satisfy the national interest In areas where they are incapable of doing so on their own” (5). Internationalization involves cooperation between sovereign states, whereas globalization refers to a process that is undermining or eroding sovereignty. Globalization arises from the confluence of something old and something new in international relations. It involves the very old process of political and economic intercourse among sovereign states. The new element is the intensification and expansion of such intercourse made possibleby technological advances in travel, communications, and computers. Encouraging such intensification and expansion is liberal economic thinking, which posits that economic interdependence makes all states economically better off and builds order and peace in the international system (6). The changes wrought by new technologies unleashed in the receptive international milieu created by liberal trade and economic policies have led to the belief that these developments are undermining sovereignty. Observers of international relations frequently note that governments no longer have control over economic forces at work within their countries. The speed and volume of international capital flows illustrate the denationalization of economics occurring through the process of globalization (7). Another example is the development of the global company—an enterprise that can no longer be considered national because of the global reach of its operations, financing options, markets, and strategies (7). The globalization of finance and business has ramifications for politics and law as leaders and legal systems adapt to the global era (8). In public health, a similar combination of old and new factors can be seen. States have historically cooperated on infectious disease control, first through international sanitary treaties and later through the World Health Organization (WHO) (9). While international cooperation is not new, current global circumstances confronting the control of infectious disease are. Globalization is also at work in public health. The assertion that a country cannot tackle emerging infectious diseases by itself demonstrates that public health policy has been denationalized. Globalization has affected public health in three ways. First, the shrinking of the world by technology and economic interdependence allows diseases to spread globally at rapid speed. Two factors contributing to the global threat from emerging infections stem directly from globalization: the increase in international travel (2, 10) and the increasingly global nature of food handling, processing, and sales (2, 10). HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, cholera, and malaria represent a few infections that have spread to new regions through global travel and trade (10). The beneficial economic and political consequences of economic interdependence may have negative ramifications for disease control. In the European Union, for example, the free movement of goods, capital, and labor makes it more difficult for member states to protect domestic populations from diseases acquired in other countries (11). Second, the development of the global market has intensified economic competition and increased pressure on governments to reduce expenditures, including the funding of public health programs, leaving states increasingly unprepared to deal with emerging disease problems. Industrialized as well as developing countries confront deteriorating public health infrastructures (12). Referring to the United States, one author described this deterioration as the “thirdworldization” of the American health care system (13).

Extinction

Unruh 7 (Bob, World Net Daily Staff, 6-24, http://www.wnd.com/?pageId=42238, 6-23-11, AH)

The World Health Organization is appealing for billions of dollars in funding to avert the apocalypse en route if a virtually untreatable form of tuberculosis that already infects 30,000 people a year is left unchecked. The TB, called XDR-TB for extensively drug resistant, is virtually immune to currently available antibiotics, turning aside the effects of both front-line and secondary drugs, officials have said. It has been in the news of late because of an American airline passenger, Andrew Speaker, an Atlanta, Ga., lawyer, who was diagnosed, then traveled to Europe for his wedding, and returned, on commercial airliners, potentially exposing hundreds of people to the frequently fatal disease. He now is being treated at a special center in Denver that deals with cases of tuberculosis. "XDR-TB is a threat to the security and stability of global health. This response plan identifies costs, milestones and priorities for health services that will continue to have an impact beyond its two-year time line," said WHO Director-General Dr. Margaret Chan.
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Tuberculosis is coming under control.

CDC 10 (3-19, http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5910a2.htm, 6-23-11, AH)

Every year, CDC reports results from the National TB Surveillance System for the previous year. For 2009, a total of 11,540 tuberculosis (TB) cases were reported in the United States. The TB rate was 3.8 cases per 100,000 population, a decrease of 11.4% from the rate of 4.2 per 100,000 reported for 2008. The 2009 rate showed the greatest single-year decrease ever recorded and was the lowest recorded rate since national TB surveillance began in 1953 (1). TB case counts and rates decreased substantially among both foreign-born and U.S.-born persons, although foreign-born persons and racial/ethnic minorities continued to have TB disease disproportionate to their respective populations. The TB rate in foreign-born persons was nearly 11 times higher than in U.S.-born persons. The rates among Hispanics and blacks were approximately eight times higher than among non-Hispanic whites, and rates among Asians were nearly 26 times higher. The large decrease in reported cases during 2009 might represent a decrease in TB disease resulting from changes in population demographics or improved TB control. However, increased underreporting or underdiagnosis of TB also is possible. CDC currently is investigating possible causes for the sharp decrease in reported TB cases. Diagnosing and reporting all TB cases is essential to ensure treatment of patients with TB and implementation of other public health interventions that interrupt transmission.

Tuberculosis is at an all-time low.

Maugh 11 (Thomas H, 3-24, http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/24/news/la-heb-us-tb-03242011, 6-23-11, AH)

The number of tuberculosis cases in the United States reached an all-time low last year, with only 11,181 cases reported to public health authorities, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. That represented a 3.9% drop in the number of cases from the preceding year, but was a disappointment on two counts: the number of cases had dropped by 11.9% in 2009, and authorities had hoped a major decline would continue; and in 1989, health officials had set a goal of eradicating TB in the U.S. by 2010, a roadmark that was clearly not met.
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Growth spreads AIDS, TB, malaria, and cholera.

Fidler 96 (David P, Indiana University School of Law, April, http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/eid/vol2no2/ fidler.htm, 6-23-11, AH)

The assertion that emerging infections are a global problem requiring a global strategy echoes observations made in other spheres of public policy: the traditional distinctions between national and international political, social, and economic activities are losing their importance (4). Globalization is eroding traditional distinctions between domestic and foreign affairs. Globalization has been defined as the “process of denationalization of markets, laws, and politics in the sense of interlacing peoples and individuals for the sake of the common good” (5). Globalization is distinguished from internationalization, which is defined “as a means to enable nation-states to satisfy the national interest In areas where they are incapable of doing so on their own” (5). Internationalization involves cooperation between sovereign states, whereas globalization refers to a process that is undermining or eroding sovereignty. Globalization arises from the confluence of something old and something new in international relations. It involves the very old process of political and economic intercourse among sovereign states. The new element is the intensification and expansion of such intercourse made possibleby technological advances in travel, communications, and computers. Encouraging such intensification and expansion is liberal economic thinking, which posits that economic interdependence makes all states economically better off and builds order and peace in the international system (6). The changes wrought by new technologies unleashed in the receptive international milieu created by liberal trade and economic policies have led to the belief that these developments are undermining sovereignty. Observers of international relations frequently note that governments no longer have control over economic forces at work within their countries. The speed and volume of international capital flows illustrate the denationalization of economics occurring through the process of globalization (7). Another example is the development of the global company—an enterprise that can no longer be considered national because of the global reach of its operations, financing options, markets, and strategies (7). The globalization of finance and business has ramifications for politics and law as leaders and legal systems adapt to the global era (8). In public health, a similar combination of old and new factors can be seen. States have historically cooperated on infectious disease control, first through international sanitary treaties and later through the World Health Organization (WHO) (9). While international cooperation is not new, current global circumstances confronting the control of infectious disease are. Globalization is also at work in public health. The assertion that a country cannot tackle emerging infectious diseases by itself demonstrates that public health policy has been denationalized. Globalization has affected public health in three ways. First, the shrinking of the world by technology and economic interdependence allows diseases to spread globally at rapid speed. Two factors contributing to the global threat from emerging infections stem directly from globalization: the increase in international travel (2, 10) and the increasingly global nature of food handling, processing, and sales (2, 10). HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, cholera, and malaria represent a few infections that have spread to new regions through global travel and trade (10). The beneficial economic and political consequences of economic interdependence may have negative ramifications for disease control. In the European Union, for example, the free movement of goods, capital, and labor makes it more difficult for member states to protect domestic populations from diseases acquired in other countries (11). Second, the development of the global market has intensified economic competition and increased pressure on governments to reduce expenditures, including the funding of public health programs, leaving states increasingly unprepared to deal with emerging disease problems. Industrialized as well as developing countries confront deteriorating public health infrastructures (12). Referring to the United States, one author described this deterioration as the “thirdworldization” of the American health care system (13).

**AIDS will cause extinction.**

**KRQE News 2** (8-28, http://www.rense.com/general28/exc.htm, 6-23-11, AH)

 "We are faced with extinction," said Dr. Banu Khan, head of the National AIDS Co-ordinating Agency in Botswana. Swaziland will see an average of 33 years and Zimbabwe, Zambia and Namibia 34 years. Angola, Lesotho, Malawi, Rwanda and Mali will see life expectancy drop to the mid- to late 30s. Without AIDS, average life in southern Africa would have been around 70 years by 2010. The figures are the latest in a series that show Africa buckling under the growing AIDS epidemic. Sub-Saharan Africa has 28.5 million of the world's 40 million infected people. Stephen Lewis, Canada's former ambassador the United Nations, said Canada's response to the crisis has been "abysmal, wholly inadequate."
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AIDS and tuberculosis are under control; the initiative will pay for itself.

Henderson 10

(Mark, Science Editor for The Times, 2-22, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/ article7035256.ece, 6-22-11, AH)

The global Aids epidemic could be contained within just five years by testing everybody in high-risk regions and immediately treating all those who are found to be HIV positive, according to a leading scientist. Universal therapy with anti-retroviral drugs would not only save millions of lives but also prevent transmission of HIV by making people who carry the virus less infectious, said Brian Williams, of the South African Centre for Epidemiological Modelling and Analysis (Sacema). While such an initiative would be expensive at first, costing at least $3 billion (£2 billion) a year in South Africa alone, it would rapidly pay for itself by cutting the cost of caring for Aids patients and reducing the economic damage caused by Aids deaths, Dr Williams told the American Association for the Advancement of Science conference in San Diego. In the absence of a vaccine, an aggressive treatment programme is the first promising way of controlling a condition that affects 33 million people worldwide and kills 2.1 million every year, he said. It also has the potential to halve tuberculosis infections associated with HIV and Aids.

AIDS is under control, and cases of tuberculosis have decreased as well.

Ranieri 11 (Tina, Holistic Health Examiner, 6-10, http://www.examiner.com/holistic-health-in-national/aids-is-under-control-no-more-war, 6-22-11, AH)

A study, HIV Prevention Trial Network (HPTN) an international research project announced in May that it was being terminated, because it had succeeded. AIDS will be 30 years old this June 2011. The study, led by Myron Cohen of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. It will be 30 years since Centers of Disease Control and Prevention reported a cluster of unusual infections in Los Angeles. The war on AIDS has done well, Elizabeth Taylor would be proud. There are now several clear ways of attacking the problem. Anti-AIDS drugs have been made available to every one infected, universal access, which is an objective to be achieved by 2015 and getting every one to take them. About one in five stops taking them within a year. One result of the HPTN052 was less Tuberculosis, a disease that was a common consequence of AIDS. Circumcision trials have shown it is a good way to stop men from catching the virus by 50%. The rate of circumcision has skyrocketed in Africa. Attempts to protect women from developing vaginal microbicides that destroy HIV infected semen has been successful. There has been a well proven way of stopping virus transmission using drugs, between mothers and babies at birth, 90%.

Growth Bad – Health – Ebola

Growth leads to globalization.

Garrett 6 (Geoffrey, Yale University Journal, 1-10, http://bev.berkeley.edu/ipe/readings/The%20 Causes%20of%20Globalization.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

Figures 2 and 3 show a strong correlation between the growth of international economic flows and the liberalization of foreign economic policies around the world. The correlation between global trade flows and (unweighted) average taxes on trade (revenues from tariffs, duties, etc. as a percentage of total trade) between 1973 and 1995 was –0.89. The reduction in tariff-type barriers was to some measure offset by increasing use of nontariff barriers—in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) at least (Garrett, 1998a, p. 811). Moreover, although trade taxes more than halved over the period, they still averaged 8% of total trade revenues in 1995. Nonetheless, the global trend line is surely indicative of the fact that global trade flows and trade liberalization around the world have moved in lock step in recent decades.

**Globalization spreads ebola.**

**Mingst 7** (Karen A, Professor Ph.D at U of Kentucky, Essentials of International Relations, ch. 10, AH)

The international community was caught unawares by the new realities spawned by globalization. Ebola, SARS, Avian bird flu, and HIV/AIDS outbreaks have been acerbated by increased global mobility.

Ebola could wipe-out a huge percentage of humanity.

Chicago Tribune 94 (10-16, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1994-10-16/features/9410160231\_1 \_marburg-virus-ebola-hot-zone, 6-23-11, AH)

The answer you want to hear to the question posed by this story's headline is, of course, "No." But the best you'll get from Richard Preston, who knows a great deal about the brilliantly colored virus that benignly dots this page, is a halting, "Probably not. It is, however, likely that this could be a slate wiper. It could wipe out a vast portion of humanity." The virus is Ebola. It is named for a river in Zaire. It is almost unimaginably lethal. "Ebola kills 9 out of 10 people who contract it. And Ebola does in 10 days what it takes AIDS 10 years to accomplish," says Preston.

Ebola could mutate, risking extinction.

Boyd 2 (Robert, Herald Washington Bureau, 1-18, http://www.aegis.org/news/mh/2002/ MH020106.html, 6-23-11, AH)

They are responsible for a host of ailments ranging from pesky common colds to the devastating HIV epidemic and incurable killers like Ebola, again on the prowl in Africa. Unlike bacteria \_ much larger germs that can usually be controlled by antibiotics \_ most viruses cannot be defeated with existing medications. Antibiotics work only against living organisms, and viruses lack most of the features of life. They cannot move, eat or reproduce on their own, but must depend on the genes they steal from their unwilling host. In addition, viruses evolve rapidly. A new strain capable of causing a global epidemic, like the flu virus that killed 25 million people in 1918-19, could emerge at any moment, Crawford wrote in her recent book, "The Invisible Enemy: A Natural History of Viruses" (Oxford University Press, 2000). Some scientists even speculate that a future "doomsday virus" combining the worst features of smallpox and Ebola could wipe out the human race. Joshua Lederberg, a Nobel Prize-winning biologist at Rockefeller University in New York, has called viruses "the single biggest threat" to human life on the planet. "Barring what we do to one another, if anything is going to wipe out humankind, it will be a virus," Lederberg said.
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Ebola is currently under control

In2EastAfrica 11 (In2EastAfrica, 5-27, http://in2eastafrica.net/ebola-outbreak-under-control/, 6-22-11, AH)

The Ministry of Health has said the Ebola outbreak in the country is under control. The head of the Ebola national task force, Dr. Anthony Mbonye, said there has been no confirmed case since May 6 when the index case was reported. “The ministry assures the general public that the outbreak is under control as seen in the absence of new confirmed cases. The public is requested to report any suspected cases to the nearest health unit,” he said. The ministry said that a total of 21 people have been tested at the Uganda Virus Institute in Entebbe and all prove negative. Mbonye said in a statement that experts were monitoring the 25 people who got in contact with the first victim.
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Growth leads to globalization.

Garrett 6 (Geoffrey, Yale University Journal, 1-10, http://bev.berkeley.edu/ipe/readings/The%20 Causes%20of%20Globalization.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

Figures 2 and 3 show a strong correlation between the growth of international economic flows and the liberalization of foreign economic policies around the world. The correlation between global trade flows and (unweighted) average taxes on trade (revenues from tariffs, duties, etc. as a percentage of total trade) between 1973 and 1995 was –0.89. The reduction in tariff-type barriers was to some measure offset by increasing use of nontariff barriers—in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) at least (Garrett, 1998a, p. 811). Moreover, although trade taxes more than halved over the period, they still averaged 8% of total trade revenues in 1995. Nonetheless, the global trend line is surely indicative of the fact that global trade flows and trade liberalization around the world have moved in lock step in recent decades.

Globalization causes high infant mortality rates.

Desai 11 (Geeta, Organizational Development Consultant, 5-4, http://www.ifuw-forums.org/blog/2011/05/04/effects-of-globalization-on-women-in-developing-countries/, 6-23-11, AH)

However, the vast majority of women in all developing countries are worse off now than before. To illustrate: Structural Adjustment Programs have required governments to cutback on food and healthcare subsidies, increasing the burdens already shouldered by women and their families. Additionally, food security is threatened by free trade policies that dictate food be produced for trade rather than domestic consumption. Instead of reforming public healthcare and its delivery, globalization has resulted in the rapid privatization of healthcare and the decline of government facilities which serve poor women and their children. Without primary healthcare, diseases such as leprosy, malaria, measles, neonatal tetanus, polio, and tuberculosis are in evidence again. Also affecting women are high infant mortality rates and the rates of death during childbirth. But, by far the worst consequence of globalization is the uptick in human and sex- trafficking as thousands of women have gone missing while looking for much – needed employment far away from the safety nets of their families and communities.

Growth Bad – Health – Infant Mortality – UQ

Programs exist that are decreasing infant mortality rates.

WBALTV 9 (8-10, http://www.wbaltv.com/r/20349962/detail.html, 6-22-11, AH)

The number of infants who die in Baltimore city is down due in part to a government-funded program called Healthy Start. The 18-year-old program gives pregnant women access to health support systems before their babies are born. Since the program began, the infant mortality rate has dropped. "We are engrained in the community, and we hired folks from the community who know where hard-to-reach women are. They weave us into the fabric of the community, linking them to services to improve their birth outcomes," said Healthy Start spokeswoman Alma Roberts. Maryland Sen. Ben Cardin and Maryland Rep. Elijah Cummings toured the facility on Monday and praised the program for what it's accomplished. "We are engrained in the community, and we hired folks from the community who know where hard-to-reach women are. They weave us into the fabric of the community, linking them to services to improve their birth outcomes." - Alma Roberts, Healthy Start "Can we save money? Yes. Can we at the same time get better results and create healthier lives? Yes -- that's what this is all about. We're going to set an example," Cummings said. "They beat the odds here. The infant mortality rates are much better than the city at large. The number of children born with weigh where they can really be healthier has increased," Cardin said. Those who run the program said it works because they go out into the community. "We have health care professionals -- advocates who live in the community where we are. They see these moms every day … they have those relationships," said Healthy Start spokeswoman Natasha Rambert. "The counselors come out and they make sure you and your baby are doing well and that you're participating in your doctor's appointments," one mother said. The program has served more than 12,000 women and their babies since the program began.

Growth Bad – Health – Biotech

Growth leads to globalization.

Garrett 6 (Geoffrey, Yale University Journal, 1-10, http://bev.berkeley.edu/ipe/readings/The%20 Causes%20of%20Globalization.pdf, 6-23-11, AH)

Figures 2 and 3 show a strong correlation between the growth of international economic flows and the liberalization of foreign economic policies around the world. The correlation between global trade flows and (unweighted) average taxes on trade (revenues from tariffs, duties, etc. as a percentage of total trade) between 1973 and 1995 was –0.89. The reduction in tariff-type barriers was to some measure offset by increasing use of nontariff barriers—in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) at least (Garrett, 1998a, p. 811). Moreover, although trade taxes more than halved over the period, they still averaged 8% of total trade revenues in 1995. Nonetheless, the global trend line is surely indicative of the fact that global trade flows and trade liberalization around the world have moved in lock step in recent decades.

Globalization hurts ALL companies.

Financial Web No Date (http://www.finweb.com/investing/how-globalization-affects-u-s-companies.html, 6-23-11, AH)

U.S. companies that import raw materials or goods from overseas are exposed to the risk that the U.S. dollar will decline. If it does, the cost of the imported goods will rise when valued in terms of the dollar. U.S. companies that export raw materials or goods overseas are exposed to the risk that the dollar may increase in value. If the dollar gets stronger, the revenue that the company generates in other currencies will, in turn, buy fewer dollars. U.S. companies that have overseas operations are exposed to the risk that either the dollar will strengthen or weaken, depending upon whether they're making overseas investments or bringing profits back home. If the company is investing overseas, the risk is that of a declining dollar. If repatriating its profits, the company would prefer not to see a strengthening dollar. Take a look at the following situation: An American company enters into a contract to build a new manufacturing plant in France. It will take a full three years to complete the plant, bring it online, and have it become profitable. During those three years, the U.S. company will be converting dollars into francs, and will be exposed to the risk that the dollar will decline, thereby buying fewer francs. After the plant becomes profitable, the company will be converting francs into dollars and the risk will be that the dollar will get stronger (less dollars bought by the francs). Even United States companies that don't import, export, or have overseas operations – but only have foreign competitors – are often exposed to FX risk. Let's examine the scenario of an American company that is not engaged nor has any interest in importing or exporting goods; all of their products are sold in the U.S. A foreign competitor, however, does have an interest in doing business internationally. For instance, if the dollar were to rise sharply against the foreign company's home currency, it would be able to charge less dollars for its goods sold in America while still maintaining its profit margin. This is because the company's expenses are denominated in its reference currency – which the strengthened dollar would now buy more of. As such, the viability of the U.S. company could be threatened by the FX risk. The changing value of the United States dollar affects virtually every American company to one degree or another. Therefore, even U.S. investors who restrict themselves to buying only domestic investments need to be aware of how changing FX rates affect their portfolios. In order to do this, investors should understand some of the reasons that foreign exchange rates change.

Biotech companies prevent extinction.

**Ewens 00** (Lara E, Boston College Law School, 9-21, http://www.bc.edu/bc\_org/avp/law/lwsch/ journals/bciclr/23\_2/05\_FMS.htm, 6-23-11, AH)

Note, however, that although biotechnology cannot create genetic traits after the loss of a species, it can help prevent extinction by numerically increasing failing species or inserting greater disease resistance into endangered plant species.

Growth Bad – Health – Biotech – UQ

Biotech companies are receiving funding now.

Florida’s RC 10 (Florida’s Research Coast, 11-8, http://www.floridarc.com/index.php?src=news&srctype=detail&category=Floridas%20Research%20Coast%20News&refno=129, 6-22-11, AH)

More than 75 Florida firms were awarded more than $26 million in federal tax credits or grants for research and development of new products with promise to significantly advance healthcare in the country, BioFlorida announced this week. The federal credits or grants are designed for projects that show significant potential to produce new cost-saving therapies, create U.S. jobs, increase the country's competitiveness or significantly advance the goal of curing cancer within the next 30 years. The program was created as part of the national healthcare overhaul. The credit or grant can cover up to 50 percent of the cost of biomedical research expenses that qualify. The maximum credit is $5 million per firm, and $1 billion for the program nationwide. Only firms with 250 or fewer employees were eligible to apply for credits or grants to put toward 2009 and 2010 investments. The U.S. Treasury Department reported it received more than 5,600 applications requesting more than $10 billion. `This is a great way to help young innovative companies through these tough economic times, and we will continue to support efforts to expand and extend the therapeutic tax credit program in Congress,'' said Russell Allen, president and chief executive officer of BioFlorida.

Growth Bad – Terrorism

Growth creates terrorists – empirically proven – all the big guns are loaded

Radu 9 (Michael is a senior fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute Ph.D.,), The futile search for “root causes” of Terrorism, 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.

Terrorism will escalate into extinction

Morgan 9 (Dennis, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin Campus - South Korea Futures, Volume 41, Issue 10, December 2009, Pages 683-693, World on Fire) LL

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” 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 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” 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.

Growth Bad – A2: Growth = Heg

**The global financial crisis has destabilized counter-balancers and made US hegemony sustainable**

**Mead 9** (Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2/4, www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/2169866/posts, AD: 6/20/10) jl

**Even before the Panic of 2008 sent financial markets into turmoil** and launched what looks like the worst global recession in decades, **talk of American decline was omnipresent. In the long term, the United States faces the rise of Asia and the looming fiscal problems posed by** Medicare and other **entitlement programs**. In the short term, there is a sense that, **after eight years of** George W. **Bush, the world, full of disdain for our way of life, seems to be spinning out of** our--and perhaps anybody's--**control**. The financial panic simply brought all that simmering anxiety to a boil, and **the consensus now seems to be that the United States isn't just in danger of decline, but in the full throes of it--the beginning of a "post-American" world.** Perhaps--but the long history of **capitalism suggests another possibility**. After all, capitalism has seen a steady procession of economic crises and panics, from the seventeenth-century Tulip Bubble in the Netherlands and the Stop of the Exchequer under Charles II in England through the Mississippi and South Sea bubbles of the early eighteenth century, on through the crises associated with the Napoleonic wars and the spectacular economic crashes that repeatedly wrought havoc and devastation to millions throughout the nineteenth century. The panics of 1837, 1857, 1873, 1893, and 1907 were especially severe, culminating in the Great Crash of 1929, which set off a depression that would not end until World War II. The series of crises continued after the war, and the last generation has seen the Penn Central bankruptcy in 1970, the first Arab oil crisis of 1973, the Third World debt crisis of 1982, the S&L crisis, the Asian crisis of 1997, the bursting of the dot-com bubble in 2001, and today's global financial meltdown. And yet, this relentless series of crises has not disrupted the rise of a global capitalist system, centered first on the power of the United Kingdom and then, since World War II, on the power of the United States. After more than 300 years, **it seems reasonable to conclude that financial and economic crises do not, by themselves, threaten either the international capitalist system or the special role within it** of leading capitalist powers like the United Kingdom and the United States. If anything, **the opposite seems true**--that **financial crises in some way sustain Anglophone power and capitalist development.** Indeed, **many critics of both capitalism and the "Anglo-Saxons**" who practice it so aggressively **have pointed to what seems to be a perverse relationship between such crises and the consolidation of the "core" capitalist economies against the impoverished periphery**. Marx noted that **financial crises remorselessly crushed weaker companies, allowing the most successful and ruthless capitalists to cement their domination** of the system. For dependency theorists like Raul Prebisch, **crises served a similar function in the international system, helping stronger countries marginalize and impoverish developing ones.** Setting aside the flaws in both these overarching theories of capitalism, this analysis of economic crises is fundamentally sound--and especially relevant to the current meltdown. Cataloguing the early losses from the financial crisis, **it's hard not to conclude that the central capitalist nations will weather the storm far better than those not so central. Emerging markets have been hit harder by the financial crisis than developed ones as investors around the world seek the safe haven provided by U.S. Treasury bills, and commodity-producing economies have suffered extraordinary shocks as commodity prices crashed from their record, boom-time highs. Countries like Russia, Venezuela, and Iran, which hoped to use oil revenue to mount a serious political challenge to American power and the existing world order, face serious new constraints**. Vladimir Putin, Hugo Chavez, **and** Mahmoud Ahmadinejad **must now spend less time planning big international moves and think a little bit harder about domestic stability. Far from being the last nail in America's coffin, the financial crisis may actually resuscitate U.S. power relative to its rivals**

Growth Bad – A2: Growth = Heg

**Economic difficulties are absorbed by awesome hegemonic production – even recessions won’t cause concern**

**Stratfor 8** [“Net Assessment: United States.” Dec 2007 – Jan 2008. http://www.stratfor.com/analysis/net\_assessment\_united\_states]

One must always remember the U.S. GDP — $13.2 trillion — in measuring any number. Both the annual debt and the total national debt must be viewed against this number, as well as the more troubling trade deficit. The $13.2 trillion can absorb damage and imbalances that smaller economies could not handle. We would expect a recession in the next couple of years simply based on the time since the last period of negative growth, but we tend to think that it is not quite here yet. But, even if it were, it would simply be a normal part of the business cycle, of no significant concern.

**Economic crises are universal – won’t impact US leadership**

**Freedman, ‘9**. Lawrence, Prof of war studies @ King’s College London. “A Subversive on the Hill,” The National Interest, May-June, Lexis.

It is at the regional level rather than the global level that the American position might become vulnerable. The current crisis may well produce great turbulence in particular countries or groups of countries at a time when the United States feels it has enough on its plate internationally and is in an introspective mood because of the severity of its own economic challenges. Yet, contrary to early expectations, **the economic crisis has not in itself led to a shifting of power balances.** When the crisis was assumed to be largely financial in nature, so that the United States and the United Kingdom would suffer most, **a shift to** the surging economy of **China was anticipated**. Continental Europe could look on smugly and the oil producers would continue to benefit from high prices. **The collapse of world trade, and subsequently the price of oil, soon made these judgments look premature. Indeed, the shock may be greater for countries with no relevant experience of the business cycle or else**, as with the oil producers, **burdened with ambitious plans based on the always-dangerous assumption that the recent past describes an indefinite future. The crisis is pulling everyone down: for the moment, at least, there are no clear winners.** If the United States was the only country held back because of its economic difficulties then others might well take advantage of perceived American weakness. But in this case, **with everyone struggling** to confront big domestic issues, **the United States is unlikely to face major challengers**. When a state is forced to dedicate resources to internal problems, it has its own incentives to keep external relations calm. True, unforeseen crises can upset all calculations, but **shared weakness may give the Obama administration some relief in terms of how it might be tested**. It is already committed to addressing these various regional conflicts with a greater reliance on diplomatic means than the Bush administration, a sign that new military conflicts are unlikely.

Growth Bad – Poverty

Growth increases poverty and hurts health

Jacobs and Podobny 7 (IA and MT, Universal Corporation: Alpha and Beta Division (Australia) and Australian Red Cross: Blood Service, Australia, University of South Australia, Australia, Do all benefit from economic growth?, http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470, 3/21/07, AD: 7/6/09) JC

Whilst, economic growth has the potential to reduce poverty, history records that not all American citizens have necessarily benefited from ‘economic growth reducing poverty by the elevation of real incomes’.[20](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B20) Yates had identified that for American working class persons, real hourly wages were lower in the 1990s than in 1970s[25](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B25) and that between 1977 and 1990 the real family income fell for the poorest 60% of all families but increased by a third for the wealthiest 20% of families.[26](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B26) These figures are more recently supported by Dooley and Prause who reveal that American males in the 25th percentile earned less in real terms in 1997 (a year of supposedly ‘good’ economic times) than their 25th percentile peers did in 1967 (p. 3).[27](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B27) To further illustrate that employment need not contribute to poverty reduction for all members of society, thereby better health for all, [Figure 1](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#F1) illustrates the annual income of a full-time worker in America, single with two qualifying children, working at minimum wages and receipt of Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) from 1970 till 2004.[28](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B28) From this graph it is evident that although working on a full-time basis, such families have not been able to maintain living above the poverty level, even after receiving the EITC. This reinforces findings by others[27,](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B27)[29](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B29) that not all individuals in societies necessarily benefit from economic development, hence not all are able to benefit from ‘economic status improvement’ as a result of (official) economic growth, consequently such subpopulations would not experience better health (lower morbidity and mortality rates) as implied by Brenner (p. 1215).[20](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B20) Given that not all members of society necessarily benefit from economic growth, it is not surprising that there is widening in life expectancy between socioeconomic groups in US,[30,](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B30)[31](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B31) which reconciles the vast literature on socioeconomic status[23,](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B23)[32,](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B32)[33](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B33) and supports Wilkinson's[34](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B34) observation that ‘among the rich developed countries, health is indeed related to relative rather than absolute income, and that, as a consequence, health may not be strongly related to economic growth’ (p. 257). As a result of such environmental factors operating in most western countries, and given that inadequately employed workers may reflect similar health outcomes as the unemployed,[35](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B35) future health-economy research should consider utilizing more comprehensive labour market measures.

Growth Bad – Poverty

Alternate causalities to poverty

Fane and Warr 2 (Geroge and Peter, Australian National University, How Economic Growth Reduces Poverty, http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/wap02/wap02.pdf, WIDER, Discussion Paper No. 2002/19, Feb 2002, AD: 7/6/09)

The results and methodology reported here suggest that large oversimplifications are involved in relating poverty reduction directly to GDP growth, without distinguishing among different possible sources of growth. Contrary to the implicit assumptions of many commentators, the poor do much better if a given amount of GDP growth is produced by technical progress in services, or manufacturing, than if it is due to technical progress in agriculture. Although more work needs to be done to improve on the parameter values assumed in this study, these qualitative results are robust with respect to wide variations in assumptions about elasticities of substitution among goods and factors. The results also imply that growth in broad sectors—agriculture, manufacturing, services, etc.—will be associated with very different effects on poverty and inequality depending on whether the exogenous shocks affect demand or supply. For example, an increase in the supply of factors used intensively in agriculture depresses the real returns to these factors while raising agricultural output; whereas an increase in demand for agricultural products, perhaps due to policy changes, would raise both agricultural output and the real returns to the factors used intensively in agriculture.

Growth is not the only factor to poverty

Madan 2 (Anisha, Financial analyst for GE and MBA at Kellogg School, Northwestern University, The Relationship between Economic Freedom and Socio – Economic Development, http://www.econ.ilstu.edu/uauje/PDF's/CarrolRound/madanpost.pdf, UAUJE, pg 8-10, 2002, AD: 7/6/09)

There is a vast amount of literature and studies performed that show that economic growth is not the end-all and be-all of economic development. Focus needs to be on social indicators that depict the quality of life of people. The Basic Needs approach to development formulated by Paul Streeten attempts to provide opportunities for the full physical, mental, and social development of the human personality and then derives ways of meeting this objective. The emphasis is on ends rather than means and non-material needs are recognized. (Streeten, 1981). Thus, mere economic growth rates cannot be a proxy for the quality of life and cannot indicate that basic needs are met. This is explained as follows: (1) The income or economic growth approach to measuring human progress deals only with the quantity of products but not with the appropriateness of those goods and services. (2) Some basic needs can only be satisfied, or more effectively satisfied through public services (education, water, and sanitation), through subsidized goods and services, or through transfer payments. (3) Consumers, both poor and rich are not always efficient in optimizing nutrition and health. Additional income can be spent on foods with lower nutritional value leading to a decrease in health. (4) The manner in which additional income is earned may affect the quality of life adversely. Compared to others, certain production choices can increase income more but have a greater negative impact on human and environmental well being. One example of this is female employment. Although the mother's income can rise, breast-feeding may reduce, which decreases the nutrition of babies. (5) Increased income does not guarantee a reduction in the mal-distribution of wealth within society or households. Therefore, the Basic Needs Approach shows that the economic growth approach neglects the importance of non-material needs and ignores the significance of socio-economic development.

Growth Bad – Poverty – Structural Violence

Growth leads to structural violence that outweighs nuclear war

Abu-Jamal 98 (Mumia, activist, 9-19, http://www.flashpoints.net/mQuietDeadlyViolence.html)

We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural' violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; By "structural violence" I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting "structural" with "behavioral violence" by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. --(Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it--really? Gilligan notes: [E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world.

Growth Bad – Famine

**Growth puts tremendous strain on arable land.**

First Fruit 99 (charity organization for developing countries, http://www.firstfruit.org/news-resources/guiding\_trends/five-undercurrents accessed 6/22/11)

By 2015 nearly half the world's population will live in countries that are “water-stressed” – mostly in Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, and northern China. Despite the overall adequacy of food, problems of distribution, availability and price will remain. Large-scale migrations and conflicts will be among the consequences. The depletion of basic resources will reach crisis levels among the poor in areas where population is dense, growth rates are rapid, food security is threatened, and/or water supply is stressed. Increasingly intense land use will cause significant degradation of arable land and loss of tropical forests. Global economic growth and population increases, particularly in developing countries, will drive a 35 – 45 percent increase in demand for energy by 2030. Air quality will continue to deteriorate in burgeoning urban areas, which, along with other forms of pollution, will exacerbate community health issues. Calls to the international community to take action against a warming climate will mount.

**Growth promotes fertilizers over land degradation.**

Esposito 11 (Anthony, Market Watch, <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/chile-sqms-q1-net-profit-jumps-46-year-on-year-2011-05-24> 5/24/11 accessed 6/22/11 JF)

**Improved global economic growth and a growing world population, which strain resources such as arable land and water availability, have fueled demand for fertilizer and specialty-chemical products."** Robust demand in all of our business lines supported the solid earnings performance in the first quarter of 2011**. Strong fertilizer market conditions drove growth in our specialty plant nutrition business line, and better pricing conditions** in potash markets sustained our fertilizer business lines," said SQM's chief executive officer, Patricio Contesse.

Land key to food supply

UNSC 7 (UN Social Council, “Africa Review Report on Drought and Desertification” Pg. 7-8 accessed 6/22/11)

25. It is common knowledge that land degradation and desertification constitutes major causes of forced human migration and environmental refugees, deadly conflicts over the use of dwindling natural resources, food insecurity and starvation, destruction of critical habitats and loss of biological diversity, socio-economic instability and poverty and climatic variability through reduced carbon sequestration potential. The impacts of drought and desertification are among the most costly events and processes in Africa. The widespread poverty, the fact that a large share of Africa’s economies depend on climatesensitive sectors mainly rain fed agriculture, poor infrastructure, heavy disease burdens, high dependence on and unsustainable exploitation of natural resources, and conflicts render the continent especially vulnerable to impacts of drought and desertification. The consequences are mostly borne by the poorest people and the Small Island Developing States (SIDS). In the region, women and children in particular, bear the greatest burden when land resources are degraded and when drought sets in. As result of the frequent droughts and desertification, Africa has continued to witness food insecurity including devastating famines, water scarcity, poor health, economic hardship and social and political unrest.32 The gravity of drought and desertification impacts in the region is demonstrated by the following examples.

Growth Bad – Democracy

Economic growth kill democracy

Harms and Ursprung, 1 (Philpp and Heinrich, University of Konstanz, “Do Civil and political repression really boost foreign direct investments?” Pg. 1-3 May, accessed 6/22/11 JF)

The globalization of the economy is an issue which continues to attract a great deal of attention in the political arena. The exchange of opinion, unfortunately, quite often does not follow civilized patterns but is articulated in street riots. The third ministerial conference of the World Trade Organization in November/December 1999, for example, gave rise to the by now legendary “battle of Seattle” and the 55th Annual Meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank Group which took place in September 2000 in Prague was also accompanied by violent demonstrations.

The arguments of the demonstrating opponents of economic globalization, be they peaceful or violent, appear to follow a standard pattern. One of the groups demonstrating in Prague, for example, described its objectives as follows: “We will be exposing the links between the IMF/WB, the WTO and transnational corporations and the ways how they work to maximize private profits and limit the power of people to protect the environment, determine their economic destiny, and safeguard their human rights. Our goal is to give the proper name to what the policies of the IMF/WB really cause in the South as well as in the Central and Eastern Europe. We will be demanding an immediate suspension of these practices leading to environmental destruction, growing social inequality and poverty and curtailing of peoples rights.” In short, globalization is interpreted as a devious maneuver undertaken by multinational firms who, on the one hand, relocate production in order to undermine the tax and regulation policies of democratic nation states and, on the other hand, exploit the politically and economically repressed workers in third world autocracies: “Essentially, the WTO, and the “new” Global Economy, hurt the environment, exploit workers, and disregard civil society’s concerns. The only beneficiaries of globalization are the largest, richest, multi-national corporations.”

It would be wrong to denigrate these statements as mere battle cries of street fighters because similar patterns of argumentation can be found in the extensive popular literature on globalization. The reproach that multinational enterprises have a special liking for autocratic countries in which workers are not allowed to organize themselves with the restul that the wage rates do not reflect their productivity, can be found, for example, in William Greider’s 1998 bestseller One World, Ready or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism. Greider in particular argues against the hypothesis that FDI may have a liberalizing effect in these countries: “The promise of a democratic evolution requires skepticism if the theory is being promoted by economic players who actually benefit from the opposite condition --the enterprises doing business in low-cost labor markets where the absence of democratic rights makes it much easier to suppress wages. A corporation that has made strategic investments based on the cost advantages offered by repressive societies can hardly be expected to advocate their abolition” (p. 38). Greider understands, of course, that FDI decisions are influenced by balancing labor cost advantages against losses of labor productivity. However, he writes in this context: “The general presumption that low cost workers in backward countries were crudely unproductive was simply not true. In fact, dollar for dollar, the cheaper workers often represented a better buy for employers than the more skillful workers who were replaced. Their productivity was lower but it was also improved rapidly – much faster than their wages. In order to attract foreign capital, their governments often made certain this was the case” (P. 74).3

Democracy solves several scenarios for extinction.

Diamond, ‘95 (Larry, Prof @ Stanford University, Promoting Democracy in the 1990’s”)

The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically “cleanse” their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

\*\*De-Dev Good\*\*

De-Dev Good – Transition Solvency

The unsustainable nature of the growth economy causes the transition

**Trainer 10** (Ted, Senior Lecturer @ U of New South Wales, “The Transition to a Just and Sustainable World” http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/TheTransitionProcess.html accessed 6/22/11 JF)

Consumer-capitalist society is grossly unsustainable and unjust. We are far beyond levels of production and consumption that can be kept up or spread to all. In addition consumer-capitalist society provides a few with high “living standards” by delivering to them far more than their fair share of world resources. Technical advance cannot solve the problems; they cannot be fixed in or by consumer-capitalist society. There must be dramatic reductions in levels of economic output, and therefore there must be radical and extreme system change. (For the detail see Part 1 of http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/02c-TSW-14p.html) There must be transition to The Simpler Way, involving simpler lifestyles, high levels of local economic self-sufficiency, highly cooperative and participatory arrangements, an almost totally new economic system (one that is not driven by market forces or profit, and one that has no growth), and fundamental value change. Many realise a sustainable and just society must be mostly made up of small local economies in which people participate collectively to run their economies to meet needs using local resources, and in which the goal is a high quality of life and not monetary wealth. This is a largely Anarchist vision and the coming conditions of scarcity will give us no choice about this. Big, centralised authoritarian systems will not work. (For more detail see Part 2 of the account at the above site.) The conditions we are entering, the era of scarcity, rule out most previous thinking about the good society and social transition. The good society cannot be affluent, highly industrialised, centralised or globalised, and we cannot get to it by violent revolution led by a vanguard party. Governments cannot make the transition for us, if only because there will be too few resources for governments to run the many local systems needed. The new local societies can only be made to work by the willing effort of local people who understand why The Simpler Way is necessary and who want to live that way and who find it rewarding. Only they know the local conditions and social situation and only they can develop the arrangements, networks, trust, cooperative climate etc. that suit them. The producing, maintaining and administering will have to be carried out by them and things can’t work unless people are eager to cooperate, discuss, turn up to working bees, and be conscientious, and unless they have the required vision. A central government could not provide or impose these conditions even if it had the resources. It must be developed, learned by us as we grope our way towards taking control of self-sufficient local economies. We do not have to get rid of consumer-capitalist society before we can begin to build the new society. Fighting directly against the system is not going to contribute much to fundamental change at this point in time. (It is at times necessary to fight against immediate threats.) The consumer-capitalist system has never been stronger than it is today. The way we think we can beat it in the long run is to ignore it to death, i.e., to turn away from it as much as is possible and to start building its replacement and persuading people to come across. The Anarchists provide the most important ideas, especially that of working to “Prefigure” the good society here and now, and focusing on development of the required vision in more and more people.

De-Dev Good – Transition Solvency

And de-development is gaining momentum—a complete economic collapse is key to finish the transition

Trainer 8 (Ted, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, [http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

Although a minor phenomenon at present, it can be confidently predicted that this paradigm shift will accelerate in coming years given the pace at which the globalisaztion of the economy will make it painfully obvious to more and more people that the old values and systems will not provide well for all. Building new systems. Much more impressive than the evidence of a change in world view is the growth of alternative settlements and systems. As Ife says, "At the grassroots level...increasing numbers of people in different countries are experimenting with community-based alternatives, such as local economic systems, community-based education, housing co-operatives...a community-based strategy based on principles of ecology and social justice is already emerging, as a result of the initiative of ordinary people at grass-roots level, who are turning away from mainstream structures..." (Ife, 1995, p. 99.) According to Norberg-Hodge, "Around the world, people are building communities that attempt to get away from the waste, pollution, competition, and violence of contemporary life. (Norberg-Hodge, 1996, p. 405.) The agency she has founded, the International Society for Ecology and Culture, works in Ladakh to reinforce local economies and its video Local Futures, is an inspiring illustration of what is being done in many parts of the world. The New Economic Foundation in London works to promote local economic development, with a special interest in bujilding local quality of life indicators and in establishing local currencies. Schroyer"s book Towards a World That Works (1997) documents many alternative community initiatives. "Everywhere people are waking up to the realities of their situation in a globalising economy and are beginning to recognise that their economies’ resources and socio-political participations must be regrounded in their local and regional communities." (p. 225) "Everywhere social and economic structures are re-emerging in the midst of the market system that are spontaneously generated social protections to normatively re-embed the market..." "It is no exaggeration to say that local communities everywhere are on the front lines of what might well be characterised as World War III." (p. 229.) "It is a contest between the competing goals of economic growth to maximise profits for absentee owners vs creating healthy communities that are good places for people to live." (p. 230.) "In Britain, over 1.5 million people now take regular part in a rainbow economy of community economic initiatives." (New Internationalist, 1996, p. 27.) Friberg and Hettne (1985) argue that two main groups are behind the emergence of self reliant communities, viz., those holding "post materialist" values, and those who have been marginalised, such as the unemployed and the Third World poor. In Living Lightly Schwarz and Schwarz discuss the many alternative settlements they visited on a recent world tour. They say that these people "...hope that the tiny islands of better living which they inhabit will provide examples which will eventually supplant the norms of unfettered capitalism which rule us today. Their hope is not in revolution but in persuasion by example." ( p. 2.) "What is new is that small groups of Living Lightly people are now part of an articulate and increasingly purposeful global culture which promotes values that run counter to those of the mainstream." (p. 2.) "They think the empire will eventually disintegrate...In anticipation of that collapse islands of refuge must be prepared." (p. 3.) Living Lightly people "...can only hope to prevail through their own example and the gradual erosion of the dominant system through local initiatives that exchange high living standards for a high quality of life." (p. 165.) Living Lightly people "...are in revolt against the emerging global economy and want to set up viable local alternatives." (p. 150.)

De-Dev Good – Transition Now Key

Economic collapse is inevitable – further delay destroys the biosphere and ensures that the future collapse causes extinction

Barry 8 (Glen, Ph.D. in "Land Resources" from the U of Wisconsin-Madison, Jan 12, [earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2008/01/economic-collapse-and-global-ecology.html] AD: 6-22-11, jam)

Given widespread failure to pursue policies sufficient to reverse deterioration of the biosphere and avoid ecological collapse, the best we can hope for may be that the growth-based economic system crashes sooner rather than later Humanity and the Earth are faced with an enormous conundrum -- sufficient climate policies enjoy political support only in times of rapid economic growth. Yet this growth is the primary factor driving greenhouse gas emissions and other environmental ills. The growth machine has pushed the planet well beyond its ecological carrying capacity, and unless constrained, can only lead to human extinction and an end to complex life. With every economic downturn, like the one now looming in the United States, it becomes more difficult and less likely that policy sufficient to ensure global ecological sustainability will be embraced. This essay explores the possibility that from a biocentric viewpoint of needs for long-term global ecological, economic and social sustainability; it would be better for the economic collapse to come now rather than later. Economic growth is a deadly disease upon the Earth, with capitalism as its most virulent strain. Throw-away consumption and explosive population growth are made possible by using up fossil fuels and destroying ecosystems. Holiday shopping numbers are covered by media in the same breath as Arctic ice melt, ignoring their deep connection. Exponential economic growth destroys ecosystems and pushes the biosphere closer to failure. Humanity has proven itself unwilling and unable to address climate change and other environmental threats with necessary haste and ambition. Action on coal, forests, population, renewable energy and emission reductions could be taken now at net benefit to the economy. Yet, the losers -- primarily fossil fuel industries and their bought oligarchy -- successfully resist futures not dependent upon their deadly products. Perpetual economic growth, and necessary climate and other ecological policies, are fundamentally incompatible. Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon establishing a steady state economy, whereby production is right-sized to not diminish natural capital. Whole industries like coal and natural forest logging will be eliminated even as new opportunities emerge in solar energy and environmental restoration. This critical transition to both economic and ecological sustainability is simply not happening on any scale. The challenge is how to carry out necessary environmental policies even as economic growth ends and consumption plunges. The natural response is going to be liquidation of even more life-giving ecosystems, and jettisoning of climate policies, to vainly try to maintain high growth and personal consumption. We know that humanity must reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% over coming decades. How will this and other necessary climate mitigation strategies be maintained during years of economic downturns, resource wars, reasonable demands for equitable consumption, and frankly, the weather being more pleasant in some places? If efforts to reduce emissions and move to a steady state economy fail; the collapse of ecological, economic and social systems is assured. Bright greens take the continued existence of a habitable Earth with viable, sustainable populations of all species including humans as the ultimate truth and the meaning of life. Whether this is possible in a time of economic collapse is crucially dependent upon whether enough ecosystems and resources remain post collapse to allow humanity to recover and reconstitute sustainable, relocalized societies. It may be better for the Earth and humanity's future that economic collapse comes sooner rather than later, while more ecosystems and opportunities to return to nature's fold exist. Economic collapse will be deeply wrenching -- part Great Depression, part African famine. There will be starvation and civil strife, and a long period of suffering and turmoil. Many will be killed as balance returns to the Earth. Most people have forgotten how to grow food and that their identity is more than what they own. Yet there is some justice, in that those who have lived most lightly upon the land will have an easier time of it, even as those super-consumers living in massive cities finally learn where their food comes from and that ecology is the meaning of life. Economic collapse now means humanity and the Earth ultimately survive to prosper again. Human suffering -- already the norm for many, but hitting the currently materially affluent -- is inevitable given the degree to which the planet's carrying capacity has been exceeded. We are a couple decades at most away from societal strife of a much greater magnitude as the Earth's biosphere fails. Humanity can take the bitter medicine now, and recover while emerging better for it; or our total collapse can be a final, fatal death swoon.

De-Dev Good – Transition Now Key

It’s linear—the longer we wait, the worse it will be

Barry 10 (Glen, Ph.D. in "Land Resources" from the U of Wisconsin-Madison, Jan 7, [www.australia.to/2010/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=308:resisting-global-ecological-change&catid=69:reports&Itemid=272] 6-23-11, jam)

The human family faces imminent and (Copenhagen would suggest) inevitable collapse of the biosphere – the thin layer of life upon an otherwise lifeless planet – that makes Earth habitable. Marshes and rivers and forests and fish are far more than resources – they and all natural ecosystems are a necessity for humanity’s existence upon Earth. A few centuries of historically unprecedented explosion in human numbers and surging, albeit inequitable, consumption and resultant resource use, ecosystem destruction and pollution; is needlessly destroying being for all living things. Revolutionary action such as ending coal use, reforming industrial agriculture and protecting and restoring old forests and other natural ecosystems, is a requirement for the continuation of shared human being. Earth is threatened by far more than a changing atmosphere causing climate change. Cumulative ecosystem destruction – not only in climate, but also water, forests, oceans, farmland, soils and toxics -- in the name of “progress” and “development” -- threatens each of us, our families and communities, as well as the Earth System in total and all her creatures. Any chance of achieving global ecological sustainability depends urgently upon shifting concerns regarding climate change to more sufficiently transform ourselves and society to more broadly resist global ecological change. Global ecological, social and economic collapse may be inevitable, but its severity, duration and likelihood of recovery are being determined by us now. It does not look good as the environmental movement has been lacking in its overall vision, ambition and implementation. The growing numbers of ecologically literate global citizens must come forward to together start considering ecologically sufficient emergency measures to protect and restore global ecosystems. We need a plan that allows humans and as many other species as possible to survive the coming great ecological collapse, even as we work to soften the collapse, and to restore to the extent practicable the Earth’s ecosystems. This mandates full protection for all remaining large natural ecosystems and working to reconnect and enlarge biologically rich smaller remnants that still exist. It is time for a hard radical turn back to a fully functioning and restored natural Earth which will require again regaining our bond with land (and air, water and oceans), powering down our energy profligacy, and taking whatever measures are necessary to once again bring society into balance with ecosystems. This may mean taking all measures necessary to stop those known to be destroying ecosystems for profit. As governments dither and the elite profit, it has become dreadfully apparent that the political, economic and social structures necessary to stop human ecocide of our and all life’s habitats does not yet exist. The three hundred year old hyper-capitalistic and nationalistic growth machine eating ecosystems is not going to willingly stop growing. But unless it does, human and most or all other life will suffer a slow and excruciating apocalyptic death. Actions can be taken now to soften ecological collapse while maximizing the likelihood that a humane and ecologically whole Earth remains to be renewed.

De-Dev Good – Transition Now Key

Transition now is best – prevents nuclear resource wars and causes a mindset shift that preserves value to life

Djordjevic 98 (Johnny, BA Global Econ, Paper in Global Sustainability @ UC, Irvine, March, [www.dbc.uci.edu/sustain/global/sensem/djordj98.html] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

The threat of nuclear war and international conflict rises with countries of all kinds entranced with the logic and idea of materialism. Perhaps the most dangerous and likely chances for a nuclear conflict arise from the competition for dwindling resources by developed countries. Similar events can be seen all across the globe. Major superpowers get themselves involved in domestic matters not concerning them, providing arms and advice to try and obtain the inside track on possible resources. International tension will rise in the competition for resources and so will the "ever-increasing probability of nuclear war"(Trainer, 1985). As developed countries pursue affluence they fail to see the inherent contradiction in this idea; as growth is the quest, the quality of life will decrease. For a healthy community, there exists a list of non-material conditions which must be present, "a sense of purpose, fulfilling work and leisure, supportive social relations, peace of mind, security from theft and violence, and caring and co-operative neighborhoods"(Trainer, 1985). And as developed countries think their citizens are the happiest in the world, "In most affluent societies rates of divorce, drug-taking, crime, mental breakdown, child abuse, alcoholism, vandalism, suicide, stress, depression, and anxiety are increasing"(Trainer, 1985). Despite all the gloomy facts and sad stories, there is a solution, to create a sustainable society. Rather than being greedy and only thinking about the self, each individual must realize the impacts of his/her selfish tendencies, and disregard their former view of the world. One must come into harmony with what is really needed to survive, and drawn a strict distinction between what is necessity and what is luxury. Not every family needs three cars, or five meals a day or four telephones and two refrigerators.Countries do not need to strive for increasing growth, less materials could be imported/exported and international tension could be greatly reduced. The major problems seem not to step from the determination of what a sustainable society is, but on how to get people to change their values. This task is not an easy one. People must be forced to realize the harmful and catastrophic consequences lie in their meaningless wants and greed. The problem of cognitive dissonance is hard to overcome, but it is not impossible. The solution to this dilemma lies in castastrophe. The only event that changes people's minds is social trauma or harm. The analogy is that a person who refuses to wear a seat belt and one day gets thrown through his/her windshield will remember to wear the seat belt after the accident. The logic behind this argument is both simple and feasible. So the question of dissonance is answered in part, but to change a whole society obviously takes a bigger and more traumatic event to occur. An economic collapse or ice age would trigger a new consciousness leading to a sustainable society. The power of an idea should never be underestimated. Hitler's idea of the Aryan race lead to the Holocaust, Marx's idea of socialism lead to Stalin's reign and the deaths of over 50 million people. But ideas change be changed, disregarded and adopted. As developed countries find themselves engaging in a greedy philosophy, once that realization is made, the first step to a better society is taken. Our current path will lead to massive suffering all across the world, with extinction a distinct possibility. Global sustainability must be adopted by every person on the planet, (starting in the developed world), otherwise the world will cease to support life.

De-Dev Good – Transition Inevitable

Collapse inevitable – diminishing returns on resource usage

MacKenzie 8 (Debora, award-winning reporter for New Scientist, Apr 2, [www.planetthoughts.org/?pg=pt/Whole&qid=2737] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

Others think our problems run deeper. From the moment our ancestors started to settle down and build cities, we have had to find solutions to the problems that success brings. "For the past 10,000 years, problem solving has produced increasing complexity in human societies," says Joseph Tainter, an archaeologist at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, and author of the 1988 book The Collapse of Complex Societies. If crops fail because rain is patchy, build irrigation canals. When they silt up, organise dredging crews. When the bigger crop yields lead to a bigger population, build more canals. When there are too many for ad hoc repairs, install a management bureaucracy, and tax people to pay for it. When they complain, invent tax inspectors and a system to record the sums paid. That much the Sumerians knew. Diminishing returns There is, however, a price to be paid. Every extra layer of organisation imposes a cost in terms of energy, the common currency of all human efforts, from building canals to educating scribes. And increasing complexity, Tainter realised, produces diminishing returns. The extra food produced by each extra hour of labour - or joule of energy invested per farmed hectare - diminishes as that investment mounts. We see the same thing today in a declining number of patents per dollar invested in research as that research investment mounts. This law of diminishing returns appears everywhere, Tainter says. To keep growing, societies must keep solving problems as they arise. Yet each problem solved means more complexity. Success generates a larger population, more kinds of specialists, more resources to manage, more information to juggle - and, ultimately, less bang for your buck. Eventually, says Tainter, the point is reached when all the energy and resources available to a society are required just to maintain its existing level of complexity. Then when the climate changes or barbarians invade, overstretched institutions break down and civil order collapses. What emerges is a less complex society, which is organised on a smaller scale or has been taken over by another group. Tainter sees diminishing returns as the underlying reason for the collapse of all ancient civilisations, from the early Chinese dynasties to the Greek city state of Mycenae. These civilisations relied on the solar energy that could be harvested from food, fodder and wood, and from wind. When this had been stretched to its limit, things fell apart. An ineluctable process Western industrial civilisation has become bigger and more complex than any before it by exploiting new sources of energy, notably coal and oil, but these are limited. There are increasing signs of diminishing returns: the energy required to get each new joule of oil is mounting and although global food production is still increasing, constant innovation is needed to cope with environmental degradation and evolving pests and diseases - the yield boosts per unit of investment in innovation are shrinking. "Since problems are inevitable," Tainter warns, "this process is in part ineluctable." Is Tainter right? An analysis of complex systems has led Yaneer Bar-Yam, head of the New England Complex Systems Institute in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to the same conclusion that Tainter reached from studying history. Social organisations become steadily more complex as they are required to deal both with environmental problems and with challenges from neighbouring societies that are also becoming more complex, Bar-Yam says. This eventually leads to a fundamental shift in the way the society is organised.

De-Dev Good – Transition Inevitable

Transition coming now – interconnectedness

MacKenzie 8 (Debora, award-winning reporter for New Scientist, Apr 2, [www.planetthoughts.org/?pg=pt/Whole&qid=2737] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

Increasing connectedness Things are not that simple, says Thomas Homer-Dixon, a political scientist at the University of Toronto, Canada, and author of the 2006 book The Upside of Down. "Initially, increasing connectedness and diversity helps: if one village has a crop failure, it can get food from another village that didn't." As connections increase, though, networked systems become increasingly tightly coupled. This means the impacts of failures can propagate: the more closely those two villages come to depend on each other, the more both will suffer if either has a problem. "Complexity leads to higher vulnerability in some ways," says Bar-Yam. "This is not widely understood." The reason is that as networks become ever tighter, they start to transmit shocks rather than absorb them. "The intricate networks that tightly connect us together - and move people, materials, information, money and energy - amplify and transmit any shock," says Homer-Dixon. "A financial crisis, a terrorist attack or a disease outbreak has almost instant destabilising effects, from one side of the world to the other." For instance, in 2003 large areas of North America and Europe suffered blackouts when apparently insignificant nodes of their respective electricity grids failed. And this year China suffered a similar blackout after heavy snow hit power lines. Tightly coupled networks like these create the potential for propagating failure across many critical industries, says Charles Perrow of Yale University, a leading authority on industrial accidents and disasters. Credit crunch Perrow says interconnectedness in the global production system has now reached the point where "a breakdown anywhere increasingly means a breakdown everywhere". This is especially true of the world's financial systems, where the coupling is very tight. "Now we have a debt crisis with the biggest player, the US. The consequences could be enormous." "A networked society behaves like a multicellular organism," says Bar-Yam, "random damage is like lopping a chunk off a sheep." Whether or not the sheep survives depends on which chunk is lost. And while we are pretty sure which chunks a sheep needs, it isn't clear - it may not even be predictable - which chunks of our densely networked civilisation are critical, until it's too late. "When we do the analysis, almost any part is critical if you lose enough of it," says Bar-Yam. "Now that we can ask questions of such systems in more sophisticated ways, we are discovering that they can be very vulnerable. That means civilisation is very vulnerable." So what can we do? "The key issue is really whether we respond successfully in the face of the new vulnerabilities we have," Bar-Yam says. That means making sure our "global sheep" does not get injured in the first place - something that may be hard to guarantee as the climate shifts and the world's fuel and mineral resources dwindle.

De-Dev Good – A2: No Tech

Transition possible now – we have the tech

Trainer 89 (Ted, Ted, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the school of Social Work, University of New South Wales, “Developed to death”, p207, jam)

Most development theorists radical as well as conventional, seem to have little or no idea of the potential for appropriate development inherent in these existing alternative technologies. Most recommend the acceptance of decades of further suffering on the part of billions of people until trickle down saves them or until capitalism self-destructs, essentially because they do not understand that we already have the ideas and techniques necessary to enable those people to build satisfactory economies for themselves within a few years, and in many cases within a few months.

De-Dev Good – A2: Backlash

Mindset shift is already underway

Henderson 91 (Hazel, Regent's Lecturer at the University of California (Santa Barbara), “paradigms in process life: beyond economics,” jam)

What we see emerging today in all the industrial societies are basic value and behavior shifts, new perceptions and an emerging paradigm, based on facing up to a new awareness of planetary realties and confirmed by a “post-Cartesian” scientific worldview based on biological and systemic life sciences, rather than inorganic, mechanistic models. Its principles involve: Interconnectedness, redistribution, heterarchy, complementarity, uncertainty and change. The newly interlinked agenda of citizens. These new worldviews are already generating better policy tools and models, beyond economics: technology assessment, social and job impact studies, environmental impact statements, future research, cross-impact studies, scenario building, global modeling and forecasting no longer based on past trend extrapolation. At the grassroots level, in academia, and all our institutions the politics of reconceptualization has begun. We see it in the newly interlinked agendas of citizens converging on the June 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio de Janiero and in the emergence of human rights and planetary citizenship. These movements all embrace a new world order based on renewable resources and energy, sustainable forms of productivity and per capita consumption, ecologically-based science and technologies and equitable sharing of resources within and between countries as the only path to peace-keeping and redirecting the billions spent on the global arms race.

Ecological consciousness is spreading

Pederson 9 (David, chief executive of E-Square Inc., one of Japan's leading sustainability think tanks and consultancies, Apr 15, [http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/commentary/data/000121] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

A new economy is on the doorstep. It's not the economy we used to know as "the new economy." It's not the information-technology-driven growth of the last few decades, although that makes up part of the new economy. A new economy is rapidly emerging, one which will transform the ways that people live and do business. The name of the new new economy is the "ecological growth economy." This is neither a bad joke nor an anachronism. It is the emerging new reality. It is also the precondition for the continuation of human progress and the survival of millions of other species on Earth. We have an obvious choice: We can speed up the realization of the ecological growth economy now, or our children and theirs will suffer for centuries. It appears to be an easy choice, doesn't it? We can choose human progress over suffering. And yet, we are not making this choice at sufficient speed or scale today. Ignorance, institutional inertia, vested interests, and greed are the main reasons for our far-too-slow action. However, as sentient creatures (Homo sapiens), humans are equipped with knowledge, good will, and a degree of wisdom. A majority of people around the Earth today are realizing that we cannot survive without embracing the ecological growth economy. Most people are willing to join forces and are willing to make certain sacrifices in lifestyle to achieve an economy that will allow the continuation of human progress into future generations. Fortunately, an increasing number of people are making great efforts to bring about this new economy.

De-Dev Good – A2: Mindset

Crisis spurs mindset shift

Kassiola 90 (Joel, Prof of Poli-Sci @ Brooklyn College, “The death of industrial civilization,” p. 196, jam)

To sum up the main thrust of this chapter, I believe that the current industrial crisis centering on the limits to growth can be instrumental in getting citizens of advanced industrial societies to recognize the erroneous nature of the dominant postindustrial social paradigm, its way of life, and values. As a consequence, this crisis will stimulate these citizens to be conscious of their society’s deficiencies inspiring the destruction of the limitless growth illusion as well as the illusory materialist reductionism of humanity, society, and politics. What I have in mind here is that the entire growth-addictive conceptual apparatus that supports postindustrial society, the industrial ideology containing the Hobbesian conception of humanity, liberalism, materialism, and competitiveness—all must be destroyed as well. Such a cleansing process will pave the way to begin the necessary transformation of postindustrial society to a transindustrial one; one not burdened by these weaknesses that are potentially fatal to our planet and all of its inhabitants.

Dedev causes mindset shift – exposes flaws in ideology

Kassiola 90 (Joel, Prof of Poli-Sci @ Brooklyn College, “The death of industrial civilization,” p. 81, jam)

Of course, we know that the purported “transpolitical” claim of economic growth as a substitute for redistribution is the result of an illusion (economic brain damage) brought on by the ideology of economic reductionist doctrine of unlimited economic growth and the elites whose interests this ideology serves. This illusion is rapidly being exposed by the disguiselifting, consciousness-creating and consciousness-raising, limits to growth and their consequences. Once the doctrine of the limitlessness of economic growth is questioned as being either impossible to achieve and/or undesirable in itself, its resulting ideological manipulation will be recognized by its victims and thereafter challenged by them. Thus, this recognition will destroy this illusion’s political effectiveness just as the awareness of any illusion produces its own self-destruction. Hence the need for political disillusionment when the illusions are as damaging as this one. The path to joy is, indeed, through the despair of the mourning period for our fantasies. When the fantasy of unlimited economic growth is recognized as such we may then proceed to create a social order whose conditions for existence do not require such delusions or its detrimental effects. No wonder the rhetoric of both sides of the limits-to-growth controversy is impassioned—so much is at stake!

De-Dev Good – A2: Mindset

Society will inevitably shift away from the progrowth mindset

Kassiola 90 (Joel, Prof of Poli-Sci @ Brooklyn College, “The death of industrial civilization,” p. 36, jam)

The strong resistance by defenders of the postindustrial status quo and advocates of progrowth values to claims of the existence of the industrial crisis and to pleas for a reassessment of industrial values by the limits-to-growth advocates tends to support Hirschman’s “avoidance” explanation. From this perspective, Ronald Reagan’s and other progrowth proponents’ electoral successes throughout postindustrial society and the public enthusiasm for their message of ceaseless, unlimited economic growth for all may be viewed as part of this disappointment-denying phenomenon. It was so much more comforting to hear the message of the resurgence of America and the coming limitless prosperity—’ ‘the morning in America’ ‘—then to admit that at its foundation was a fantasy and that a change in our values and social order were necessary! Nevertheless, considering the reluctance of mankind to experience disappointment and admit errors—and our tendency to deny reality in order to accomplish these objectives—the fact that the apocalyptic limits-to-growth literature and critical environmental movement exist at all, especially as extensively and influentially as they do in the multidisciplinary scholarly community, the public media, and slowly but significantly within the public at large,’2 provides evidence that the phenomenon of human denial is breaking down as social conditions worsen and the undesirable consequences of industrial values are experienced directly by more advanced industrial citizens.

New movements prove dedev is gaining momentum

Kassiola 90 (Joel, Prof of Poli-Sci @ Brooklyn College, “The death of industrial civilization,” p. 177-178, jam)

As Slater has argued, personal (and, I would add, social) change requires a disillusionment with the current values and beliefs. There are indications of such disillusionment that should encourage advocates of transformational change within industrial societies: the persistent and various environmental groups throughout the industrial nation-states even through poor economic times when progrowth critics expected a return to the priority of materialism and economic values;56 the rise of new social movements throughout the postindustrial world, like the Greens, proclaiming alternative nonmaterialist values; and the workplace democracy movement increasing the autonomy of workers as well as humanizing the nature of industrial work. All of these challenge the dominance of existing post-industrial values and social conditions. They also reveal that the educational, conscientizing, disillusioning process pertaining to postindustrial life and values has already begun. The excesses of limitless industrialism— ecological, normative, and, if you will, spiritual—implying the existence of limits beyond which “excess” is defined, are beginning to be understood by the postindustrial public at large!

De-Dev Good – A2: Mindset

Recent developments prove mindset shift is possible

Kassiola 90 (Joel, Prof of Poli-Sci @ Brooklyn College, “The death of industrial civilization,” p. 28-29, jam)

I think that this psychological analysis provides insight into much of the predicament of contemporary industrial citizens and their culture. The illusion of unlimited economic growth that forms the bedrock of industrial civilization, the dream of limitless economic growth with prosperity for everyone, and the social value of “unlimited progress” has been challenged effectively by recent developments. These include: biophysical limits asserted by the limits-to-growth advocates and recent shocking environmental, economic and political events. Even the steadfast defenders of industrialism find themselves either denying that a crisis exists at all and going on to counterattack the limits-to-growth critics of industrial society (as exemplified by the progrowth literature and defenders of industrial culture such as the contributors to the Simon and Kahn volume) or suffering the pains of being trapped in their incomplete despair because they still hold on to the idea that industrial culture can somehow be salvaged with its basic values intact, including unlimited economic growth. These industrial diehards, from scholars like Beckerman, Kahn and Julian L. Simon, to virtually all policymakers like former president Ronald Reagan down to the county and municipal leaders (but see rise of antigrowth movement in American West) ,76 hang on to, instead of mourn for, their illusory unlimited growth conception that deserves to be laid to rest. Ridding ourselves of that concept and recognizing its futility as well as undesirability would free industrial inhabitants to create a new and more satisfying social order for all of its members. This could occur despite the temporary grief associated with the mourning period for our fantasies that would surely characterize the transitional period. “So long as we imagine things are getting better we will never reexamine basic assumptions.”77

De-Dev Good – Hundredth Monkey

Mindset shift will happen – it cascades rapidly

Keyes 9 (Ken, studied at Duke U and later U of Miami, author of numerous books, [http://www.nbbta.org/members/headquarters/blog/VIEW/00000003/00000042/The-100th-Monkey-Story.html#00000042] AD: 6-23-11, jam )

The Japanese monkey, Macaca fuscata, has been observed in the wild for a period of over 30 years. In 1952, on the island of Koshima scientists were providing monkeys with sweet potatoes dropped in the sand. The monkeys liked the taste of the raw sweet potatoes, but they found the dirt unpleasant. An 18-month-old female named Imo found she could solve the problem in a nearby stream. She taught this trick to her mother. Her playmates also learned this new way and they taught their mothers, too. This cultural innovation was gradually picked up by various monkeys before the eyes of the scientists. Between 1952 and 1958, all the young monkeys learned to wash the sandy sweet potatoes to make them more palatable. Only the adults who imitated their children learned this social improvement. Other adults kept eating the dirty sweet potatoes. Then something startling took place. In the autumn of 1958, a certain number of Koshima monkeys were washing sweet potatoes—the exact number is not known. Let us suppose that when the sun rose one morning there were 99 monkeys on Koshima Island who had learned to wash their sweet potatoes. Let’s further suppose that later that morning, the hundredth monkey learned to wash potatoes. THEN IT HAPPENED! By that evening almost everyone in the tribe was washing sweet potatoes before eating them. The added energy of this hundredth monkey somehow created an ideological breakthrough! But notice. A most surprising thing observed by these scientists was that the habit of washing sweet potatoes then jumped over the sea …Colonies of monkeys on other islands and the mainland troop of monkeys at Takasakiyama began washing their sweet potatoes! Thus, when a certain critical number achieves an awareness, this new awareness may be communicated from mind to mind. Although the exact number may very, the Hundredth Monkey Phenomenon means that when only a limited number of people know of a new way, it may remain the consciousness property of these people. But there is a point at which if only one more person tunes-in to a new awareness, a field is strengthened so that this awareness is picked up by almost everyone! …

De-Dev Good – A2: Growth Inevitable

The idea that growth is a specific cultural construction

Hamilton 2 (Clive, prof of Public Ethics at the Australian National U, “Growth Fetish”, p. 121, jam)

Several arguments are used in support of the belief that growth is inevitable. They are the arguments that will be used to suggest that the “post-growth society’ advocated in this book is utopian. The economics texts share at least one thing with popular wisdom—that human desire is insatiable and people will always want to increase their incomes. This is obviously a culturally specific belief that has been presented as ‘human nature’. Anyone with a knowledge of pre-industrial societies knows that, while greed has a very long history, the idea that human desire for material goods is inherently limitless is contradicted by anthropological facts, including (as discussed in Chapter 8) some anthropological facts of the 21st century. But perhaps a more compelling explanation for the fact that so many people believe that economic growth is inevitable is simply that nature is so often intoned, and all authoritative people seem to believe it. So rarely is the inevitability of growth questioned that most people immediately become defensive when asked to follow the position through. Maybe the belief in the inevitability of growth is the counterpart of the consumerist dream: it is convenient to believe that growth will never end because such a belief opens up the possibility of unrestrained expansion in our lifetimes, thus validating our guilty acquisitiveness.

Anthropology proves that mindset shifts are possible and frequent

Miller 99 (Will, prof of Philosophy at Vermont U, [http://www.monthlyreview.org/299mill.htm] AD: 6-23-11, jam)

It is not without reason that economics has come to be known as the dismal science. Mainstream economists since Adam Smith have assumed that all human relations are ultimately those of the marketplace, of buying and selling, of control and exploitation of the suffering, vulnerability and desperation of others. The current dominance of private property relations—where land, resources and tools are exclusively controlled by a small minority of individuals for their private perpetual reward—is projected backward over the whole span of human history. However useful this projection may be for justifying existing market society, it is strikingly poor anthropology, dubious history, and third-rate psychology. But it seems actual human history has had a much different bent. For our first few hundred thousand years on this planet—according to current evidence—humans lived in small groups organized around mutually beneficial social relations, with resources held in common as social property. Social equality and voluntary divisions of labor endured for millennia as the basis for human communal life. With essentially social incentives, everyone who could contributed to the commonwealth for the use of all. In the long sweep of this history the emergence of dominant classes—chiefs, kings, aristocracies of birth and wealth—is a very recent event, perhaps no more than 10,000 years ago, or less, depending on which culture is considered. From time to time, small human communities organized in such communal ways continue to be 'discovered,' communities that have been spared being "civilized" by conquest at the hands of more "advanced" class societies.

De-Dev Good – At: Transition Wars

No transition wars – there aren’t any resources

Bennett and Nordstrom 2k (D. Scott, Ph.D., The U of Michigan, Distinguished prof of Political Science, and Timothy, Associate prof. Director of Graduate Studies @ U of Mississippi, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 44, No.1, Feb, pp. 33-61, jam)

In this analysis, we focus on using economic conditions to understand when rival ries are likely to escalate or end. Rivalries are an appropriate set of cases to use when examining substitutability both because leaders in rival states have clearly substitutable choices and because rivalries are a set of cases in which externalization is a particularly plausible policy option.7 In particular, when confronted with domestic problems, leaders in a rivalry have the clear alternatives of escalating the conflict with the rival to divert attention or to work to settle the rivalry as a means of freeing up a substantial amount of resources that can be directed toward solving internal problems. In the case of the diversion option, rivals provide logical, believable actors for leaders to target; the presence of a clear rival may offer unstable elites a particularly inviting tar- get for hostile statements or actual conflict as necessary. The public and relevant elites already consider the rival a threat or else the rivalry would not have continued for an extended period; the presence of disputed issues also provides a casus belli with the rival that is always present. Rivals also may provide a target where the possible costs and risks of externalization are relatively controlled. If the goal is diversion, leaders will want to divert attention without provoking an actual (and expensive) war. Over the course of many confrontations, rival states may learn to anticipate response patterns, leading to safer disputes or at least to leaders believing that they can control the risks of conflict when they initiate a new confrontation. In sum, rivals provide good targets for domestically challenged political leaders. This leads to our first hypothesis, which is as follows: Hypothesis 1: Poor economic conditions lead to diversionary actions against the rival. Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competi- tion between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that ends a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy. In a "guns ver- sus butter" world of economic trade-offs, when a state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attrac- tive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to allevi- ate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop when the economic situation sours and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument also encompasses the view that the cold war ended because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States. Hypothesis 2: Poor economic conditions increase the probability of rivalry termination. Hypotheses 1 and 2 posit opposite behaviors in response to a single cause (internal economic problems). As such, they demand a research design that can account for sub- stitutability between them.

De-Dev Good – At: Transition Wars

**Economic collapse forces countries to focus inward – solves risk of conflict**

Bennett and Nordstrom 2k (D. Scott, Ph.D., The U of Michigan, Distinguished prof of Political Science, and Timothy, Associate prof. Director of Graduate Studies @ U of Mississippi, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 44, No.1, Feb, pp. 33-61, jam)

INTERNAL CONDITIONS AND EXTERNAL BEHAVIOR: IMPROVEMENTS By coming at externalization from the substitutability perspective, we hope to deal with some of the theoretical problems raised by critics of diversionary conflict theory. Substitutability can be seen as a particular problem of model specification where the dependent variable has not been fully developed. We believe that one of the theoretical problems with studies of externalization has been a lack of attention to alternative choices; Bueno de Mesquita actually hints toward this (and the importance of foreign policy substitution) when he argues that it is shortsighted to conclude that a leader will uniformly externalize in response to domestic problems at the expense of other possi- ble policy choices (1985, 130). We hope to improve on the study of externalization and behavior within rivalries by considering multiple outcomes in response to domestic conditions.5 In particular, we will focus on the alternative option that instead of exter- nalizing, leaders may internalize when faced with domestic economic troubles. Rather than diverting the attention of the public or relevant elites through military action, leaders may actually work to solve their internal problems internally. Tying internal solutions to the external environment, we focus on the possibility that leaders may work to disengage their country from hostile relationships in the international arena to deal with domestic issues. Domestic problems often emerge from the challenges of spreading finite resources across many different issue areas in a manner that satisfies the public and solves real problems. Turning inward for some time may free up resources required to jump-start the domestic economy or may simply provide leaders the time to solve internal distributional issues. In our study, we will focus on the condition of the domestic economy (gross domes- tic product [GDP] per capita growth) as a source of pressure on leaders to externalize. We do this for a number of reasons. First, when studying rivalries, we need an indicator of potential domestic trouble that is applicable beyond just the United States or just advanced industrialized democracies. In many non-Western states, variables such as election cycles and presidential popularity are irrelevant. Economics are important to all countries at all times. At a purely practical level, GDP data is also more widely available (cross-nationally and historically) than is data on inflation or unemploy- ment.6 Second, we believe that fundamental economic conditions are a source of potential political problems to which leaders must pay attention. Slowing growth or worsening economic conditions may lead to mass dissatisfaction and protests down the road; economic problems may best be dealt with at an early stage before they turn into outward, potentially violent, conflict. This leads us to a third argument, which is that we in fact believe that it may be more appropriate in general to use indicators of latent conflict rather than manifest conflict as indicators of the potential to divert. Once the citizens of a country are so distressed that they resort to manifest conflict (rioting or engaging in open protest), it may be too late for a leader to satisfy them by engaging in distracting foreign policy actions. If indeed leaders do attempt to distract people's attention, then if protest reaches a high level, that attempt has actually failed and we are looking for correlations between failed externalization attempts and further diversion.

Even if conflicts occur they won’t escalate

Bennett and Nordstrom 2k (D. Scott, Ph.D., The U of Michigan, Distinguished prof of Political Science, and Timothy, Associate prof. Director of Graduate Studies @ U of Mississippi, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 44, No.1, Feb, pp. 33-61, jam)

\* When engaging in diversionary actions in response to economic problems, leaders will be most interested in a cheap, quick victory that gives them the benefit of a rally effect with- out suffering the long-term costs (in both economic and popularity terms) of an extended confrontation or war. This makes weak states particularly inviting targets for diversion- ary action since they may be less likely to respond than strong states and because any response they make will be less costly to the initiator. \* Following Blainey (1973), a state facing poor economic conditions may in factbe the target of an attack rather than the initiator. This may be even more likely in the context of a rivalry because rival states are likely to be looking for any advantage over their rivals. Leaders may hope to catch an economically challenged rival looking inward in response to a slowing economy. \* Following the strategic application of diversionary conflict theory and states' desire to engage in only cheap conflicts for diversionary purposes, states should avoid conflict initiation against target states experiencing economic problems.

De-Dev Good – At: Transition Wars

Depressions force focus on internal problems – prevents military conflict – the economy was fundamentally different during WW2

Deudney 91 (Daniel, Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 47(3), Apr, pp. 22, jam)

Poverty wars. In a second scenario, declining living standards first cause internal turmoil, then war. If groups at all levels of affluence pro¬tect their standard of living by pushing depriva¬tion on other groups, class war and revolu¬tionary upheavals could result. Faced with these pressures, liberal democracy and free market system.-- could increasingly be replaced by authoritarian systems capable of maintaining minimum order.' If authoritarian regimes are more war-prone because they lack democratic control, and if revolutionary regimes are war-prone because of their ideological fervor and iso¬lation, then the world is likely to become more violent. The record of previous depressions supports the proposition that widespread economic stagnation and unmet economic expectations contribute to international conflict. Although initially compelling, this scenario has major flaws. One is that it is arguably based on unsound economic theory. Wealth is formed not so much by the availability of cheap natural resources as by capital formation through savings and more efficient production. Many resource-poor countries, like Japan, are very wealthy, while many countries with more exten¬sive resources are poor. Environmental con¬straints require an end to economic growth based on growing use of raw materials, but not necessarily an end to growth in the production of goods and services. In addition, economic decline does not neces-sarily produce conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may largely depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. And as people get poorer, they may become less willing to spend scarce resources for military forces. As Bernard Brodie observed about the modern era. "The predisposing factors to military aggression are full bellies, not empty ones.""'The experi-ence of economic depressions over the last two centuries may be irrelevant, because such de-pressions were characterized by underutilized production capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930s, increased military spending stim-ulated economies, but if economic growth is retarded by environmental constraints, military spending will exacerbate the problem. ■ Power wars. A third scenario is that environ-mental degradation might cause war by altering the relative power of states; that is, newly stronger slates may be tempted to prey upon the newly weaker ones, or weakened states may attack and lock in their positions before their power ebbs further. But such alterations might not lead to war as readily as the lessons of histo-ry suggest, because economic power and mili-tary power are not as tightly coupled as in the past. The economic power positions of Germany and Japan have changed greatly since World War II, but these changes have not been accom¬panied by war or threat of war. In the contem¬porary world, whole industries rise, fall, and relocate, causing substantial fluctuations in the economic well-being of regions and peoples, without producing wars. There is no reason to believe that changes in relative wealth and power caused by the uneven impact of environ¬mental degradation would inevitably lead to war. Even if environmental degradation were to destroy the basic social and economic fabric of a country or region, the impact on international order may not be very great. Among the first casualties in such a country would be the capac¬ity to wage war. The poor and wretched of the earth may Is1 able to deny an outside aggressor an easy conquest, hut they are themselves a minimal threat to other states. Contemporary offensive military operations require complex organizational skills, specialized industrial prod¬ucts, and surplus wealth.

De-Dev Good – At: Transition Wars

Dedev key to peace

Trainer 95 (Ted, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales,” The Conserver Society”, p. 165, jam)

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.

A change in mindset allows for a peaceful transition

Milbrath 89 (Lester W., prof Emeritus of Political Science and Sociology at SUNY-Buffalo, “Envisioning a Sustainable Society”, p. 318, jam)

Throughout this long and difficult transition, we must avoid the mind-poisoning belief that peace cannot be achieved. The possibility of success cannot be judged solely on the basis of what has happened in the past, or on the seeming intransigence of the present. We can rather swiftly learn a new perspective and new attitudes toward each other. As Erhard says, nothing is more powerful than an idea whose time has come. The time when the ideas leading to peace will prevail draws closer as a result of billions of individual thoughts, desires and convictions among people who are committed to making peace possible.