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## 1NC – Growth Bad

#### The transition is already happening but the longer we ignore it the worse the impacts become

Peter David Pedersen**,** chief executive of E-Square Inc., one of Japan's leading sustainability think tanks and consultancies. He introduced the concept of LOHAS (Lifestyles of Health And Sustainability) to Japan in 2002, 4-15-2009 “Homo sociens and the New Ecological Growth Economy” http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/commentary/data/000121

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.

#### And, the resulting growth from the plan kills the environment and causes extinction.

Murray Bookchin, dir. emeritus Institute for Social Ecology @ Plainfield, The Progressive, August 1989, pp. 19-23.

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.

## Uniqueness Extensions

####  the transition is inevitable but continuing our consumption will only lead to a worse economic collapse

Peter David Pedersen**,** chief executive of E-Square Inc., one of Japan's leading sustainability think tanks and consultancies. He introduced the concept of LOHAS (Lifestyles of Health And Sustainability) to Japan in 2002, 4-15-2009 “Homo sociens and the New Ecological Growth Economy” http://www.policyinnovations.org/ideas/commentary/data/000121

The ecological growth economy will not mean sacrifice, and will not cause a return to low growth or no growth. It will not mean a less attractive lifestyle, but will, in fact, create a more attractive one. It will drive the continued growth of the global economy into the second half of the twenty-first century. It will enable the greatest consumption boom in history and will create more new business opportunities than ever before. Does this sound unlikely or undesirable? I argue that it is inevitable. Why? Because it is the only way we can choose life over death, continued human progress over prolonged suffering. The human population will consume at least twice as much food in 2050 as in 1995. Energy consumption will rise by approximately 76 percent between 2000 and 2030. The urban population will rise from 3.3 billion in 2007 to 5 billion in 2030 and further on to 6.4 billion in 2050. There will be an estimated 9.15 billion people on Earth in 2050, as compared to 6.7 billion in early 2009, and they will all want to live decent lives. They will want to be able to consume, to expand their personal freedom and mobility, and to enjoy what they define as a prosperous or satisfactory lifestyle. Their combined consumption drive will most likely be the greatest and longest seen in human history in any 50-year span. Neither laws nor conventional appeals to morality will stop these new consumers from consuming more. There is a crucial question of "how much is enough" or of what constitutes a prosperous lifestyle, and there is certainly gross over-consumption in many countries, but prosperity will not be defined by scholars or by environmentalists. It will be defined and realized by people all over the Earth in and through their daily lives.

## Uniqueness Extensions

### Collapse Coming

**Collapse of society is inevitable**

**Tim Jackson,** Professor of the UK’s Sustainable Development Commission, Winter/Spring 2010, “Prosperity without growth: planning for a sustainable economy,” Pacific Ecologist, Number 19, pg. 10,

Economic growth has failed two billion people who still live on less than $2 daily, it's failed the fragile eco logical systems on which we depend for survival and spectacularly failed to provide economic stability and to secure people's livelihoods. The model was always unstable ecologically, and has now been shown to be unstable economically. The banking crisis of 2008 led the world to the brink of financial disaster, shaking the foundations of the economic model. It provides a unique opportunity to reflect on growth and to address financial and ecological sustainability together. The market was not undone by rogue individuals or incompetent regulators turning a blind eye. It was undone by growth itself, the imperative shaping the modern economy. Growth motivated the freedoms granted to the financial sector and is at least partly responsible for loosening regulations and the proliferation of unstable financial derivatives. Continued expansion of credit was deliberately courted as an essential mechanism to stimulate consumption growth. To protect economic growth we have been prepared to accept unsustainable financial and ecological liabilities, believing them necessary to deliver security and keep us from collapse. It was never sustainable in the long-term, now the financial crisis has shown us it's not even sustainable in the short-term. Today we face the imminent end of the cheap oil era, the prospect of steadily rising commodity prices, degradation of forests, lakes and soils, conflicts over land use, water quality, fishing rights and the huge challenge of stabilising concentrations of carbon in the global atmosphere. We face these tasks with a basically broken economy, in desperate need of renewal. Returning to business as usual is not an option. Prosperity for the few founded on ecological destruction and persistent social injustice is no foundation for civilised society. Economic recovery is vital. Protecting people's jobs and creating new ones is absolutely essential. But we are also in urgent need of a renewed sense of shared prosperity, a commitment to fairness and flourishing in a finite world.

#### Collapse is inevitable – their authors use flawed assumptions

Graeme Taylor, Master’s degree in Conflict Analysis and Management, Coordinator of BEST Future, 2008 “Evolution’s Edge: The Coming Collapse and Transformation of Our World,” Pomegranate Press, pg. 63-64,

Why is it so difficult for politicians, business people, economists and others to accept that there are environmental limits to growth? Why are they deaf to the warnings of scientists and blind to the approaching crises? The answer is that they, like us, are products of our cultures and our times. In every age most people have shared the values of their society. Today we live in capitalist industrial societies which confidently proclaim that market forces plus technology will solve every problem. Most policy makers support these values, not only because it is in their personal interests to defend the system, but also because they passionately believe that capitalism is the best system that has ever existed. And in many ways they are right. For two and a half centuries industrialization has improved the living standards of most people in the world — in general people now live longer and are better fed, better housed and better educated than ever before. Capitalism (the dominant type of industrial system) has helped to overthrow the dictatorial rule of kings and give individuals more rights and freedoms. Although industrialization has brought misery to many (especially where it has been imposed by force), in general it has brought tremendous benefits to our species. 2 This is not to say that the industrial system is wonderful — the environment is being destroyed and the world is full of cruelty and suffering. But it is as meaningless to say that the industrial system is bad as it is to label Stone Age societies good or bad. For all its faults and crimes industrial civilization has been a necessary stage in the evolution of our species. From an evolutionary standpoint the fundamental problem with the dominant world system is not that it is immoral, but that it is unsustainable. And the reason why industrial capitalism is unsustainable is not that it uses industrial processes (which we need to raise living standards) or that it relies on market forces to set prices (an important economic tool) or even that it is based on self-interest and competition (these are part of our biological makeup). The problem is that it is organized by a belief system that does not recognize the need for limits — limits on environmental exploitation, limits on economic competition and limits on social inequality. Industrial capitalism is like a car that has an accelerator but no brakes.

### Collapse Coming

**Global Economic Collapse Is Inevitable**

Rebecca Boyle, St. Louis freelance writer, 4-5-2012, “MIT Predicts That World Economy Will Collapse By 2030”, PopSci, http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2012-04/new-research-tracks-40-year-old-prediction-world-economy-will-collapse-2030

Forty years after its initial publication, a study called The Limits to Growth is looking [depressingly prescient](http://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/Looking-Back-on-the-Limits-of-Growth.html). Commissioned by an international think tank called the Club of Rome, the 1972 report found that if civilization continued on its path toward increasing consumption, the global economy would collapse by 2030. Population losses would ensue, and things would generally fall apart.

The study was — and remains — nothing if not controversial, with economists doubting its predictions and decrying the notion of imposing limits on economic growth. Australian researcher [Graham Turner](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CC4QFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.themonthly.com.au%2Fgraham-turner&ei=idJ9T9zsMISA2gXx8oyBDQ&usg=AFQjCNFW0MNFZwsZFsyCPEQ7lPfvIRSfsA) has examined its assumptions in great detail during the past several years, and apparently his latest research falls in line with the report’s predictions, according to Smithsonian Magazine. The world is on track for disaster, the magazine says.

The study, initially completed at MIT, relied on several computer models of economic trends and estimated that if things didn’t change much, and humans continued to consume natural resources apace, the world would run out at some point. Oil will peak (some argue it has) before dropping down the other side of the bell curve, yet demand for food and services would only continue to rise. Turner says real-world data from 1970 to 2000 tracks with the study’s draconian predictions: “There is a very clear warning bell being rung here. We are not on a sustainable trajectory,” he tells [Smithsonian](http://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/Looking-Back-on-the-Limits-of-Growth.html).

#### Economic Collapse Certain

**J. D. Heyes,** writer for NaturalNews, 4-27-2012, “MIT computer simulation predicts total global economic collapse in less than 20 years”, NaturalNews, ,[http://www.naturalnews.com/035700\_MIT\_economic\_collapse\_simulation.html)//JL](http://www.naturalnews.com/035700_MIT_economic_collapse_simulation.html%29//JL)

Don't look now, but some of the world's smartest people are even predicting the end of the global economic order as we know it, and they're saying it'll happen within the next two decades. According to a [group of researchers](http://www.theburningplatform.com/?p=32713) from the Jay W. Forrester's institute at the [Massachusetts Institute of Technology](http://web.mit.edu/) (MIT), a computer simulation concluded that the world could suffer a "global economic collapse" coupled by a "precipitous population decline" at current rates of resource consumption.

### Collapse Coming

#### **Status quo economic policies are widening the rich/poor gap, prompting instability.**

Lisa Schlein, 11-1-2009 “ILO: Financial Crisis Will Cause Income Inequality Gap to Widen” International Labor Organization)<http://www.voanews.com/articleprintview/349228.html>

 The International Labor Organization finds the gap between the world's rich and poor is vast and growing, despite economic growth that has produced millions of new jobs since the early 1990s. Lisa Schlein reports for VOA from Geneva the group says long-term structural reforms need to be adopted. The ILO annual World of Work Report says it is not opposed to amply compensating people in charge of high-flying enterprises. It says a certain degree of income inequality is useful in rewarding effort, talent and innovation. But ILO Institute for Labor Studies Director Raymond Torres says excessive income inequality can be counter-productive and damaging for most economies. "Indeed, there is evidence that when income inequality is too high, there can be more instability in society," he said. "We have evidence, for example in studies on crime rates and so on. More certainly, the political support for pro-growth policies like trade and foreign direct investment, which are important for economic growth, can be weakened if the middle-class and low-income groups think that they do not get the benefits of growth produced for those pro-growth policies." The report notes the income gap between top executives and the average employee is widening. For example, it finds in the United States chief executive officers of the 15 largest companies last year earned 520 times more than the average worker. And, this is up from 360 times more in 2003. The ILO report cites similar patterns in Australia, Germany, Hong Kong, the Netherlands and South Africa. Torres says these huge executive paychecks are not always deserved. "The report ... shows these executive pay trends have not been related, certainly not always been related to firm performance. And, that there has been a growing disconnect between executive pay trends and the performance of the firms that those executives actually manage. This reflects institutional flaws," he said. Torres says the short-term effect of the current financial crisis may be to reduce income inequality because people in the higher-income brackets play on the stock market, which now is in free-fall. But, he says previous crises show it is the most vulnerable people who suffer the greatest consequences. The report warns too much income inequality weakens one of the engines of economic growth, which is domestic demand. It says a major share of the cost of the financial and economic crisis will be borne by hundreds of millions of people who have not shared in the benefits of recent growth.

## US Growth Bad – Democracy

### US Growth Bad - Democracy

#### Economic growth creates massive social inequality which crushes democracy.

Phillip Harms and Heinrich UrsprungUniversity of Konstanz, May 2002 “Do Civil and political repression really boost foreign direct investments?” Pg. 1-3

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

#### Neoliberal competition destroys democracy

Eberhard Kienle, Lecturer in Middle East Politics at University of London and Chair of its Center for Near and Middle Eastern Studies, 5-10-2010 “Global competitiveness, the erosion of checks and balances, and the demise of liberal democracy”, “http://www.opendemocracy.net/global-competitiveness-erosion-of-checks-and-balances-and-demise-of-liberal-democracy”

 As Wendy Brown, followed by Myriam Revault d’Allonnes, aptly put it with reference to Michel Foucault, neoliberalism as preached and practised today is quite different from ‘traditional’ liberalism as it was defined and lived by its classics and their followers. While the latter sought to regulate existing ‘natural’ markets, neoliberalism as a ‘constructivist’ approach attempts to build and strengthen markets in the economy and beyond. Thus competition and competitiveness are generalized as the gold standard by which to measure all human activity including the performance of governments [4]. Export subsidies, trade tariffs, tax holidays to attract foreign capital and active -yet selective- immigration policies targeting specific skill groups like IT technicians are only some of the measures by which governments attempt to enhance the competitiveness of their respective countries. Relevant international regimes such as the WTO or the European Neighbourhood Policy serve similar purposes, obviously within the limits of the balances of power they reflect at given points in time. Without claiming all wealth increases are zero-sum, there are clearly some effects that potentially threaten other individuals, groups or ‘nations’. The competition for competitiveness naturally appears to many players as a matter of life and death, domination and submission (Zygmunt Baumant describes this eloquently in Wasted Lives: Modernity and Its Outcasts [5]). Above and beyond the allegedly new manufactured risks that are part of modernisation, at the origin of a ‘risk society’ and indivisible from Ulrich Beck’s ‘second modernity’[6], the enlightenment that we continue to value highly may once again produce its complete opposite. After giving birth to the tyrannies of fascism and feeding the stultifying mass media that are at the centre of Theodor W. Adorno’s and Max Horkheimer’s ‘Dialectics of the Enlightenment’[7], its dynamics may now push us for good into the new social Darwinian logic of unbridled market competition. Fuelled by existential fears, the search for efficiency is becoming the chief, if not sole, guiding principle for human action and public policies. Unchecked by competing concerns such as equity or compassion, it is becoming a totalitarian principle threatening the survival of pluralism, democracy and human rights. A totalitarian principle does not ipso facto entail totalitarian government in the traditional sense. However, by definition it entails the removal of the various sources of friction or opposition and thus the checks and balances that might prevent or delay its own translation into reality [8].

## US Growth Bad – Econ Wars

### US Growth Bad – War

#### Empirical data shows economic growth and wars goes hand in hand

Meir Kohn, Economic Development and the Evolution of Government in Pre-Industrial Europe, November 2005, P1, Dartmouth College, Dpt of Economics, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=866986

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

Charles Boehmer, Ph.D Pennsylvania State U in IR, associate prof @ U of Texas at El Paso, Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 21(3), June 2010 , pp.249-268, EBSCO

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.

### US Growth Bad – War

#### Data proves growth causes war

Charles Boehmer, Ph.D Pennsylvania State U in IR, associate prof @ U of Texas at El Paso, Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 21(3), June 2010 , pp.249-268, EBSCO

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.

#### Declining hegemons use economic growth to lash out in wars.

Christopher Chase-Dunn Director of the Institute for Research on World-Systems, U of California-Riverside, and Volker Bornschier prof at the University of Zurich, Switzerland, 1999 ( “The Future of Global Conflict”, Sage Publications, p. 43

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).

### US Growth Bad – War

#### History shows growth leads to war

Joshua Goldstein, Political Science at MIT, December 1987, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol 31, No 4, “http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156”

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

Joshua Goldstein, Political Science at MIT, December 1987, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol 31, No 4, “http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156”

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

Joshua Goldstein, Political Science at MIT, December 1987, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol 31, No 4, “http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156”

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."

## U.S. Growth Bad - Environment

### US Growth Bad – Environment – Extinction

#### Growth kills the environment.

Murray Bookchin, dir. emeritus Institute for Social Ecology @ Plainfield, The Progressive, August 1989, pp. 19-23.

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.

### US Growth Bad – Environment - General

#### Globalization is killing the ecosystem

Christian Sarkar, freelance writer, 6-17-2011 www.harvesth2o.com/ecowarning.shtml

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.

#### Growth drives environmental unsustainability

Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, July 2002, ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D62IfYouWantAffluence.html

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.

### US Growth Bad – Environment - General

#### Downturns leads to environmentally friendly investments.

Associated Foreign Press, 9-18-2009, http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5jG0UqOyZ\_VSEN1i8jCsCzwhQr6uA

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

Ted Trainer 9-24-2010, “http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/TheEnvProb.html”

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.

## US Growth Bad – Environment - Deforestation

### US Growth Bad – Environment - Deforestation

#### Economic growth causes deforestation – Nigeria proves

Usman and Adefalu, BA and LL, Biodiversity, Nigerian forestry, wildlife and protected areas: Status report University of Ilorin, 9-1-2010

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

Tim Gatto, staff writer at The Agonist, 4-25-2008, h”ttp://agonist.org/timgatto/20080425/the\_tipping\_point\_and\_critical\_mass\_are\_we\_there\_yet”

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.

## US Growth Bad – Environment - Drinking Water

### US Growth Bad – Environment - Drinking Water

#### Growth leads to poor water quality

 Gwen Fleming, 2-8-2011, St. Petersburg Times, ln.

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.

## US Growth Bad – Environment – Oceans

### US Growth Bad – Environment – Oceans

#### Growth is causing the collapse of the oceans

CBS 6-21-2011, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2011/06/20/scitech/main20072805.shtml

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

Robin Craig, prof of law, 2003, McGeorge review, p. 155, vol 34

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.

## US Growth Bad – Environment – Species

### US Growth Bad – Environment – Species

#### Growth kills species

Ted Trainer, 9-16-2010, UNSW, “http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html”

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

David N. Diner, Instructor, Administrative and Civil Law Division, The Judge Advocate General's School, United States Army, 1994, "The Army and the Endangered Species Act: Who's Endangering Whom?" 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161l/n

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.

### US Growth Bad – Environment – Species

#### Growth drives species loss

Ted Trainer, 9-16-2010, UNSW, “http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html”

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.

#### Economic growth would push the market further, destroying the environment.

Collins Ayoo, Prof Department of Economics, University of Calgary, 2008 “Management of Environmental Quality iss 5,” ln

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).

### US Growth Bad – Environment – Species

#### Growth kills biodiversity

Collins Ayoo, Prof Department of Economics, University of Calgary, 2008 “Management of Environmental Quality iss 5,” ln

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

Collins Ayoo, Prof Department of Economics, University of Calgary, 2008 “Management of Environmental Quality iss 5,” ln

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

## US Growth Bad – Global Warming

### US Growth Bad – Global Warming

#### Growth causes warming

Glen Barry, phd, personal blog, 1-12-2008, “http://earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2008/01/economic-collapse-and-global-ecology.html”

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.

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

Jonny Djordjevic, BA Global Econ, UC Irvine, March 1998 www.dbc.uci.edu/sustain/global/sensem/djordj98.html

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).

### US Growth Bad –Global Warming

#### Economic decline solves warming – means consumption of less resources

Michael Klare, Professor at Hampshire College, 10-17-2008, huffington post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-t-klare/the-economic-crisis-and-t\_b\_135631.html

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

Michele Kambas, Reuters, 10-7-2008, “http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/10/07/us-summit-financial-idUSTRE4966A220081007”

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.

### US Growth Bad – Global Warming

Economic growth drives climate change

Ted Trainer, 9-16-2010, UNSW, “http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/AffluentSoc.html”

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.)

Growth causes warming – all other theories are outdated

Manisha Shekhar, Prof @ Saxena College, 2009, 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

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.

### US Growth Bad - Global Warming

#### Capitalism leads to warming—only elites can afford to release carbon at the expense of all

Robert MacNeila **and** Mattew **Paterson,** writers for Environmental Politics, 3-9-2012, "Neoliberal climate policy: from market fetishism to the developmental state", http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09644016.2012.651900

Such responses arise out of both the ideological logic of neoliberalism – the fetishising of markets as forms of social organisation – and its political character, as effectively a project by global economic elites to roll back the redistributive reforms of the mid-twentieth century in most advanced industrial economies (Harvey 1989 The first process can be understood in terms of standard debates in environmental economics focused on understanding environmental problems as externalities. Two responses to this are well-known: the Pigouvian one in which the state operates as a neutral agent to force internalisation of external costs (normally through taxation), and the Coasian one in which the problem is understood as one of inadequate assignment of property rights (see Barry 2007 , ch.8, for a review). This is of course the argument popularised in Garrett Hardin's ‘tragedy of the commons' (1968), although Coase's logic is rather more nuanced than Hardin's. In particular, it gains force in neoliberal discourse in part because of a scepticism towards the idea of state neutrality contained in the Pigouvian preference for environmental taxation, associated particularly with the public choice element in neoliberal ideological discourse (Gamble 1988 , Hay 2007) that regards such taxation as subject to all sorts of rent-seeking behaviour by both state bureaucrats and vested economic interests. The neoliberalisation of environmental discourse entails a favouring of the latter (Coasian) explanation, and thus focuses on the attribution of individual, exclusive property rights in order to create the appropriate incentives not to over-use resources. But it also, in many instances, constitutes an appropriation of existing commons, and thus can be understood from this perspective as a return to processes of primitive accumulation (Glassman 2007) – or in other words as part of the political logic of neoliberalism as an elite-led struggle to regain dominance (Harvey 2005). This process of commodification occurs through the creation of either cap-and-trade or offset markets around carbon emissions. The former, in effect, creates tradable property rights to emit carbon up to a certain limit, while the latter is effectively a market in promises not to emit carbon (Hoffmann 2011 where such promises create credits that can then be traded to compensate for (i.e. offset) emissions produced elsewhere. Both types of markets have expanded enormously since the early 2000s, and are now comfortably the largest single environmental market, worth US$143 billion in 2009 and are often claimed by participants to be the most rapidly growing derivatives market of any type. Allied to the literature arguing that carbon markets are driven by a neoliberal logic is a large body of work by critical social movements that also emphasises that the commodification of climate is essentially a process of appropriation of rights to use the atmosphere's carbon capacities by northern political and economic elites at the expense of the rest of the planet is worth noting as well, as it aims to identify the conditions under which economies might undergo substantial transformations in the way they metabolise nature and thus produce various forms of environmental degradation. This literature generally argues that it is easier to pursue ecological modernisation strategies in social democratic welfare states than in neoliberal ones (Mol and Spaargaren 2002, Dryzek et al. 2003 ). This corresponds broadly to distinctions in comparative political economy (Hall and Soskice 2001 ) between ‘coordinated market economies’ (CMEs) and ‘liberal market economies’ (LMEs).4 According to much of this work, EM practices are increasingly deployed in Western Europe and East Asia but have consistently failed to win favour in the United States because of that country's neoliberal ideological climate, notoriously combative relationship between states and markets, and non-conducive legislative system (Mol and Spaargaren 2002, Dryzek et al. 2003 , Dryzek 2004). Indeed, as Dryzek (2004) argues, the states that consistently excel at implementing the tenets of EM are those which feature cooperative and corporatist political-economic systems, characterised by a culture of cooperation among business, government, and environmental groups. As Schlosberg and Rinfret (2008, p. 793) argue, ‘such a structure has simply not existed in the US, where the adversarial culture and institutional pathologies of US policy-making encourage competition and conflict over cooperation and intelligent policy design'. For Driesen (2010 , p. 112), Washington's continued inability to implement such progressive interventionism can indeed be explained by the country's culture of market fundamentalism and neoliberal state–market relations: In particular, the United States' failure arises from an ideological climate that embraced free markets as the solution to all economic and social issues and regarded vigorous government action as anathema. This ideological climate … influenced government's approach in a variety of areas, leading to … a lack of vigour in on-going efforts to protect public health, safety, and the environment. While institutional inertia allowed already existing environmental programs to remain in place … neoliberalism made it very difficult to take on the challenging new problem of global warming. Market-based mechanisms … remain central to new federal efforts to address global climate change and the ongoing academic debate about how best to address global climate disruption. Our argument in this article is that the central problem with these analyses lies in the way that they conceive of neoliberalism either purely at the level of ideology, or in terms of a roll-out of financial interests. In other words, they tend to take too seriously the ideological claims made by market fundamentalists about how neoliberal states in practice operate, and thereby tend to over-represent the place of commodification and privatisation logics in neoliberal policy. Instead, we argue that a more conceptually nuanced depiction of neoliberal climate policy would acknowledge that, while commodification and greater use of market instruments are indeed salient elements of the contemporary response, they are merely one aspect of it, and have not crowded out (or successfully trumped) other competing logics in the policy process. In particular, neoliberal ideology does not negate the state's structural role in creating the conditions for stable growth and accumulation. Regarding climate change, this entails broad action to establish new modes of regulation for things like energy and environmental security, and using the specific forms that climate policy takes as means to promote new forms of accumulation and sectoral growth. At best, neoliberal ideology provides a contextual backdrop for these policy objectives and can thereby alter the ways that policies manifest under market-fundamentalist conditions, but it does not alter them in any basic manner. Employing a strategic-relational understanding of how climate policies emerge in neoliberal states we view the state not as a homogenous entity with a singular purpose or ideology, but rather as a form of social relation, and thus effectively an arena of struggle between various political and economic forces seeking to use state power for specific purposes. In spite of this heterogeneity, however, political struggles within the state can be seen as maintaining specific patterns of ‘strategic selectivity’ (or in institutionalist language, path-dependency) that both structurally reflect and modify the efforts of various actors to shape individual policies. These strategic selectivities cause certain actors, identities, strategies, and spatial/temporal horizons to be privileged over time in each context, and thus produce a range of competing coherent logics in the policy process. Such a relational perspective which takes into account the full range of structural, institutional, and idiosyncratic influences on policy necessarily forces us to rule out any general theories of neoliberal climate policy, and acknowledge that each individual ‘neoliberal state’ arrives at a set of policies according to its own specific conditions and political relations, and not a hegemonic brand of neoliberalism based on a singular logic or policy form. This is even the case while many forces promoting neoliberal ideology aspire to such a singular logic – the structural and institutional requirements of the capitalist state as well as the pre-existing histories of particular states intervene between ideology and outcomes to produce variation between different states. This framework thus presents us with two key questions regarding the specific character of US climate policy. First, the existence of several competing logics within individual neoliberalisms asks us to define what particular logics are acting upon the climate policy process in the United States. While the most obvious one, the logic of financialisation, has not yet been strong enough to establish a federal cap-and-trade system against the backdrop of powerful fossil fuel interests, an influential secondary logic we see as guiding policy has been the federal government's tradition of directly fostering and facilitating the growth of domestic high-tech sectors since the late 1970s. As noted above, this logic has helped to tacitly define the issue of climate change not as a problem of market failure or absent property rights, but rather as one of inappropriate technologies, and thus policy responses have implicitly aimed towards the development (either directly or indirectly) of novel energy technologies and efficiency processes, and the fostering of new markets for these innovations.

## US Growth Bad – Poverty

### US Growth Bad – Poverty

#### Alternate causalities to poverty

George Fane and Peter Warr, February 2002, Australian National University, How Economic Growth Reduces Poverty, http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/wap02/wap02.pdf

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

Anisha Madan, Financial analyst for GE and MBA at Kellogg School, Northwestern University, 8-10-2002, “The Relationship between Economic Freedom and Socio – Economic Development”, “http://www.econ.ilstu.edu/uauje/PDF's/CarrolRound/madanpost.pdf”

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.

## US Growth Bad - Resource Wars

### US Growth Bad – Resources Wars

#### Economic growth is unsustainable and inevitably causes resource wars

Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, July 2002, ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D62IfYouWantAffluence.html

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

Richard Heinberg, Senior Fellow of the Post Carbon Institute in Santa Rosa, California, 2004, "Powerdown: Options and Actions for a Post-Carbon World,"

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.

### US Growth Bad – War – Resources

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

Lester Milbrath, Professor Emeritus of Political science and Sociology at SUNY-Buffalo, Envisioning a Sustainable Society, pp. 343-344

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

Tan Tan Yee, Jan1999, Journal of the Singapore Armed Forces, http://www.mindef.gov.sg/safti/pointer/back/journals/1999/Vol25\_1/7.htm

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

## US Growth Bad – Terrorism

### US Growth Bad – Terrorism

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

Michael Radu, senior fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute Ph.D, 7-9-2002, “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

Dennis Morgan, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin Campus, December 2009, South Korea Futures, Volume 41, Issue 10, December 2009, Pages 683-693,

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.

## US Growth Bad – US-China War

### US Growth Bad – War – China – Aggression

#### Economic growth causes China war

Charles Boehmer, Ph.D Pennsylvania State U in IR, associate prof @ U of Texas at El Paso, Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 21(3), June 2010 , pp.249-268, EBSCO

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

Charles Boehmer, Ph.D Pennsylvania State U in IR, associate prof @ U of Texas at El Paso, Defence and Peace Economics, Vol. 21(3), June 2010 , pp.249-268, EBSCO

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.

### US Growth Bad – War – China – Aggression

#### Chinese growth destroys US heg

Toni Straka, INDEPENDENT Certified Financial Analyst, 6-30-2009, The Prudent Investor, 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:

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

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

Garrick Hileman, financial consultant nd trader for private corporations, 7-5-2010, “Seeking Alpha”, http://seekingalpha.com/article/213101-is-a-u-s-china-economic-war-on-its-way )

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 civilization.

## US Transition Good

### US Transition Good – Transition Possible

#### De-development is gaining momentum—a complete economic collapse is key to finish the transition

Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, July 2002, ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D62IfYouWantAffluence.html

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.)

### US Transition Good – Transition Possible

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

Glen Barry, Ph.D. in "Land Resources" from the U of Wisconsin-Madison, 1-12-2008, earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2008/01/economic-collapse-and-global-ecology.html

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.

### US Transition Good – Transition Possible

Waiting only makes the situation worse – we must let it collapse now

Glen Barry, Ph.D. in "Land Resources" from the U of Wisconsin-Madison, 1-12-2008, earthmeanders.blogspot.com/2008/01/economic-collapse-and-global-ecology.html

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.

### US Transition Good – Transition Possible

#### The unsustainable nature of the growth economy causes the transition

Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, July 2002, ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/D62IfYouWantAffluence.html

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.

### AT Transition Wars

#### Countries exist the international sphere and focus on the nation-state, prevents transition wars from occuring

D. Scott Bennett, Ph.D., The U of Michigan, Distinguished prof of Political Science, and Timothy Nordstrom, Associate prof. Director of Graduate Studies @ U of Mississippi, February 2000, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 44, No.1

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

D. Scott Bennett, Ph.D., The U of Michigan, Distinguished prof of Political Science, and Timothy Nordstrom, Associate prof. Director of Graduate Studies @ U of Mississippi, February 2000, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 44, No.1

\* 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.

### AT Transition Wars

#### There aren’t enough resources for a transition war

D. Scott Bennett, Ph.D., The U of Michigan, Distinguished prof of Political Science, and Timothy Nordstrom, Associate prof. Director of Graduate Studies @ U of Mississippi, February 2000, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 44, No.1

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.