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Growth Good – Laundry List

Growth key to solve a laundry list of problems – war, proliferation, environment, disease and drug trafficking

Silk 93

Leonard. “Dangers of Slow Growth.” Foreign Affairs. Vol 72 Issue 1. 1993/1994.

The last such asset deflation, credit crunch and wave of bankruptcies followed the Great Crash of 1929. Fiscal, monetary, and trade policy blunders helped to turn that earlier asset deflation into the Great Depression of the 1930s, which lasted a full decade--until the outbreak of World War II. I shall always remember the phrase of my old boss, Elliott V. Bell: "Out of the wreckage of depression slithered the serpents of Nazism and war." Nowadays, reversing the celebrated maxim of George Santayana, we believe or hope that those who remember the past are not condemned to repeat it. Yet it is already evident that the long period of slow growth, which some have called a "controlled depression," has produced revolutionary consequences of its own. It helped to shatter the Soviet empire. As the British editor William Rees-Mogg has written: "A world economic crisis is a type of world revolution. It destroys old structures, economic and political. The Soviet Union, with its rigid inability to adapt, was the first to fall before the full force of the storm. Such a crisis destroys well-meaning politicians and promotes men of power . . . . It destroys respect for government, as people discover that their leaders cannot control events."[8] The burst of optimism that greeted the downfall of Soviet communism has given way to anxiety that years will pass before the new states in the East can become effective market economies and democracies--and that some may not make it at all before dictatorship returns. The end of the Cold War was expected to bring great benefits to people in many countries as resources were shifted from military to social programs. Thus far, however, the peace dividend only shows up in lost jobs and falling incomes. Theoretically there is no reason why this must be so; in a rational world, the improved prospects for peace should have led to greater spending on consumer goods and productivity-raising investment. But that can happen only if workers can be shifted to new jobs--and financial resources reallocated to create those jobs. In the absence of such shifts of human and capital resources to expanding civilian industries, there are strong economic pressures on arms-producing nations to maintain high levels of military production and to sell weapons, both conventional and dual-use nuclear technology, wherever buyers can be found. Without a revival of national economies and the global economy, the production and proliferation of weapons will continue, creating more Iraqs, Yugoslavias, Somalias and Cambodias--or worse. Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues. Growth will not solve all those problems by itself. But economic growth--and growth alone--creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.

Growth Good – War (Short)

Economic collapse causes extinction

Kerpen 8

Phil, National Review Online, October 29, , Don't Turn Panic Into Depression, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/10/29/opinion/main4555821.shtml

It’s important that we avoid all these policy errors - not just for the sake of our prosperity, but for our survival. The Great Depression, after all, didn’t end until the advent of World War II, the most destructive war in the history of the planet. In a world of nuclear and biological weapons and non-state terrorist organizations that breed on poverty and despair, another global economic breakdown of such extended duration would risk armed conflicts on an even greater scale. To be sure, Washington already has stoked the flames of the financial panic. The president and the Treasury secretary did the policy equivalent of yelling fire in a crowded theater when they insisted that Congress immediately pass a bad bailout bill or face financial Armageddon. Members of Congress splintered and voted against the bill before voting for it several days later, showing a lack of conviction that did nothing to reassure markets. Even Alan Greenspan is questioning free markets today, placing our policy fundamentals in even greater jeopardy. But after the elections, all eyes will turn to the new president and Congress in search of reassurance that the fundamentals of our free economy will be supported. That will require the shelving of any talk of trade protectionism, higher taxes, and more restrictive labor markets. The stakes couldn’t be any higher.

Economic decline causes nuclear war

Mead 92

Walter Russell, Senior Fellow in American FoPo @ the Council on Foreign Relations, World Policy Institute, 1992

Hundreds of millions, billions, of people have pinned their hopes on the international market . They and their leaders have embraced market principles and drawn closer to the west because they believe the system can work for them? But what if it can’t? What if the global economy stagnates or even shrinks? In that case, we will face a new period of international conflict: North against South, rich against poor. Russia, China India, these countries with their billions of people and their nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to the world than Germany and Japan did in the 30s.

Collapse causes extinction

Bearden 00

Thomas**. (**Lt. Col in US Army), “The Unnecessary Energy Crisis”, Free Republic, June 24, p. online

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China-whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States-attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself. The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

Growth Good – War (Short)

Economic collapse causes nuclear war

Cook 7

Richard. Frequent contributor to Global Research. 6/14/7. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=5964>.

Times of economic crisis produce international tension and politicians tend to go to war rather than face the economic music. The classic example is the worldwide depression of the 1930s leading to World War II. Conditions in the coming years could be as bad as they were then. We could have a really big war if the U.S. decides once and for all to haul off and let China, or whomever, have it in the chops. If they don’t want our dollars or our debt any more, how about a few nukes?

Collapse causes global wars

Lopez 98

Bernado v. Lopez, September 10 1998, Business World pg. 12, Accessed lexis-nexis

What would it be like if global recession becomes full bloom? The results will be catastrophic. Certainly, global recession will spawn wars of all kinds. Ethnic wars can easily escalate in the grapple for dwindling food stocks as in India-Pakistan-Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Indonesia. Regional conflicts in key flashpoints can easily erupt such as in the Middle East, Korea, and Taiwan.

Economic decline breeds wars

Mead 9

2/4, Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America, The New Republic

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. **Bad economic times** can **breed wars**. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, **decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight**.

Growth Good – War (Longer)

Growth prevents conflicts that lead to nuclear war

Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8

Aaron, professor of politics and international relations at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School, Gabriel, Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, The Dangers of a Diminished America, WSJ, 10/21, Proquest

Pressures to cut defense spending, and to dodge the cost of waging two wars, already intense before this crisis, are likely to mount. Despite the success of the surge, the war in Iraq remains deeply unpopular. Precipitous withdrawal -- attractive to a sizable swath of the electorate before the financial implosion -- might well become even more popular with annual war bills running in the hundreds of billions. Protectionist sentiments are sure to grow stronger as jobs disappear in the coming slowdown. Even before our current woes, calls to save jobs by restricting imports had begun to gather support among many Democrats and some Republicans. In a **prolonged recession**, gale-force winds of protectionism will blow. Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

Growth Good – War (Longer)

Economic contraction would cause collapse, mass starvation, totalitarianism, and nuclear war

Nyquist 5

J.R, expert in geopolitics and international relations, WorldNetDaily contributing editor, “The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash,” February 4, http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2005/0204.html

Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of anti-capitalist majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America’s strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the United States from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion people to live on the earth’s surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet’s economy would contract and untold millions would die of starvation. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be waged with mass destruction weapons and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs. But we cannot do this. As one observer recently lamented, “We drank the poison and now we must die.”

Economic collapse leads to great power wars

Mead 9

Walter Russell. Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations. 2/4/9. <http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2>.

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

Growth Good – War (Longer)

US prolonged recession leads to diversionary wars

Yulu 3

Zhang, Viewpoint: Economic Recession-Blasting Fuse of Modern War, People’s Daily Online

The Iraq war has caused world people to think of many questions, one of which being the cause of war. Based on their analyses, many scholars and experts hold that the world political and economic unbalance is the factor that leads to war, but in the opinion of this author, Zhang Yulu, economic recession is the real fuse of modern war. If one examines the wars broken out ever since more than a century ago, one will discover an interesting phenomenon, that is, each fairly big economic recession (or economic crisis) was inevitably followed by the eruption of a war. This is true with World I, World War II, the Gulf War, as well as the Iraq war. It can be said that economic downturn is the blasting fuse of modern war. After the establishment of the capitalist system in Western countries, the market economy gradually replaced the natural economy to hold a dominant position. The market economy, more often than not, presented itself as a "surplus economy". The economic crisis is the result of this kind of relative excess and a passive method for eliminating the excess. During the period of recession, there are sharp social contradictions, stockpiling commodities and declining production, under this circumstance, the State must bear the responsibility to eliminate excess and stimulate production. The most effective method. The interactions of the two major forces--the sharp domestic contradictions and the expansion of military strengths-are bound to cause certain big powers to cherish the motive to lift themselves out of the "quagmire" of recession by relying on war. No wonder before the Iraq war completely came to an end, certain American "experts" began to calculate how large a role the Iraq war could play for US economic recovery. As a matter of fact, the United States is quite experienced in making a big fortune out of war and making use of war to remedy recession. World War I helped the United States to secure its throne as the world's number one power, World War II helped it to attain the position as a superpower. Victory in the Gulf War, to a certain extent, helped bring about a "new economy" and a period of 10-year-long economic prosperity for the United States. Owing to US military might, many countries have attached themselves to or are dependent on America politically and militarily, as a result, US hegemony pushes its way through, thus objectively making the United States become the country enjoying the most "stability" in the world. US present economic difficulty is associated with the declining investment rates resulted from enterprises' overproduction capacity and companies' accounting scandals, thus laying bare the aspect of false prosperity of its "new economy", but the most direct fuse of US economic recession is the "9.11" incident, it exposes the weakness of the US "security system", predicting that the "investment paradise" is facing challenges. So, in a certain sense, American economic recession is caused by the threat to its hegemony, not purely due to economic factors. The US government is well aware of the relations among US economic prosperity, its security and world security, the United States holds that to maintain US economic prosperity, it is essential to ensure national security, restore the "investment paradise" position and create neither too big nor too small troubles to the world, leaving other parts of the world in a state of "controlled" insecurity. Only by doing so, can the United States "gain benefits as can a fisherman". That's why the United States is going all out to attack "terrorism" at all costs, which presently poses the greatest threat to the country; blockade so-called disobedient "axis of evil countries", guard against potential competitors such as China, Russia and Europe, and reestablish a "secured islet". The Afghanistan war produced the effect of "killing three birds with one stone", dealt a heavy blow to terrorism and at the same time helped US influence to penetrate into regions close to China and Russia. Guided by this policy and inspired by victory gained in the anti-terrorism war, the United States started attacks on Iraq in defiance of world people's strong anti-war cries. This action was neither taken out of the emotional impulse of President George W. Bush, nor was it taken purely for oil interests. The disintegration of the Soviet Union once greatly excited some people who thought that war danger had decreased with the conclusion of the Cold War. Now it turns out that the world dominated by one superpower is more disquiet than it is faced with the contest between two powers for hegemony. The world is analogous to a scale that can be balanced only when things on both ends are of equal weights, change in the weight on one end means the loss of balance. After the break-up of the Soviet Union, the strength restraining the United States has been weakened, multi-polarization is in the process of development, the United States, being the sole superpower, increasingly likes to speak in a "Tomahawk" way. Especially when the tranquillity of various countries has begun to be linked up with the performance of the US economy, as a "folk prescription" for remedying US economic recession, war has become a "good recipe". The United States has repeatedly drawn benefits from its military might, so it has made up its mind to maintain its military leading position. As soon as he took office, President Bush declared his intention to build an "unmatchable" military force, and approved the defense budget totaling US$310 billion for 2001 and the country's budgeted military spending reached as high as US$392 billion for 2003, even higher than the combined total of other 20 military powers. An additional war fund worth nearly US$80 billion was put in during the Iraq war. It seems that the dose of fitness "desperate cures" of the United States will continuously be put into use.

Growth Good – War (Longer)

Economic decline leads to conflict

Klare 9

Michael, 2/26, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, A Planet at the Brink?, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global\_Economy/KB26Dj02.html

The global economic meltdown has already caused bank failures, bankruptcies, plant closings, and foreclosures and will, in the coming year, leave many tens of millions unemployed across the planet. But another perilous consequence of the crash of 2008 has only recently made its appearance: increased civil unrest and ethnic strife. Someday, perhaps, war may follow. As people lose confidence in the ability of markets and governments to solve the global crisis, they are likely to erupt into violent protests or to assault others they deem responsible for their plight, including government officials, plant managers,  landlords, immigrants, and ethnic minorities. (The list could, in the future, prove long and unnerving.) If the present economic disaster turns into what President Barack Obama has referred to as a "lost decade", **the result could be a global landscape filled with economically-fueled upheavals**. Indeed, if you want to be grimly impressed, hang a world map on your wall and start inserting red pins where violent episodes have already occurred. Athens (Greece), Longnan (China), Port-au-Prince (Haiti), Riga (Latvia), [Santa Cruz](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global_Economy/KB26Dj02.html) (Bolivia), Sofia (Bulgaria), Vilnius (Lithuania), and Vladivostok (Russia) would be a start. Many other cities from Reykjavik, Paris, Rome, and Zaragoza to Moscow and [Dublin](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global_Economy/KB26Dj02.html) have witnessed huge protests over rising unemployment and falling wages that remained orderly thanks in part to the presence of vast numbers of riot police. If you inserted orange pins at these locations - none as yet in the United States - your map would already look aflame with activity. And if you're a gambling man or woman, it's a safe bet that this map will soon be far better populated with red and orange pins. For the most part, such upheavals, even when violent, are likely to remain localized in nature, and disorganized enough that government forces will be able to bring them under control within days or weeks, even if - as with Athens for six days last December - urban paralysis sets in due to rioting, tear gas, and police cordons. That, at least, has been the case so far. It is entirely possible, however, that, as the economic crisis worsens, some of these incidents will metastasize into far more intense and long-lasting events: armed rebellions, military takeovers, civil conflicts, even economically fueled wars between states. Every outbreak of violence has its own distinctive origins and characteristics. All, however, are driven by a similar combination of anxiety about the future and lack of confidence in the ability of established institutions to deal with the problems at hand. And just as the economic crisis has proven global in ways not seen before, so **local incidents** - especially given the almost instantaneous nature of modern communications - **have a potential to spark others in far-off places**, linked only in a virtual sense.

These brushfires spread

Klare 9

Michael, 2/26, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, A Planet at the Brink?, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global\_Economy/KB26Dj02.html

Combine these two World Bank findings - zero economic growth in the developing world and rising food prices - and you have a perfect recipe for unrelenting civil unrest and violence. The eruptions seen in 2008 and early 2009 will then be **mere harbingers of a grim future in which, in a given week, any number of cities reel from riots and civil disturbances which could spread like multiple brushfires in a drought**.

Growth Good – War/Hegemony

Growth key to international stability – solves regime change, builds international institutions, and prevents regional wars – collapses US Leadership and fuels anti-Americanism

Rothkopf 9

David, Visiting Fellow @ Carnegie Endowment for Int’l Peace, 3/11/9. CQ Congressional Testimony, Lexis

We have only experienced the first wave of shocks associated with the international economic collapse. It is still too early to say how long the economic dimensions of the global downturn will continue to challenge leaders and populations worldwide, and while it is impossible to predict how much further conditions will deteriorate before the global economy begins to recover as it inevitably will, one set of consequences of the crisis can be predicted with a high degree of confidence. A crisis of this severity, one that according to the most recent estimate by the World Bank will produce net global contraction in 2009, that has already brought U.S. stock markets to 12 year lows stripping away over half their value, that has deeply eaten into world trade cutting volumes by almost a third and into capital flows and shaken the global financial system to its very foundations, will unavoidably produce a series of political aftershocks. A recent report for the Asian Development Bank suggests the crisis has already obliterated approximately $50 trillion in asset value worldwide - the equivalent of roughly a year of global economic output. We have already seen political reactions in public demonstrations and other violent episodes in a diverse list of countries including Greece, China, Haiti, Latvia, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Russia, Italy, Ireland, Iceland and Lithuania. But these events are just the first rumblings of upsets that almost certainly will ultimately be far more serious and will have important national security consequences for the U.S.. Further, the crisis may in the longer run produce lasting geopolitical shifts as power is concentrated in the hands of nations with available capital, drawn away from those who are net borrowers, and greater and greater constraints limit the options of nations who are likely to spend years seeking to work down the debts incurred during this time of severe global contraction. This new reality was reflected in the fact that Director of National Intelligence Blair in his February 12, 2009 testimony to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on the Intelligence Community's Annual Threat Assessment cited the crisis as the primary driver of concerns in today's world. As he clearly stated, "The primary near-term security concern of the United States is the global economic crisis and its geopolitical implications." In fact, during the past few months, as the crisis has brought down governments (Iceland) and threatened others (across Eastern Europe), it has also had more pernicious effects that are harder to see. Greatest of these is certainly its impact on the United States, reducing the resources available to this country as well as seemingly eating away at the political will that would be required if the U.S. were to play the active, broad-ranging internationally stabilizing role that has marked our foreign policy since the end of the Second World War. Adding to this is the weakening of our core alliances, not in terms of the desire to collaborate, but rather because allies have been preoccupied by challenges at home. Some leading allies, notably the EU, have in recent weeks seen the viability of their core institutions questioned. The weakening of international institutions has been a related consequence of the crisis. Without a degree of financial support and political flexibility for vital organizations like the IMF and the World Bank that seems unlikely at the moment, we may well find ourselves at a true crossroads for the international system. At precisely the instance that the crisis has revealed a need for greater global regulatory oversight and stronger financial institutions to prevent and to respond to crisis, rising nationalism, the political imperative of turning inward, and limited resources threaten existing institutions with irrelevance and needed new ones with being stillborn. Given other weaknesses in this system, such as the dubious value- added of much of the United Nations, the unsettling recent track record of the global non-proliferation regime, the troubles at the WTO with the Doha Round and the failure to establish, as yet, a global environmental organization to address climate change, it is possible to see the crisis neutralizing much of the system built up since the end of the Second World War. The challenges the system faces are made all the more complex by the need to rethink the steering committee for this system and recognize the rise of emerging powers and the declining relevance of some established powers. That this economic crisis has also produced a global crisis of confidence in institutions from national governments to financial markets, from international economic coordination mechanisms that have failed to big corporations, only further exacerbates these already daunting challenges. Beyond threats to stabilizing forces and the international system, individual countries and key regions are also likely to see decline and unrest brought on by the crisis. Some of this unrest is likely to take the form of regime changes or social instability. Other risks associated with the crisis will come as opportunists seek to use anger at the failures in a system that is closely associated with the U.S. to foment hatred, to fuel recruitment for extremist and anti-US organizations and to simply produce distractions from local problems via the time-tested means of identifying foreign or domestic scapegoats and lashing out against them.

Growth Good – Hegemony

Growth key to hegemony – declining foreign aid and defense spending

Haass 8

Richard. President of the Council on Foreign Relations. 11/8/8. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122611110847810599.html>.

Pressures to rein in federal spending are sure to grow. There is little that is easy to cut given the need to meet entitlement obligations, pay interest on the $10 trillion debt, and bail out states and cities unable to balance their budgets. What's more, there is an emerging consensus on the need for yet another stimulus package. Down the road, ballooning deficits will bring inflation and cause problems for the dollar. It is highly likely then that Congress will want to cut the defense and foreign-aid budgets simply because there are so few other targets available to reduce federal spending. This will limit the availability of tools central to asserting U.S. power and influence abroad.

Hegemony solves nuclear war

Khalilzad 95

Zalmay, Washington Quarterly, Spring, LN

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

Growth Good – Terrorism

Economic decline leads to terrorism

Thomas 8

John Thomas, Professor of Economics, January 18 2008, Becker-Posner Blog, Accessed April 8 2008, http://www.becker-posner-blog.com/archives/2008/01/terrorism\_and\_e.html

However lack of economic growth also helps terrorism. To manage in the modern world, every country requires an intellectual class, and without sufficient economic growth this intellectual class is often idle or their partially educated children are idle and likely somewhat unemployed, and thus ripe for radicalism. Also, lack of economic growth tends to support the idea that the nation has fallen behind as a great power. People always like to feel like their part of a great power and economic growth makes people feel like if they are not part of a great power they are becoming part of one. Much of the discontent in the Muslim world is from the idea that the Muslim world has fallen behind the West and thus it must become a great power by any means necessarily.

Terrorism leads to extinction – retaliation

Speice 6

Speice, Patrick F., Jr. "Negligence and nuclear nonproliferation: eliminating the current liability barrier to bilateral U.S.-Russian nonproliferation assistance programs." William and Mary Law Review 47.4 (Feb 2006): 1427(59). Expanded Academic ASAP.

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. (49) Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict. (50) In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. (51) This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States or its allies by hostile states, (52) as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons. (53)

Growth Good – Terrorism

Growth leads to anti-Americanism – backlash against globalization

Haass 8

Richard. President of the Council on Foreign Relations. 11/8/8. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122611110847810599.html>.

We are already seeing increased anti-Americanism, the result of perceptions that the global economic slowdown had its roots in the U.S. mortgage market. Globalization itself is further tarnished. What we can expect is heightened state intervention, protectionism and mercantilism as governments look to enter into arrangements that guarantee preferential outcomes.

Growth Good – Population Growth

Economic growth solves population growth

Hollander 3

Jack, professor emeritus of Energy and Resources at the University of California, Berkeley, Oakland Tribune, ln

The picture is very different in the developing countries. Poverty itself is the environmental villain, and poor people are its victims. One example is the population problem. An absolute requirement for a future sustainable environment is a stable global population, yet traditionally the poorest countries produced explosive population- growth rates. The large families in these countries were the result of high expected death rates from hunger, infectious diseases, contaminated water, lack of health care, resources and education. Now, as income slowly rises in the developing countries, one can see the beginnings of a trend toward population stability. In every country with per-capita annual income over $5,000 (1994 dollars), the fertility rate (average number of children per woman) has dropped to the point where it is not higher than, and in some cases lower than, the minimum replacement level (2.1 children per woman). Even in Sri Lanka, where per-capita income is under $1,000, the fertility rate is only at replacement level.

Extinction

Otten 1

Edward Otten, Professor of Emergency Medicine and Pediatrics at the University of Cincinnati, 2000-2001, <http://www.ecology.org/biod/population/human_pop1.html>

The exponential growth of the human population, making humans the dominant species on the planet, is having a grave impact on biodiversity. This destruction of species by humans will eventually lead to a destruction of the human species through natural selection. While human beings have had an effect for the last 50,000 years, it has only been since the industrial revolution that the impact has been global rather than regional. This global impact is taking place through five primary processes: over harvesting, alien species introduction, pollution, habitat fragmentation, and outright habit destruction.

And global wars

Ehrlich and Ehrlich 6

Paul Ehrlich and Anne Ehrlich, faculty at Stanford University, 9-30-2006, New Scientist

Much of today's population growth is occurring in rural regions in the developing world, sparking tension both within and between nations as increasing numbers of young people migrate to cities and to wealthier countries looking for a better life. In the US, where large numbers of illegal immigrants enter the country in search of work, opinions on immigration are already sharply divided. Western European nations have tended to accept limited immigration from developing countries as a way to augment their workforce. Here too illegal immigration is increasingly a problem, as thousands of people flee overcrowded labour markets in poor African and Asian countries in search of jobs. In many developing countries, numbers of young working-age people are rising by up to 3 per cent per year. Dissatisfaction is inevitable where populations of mostly young people face high unemployment, poverty, poor healthcare, limited education, inequity and repressive government. Revolutions and political unrest most often occur in developing nations with growing populations. Unemployed, disaffected young men provide both public support and cannon fodder for terrorism. The majority of terrorists behind 9/11 and attacks in Europe, for instance, have been young adult men. This is also the demographic group responsible for most crime globally. Expanding populations also create rising demands for food, energy and materials. The strain this puts on ecosystems and resources in developing countries is compounded by demands from industrialised nations keen to exploit everything from timber and tropical fruits to metals and petroleum. Shortages of fresh water are increasingly common, jeopardising food production among many other problems. Rising oil prices may now be signalling the end of cheap energy, which also poses a threat to successful development. At the same time, mounting evidence of global warming makes reducing fossil-fuel use imperative. If the 5 billion-plus people in developing nations matched the consumption patterns of the 1.2 billion in the industrialized world, at least two more Earths would be needed to support everyone. Politicians and the public seem utterly oblivious to what will be required to maintain crucial ecosystem services and an adequate food supply in the face of rapid climate change and an accelerated loss of biodiversity. The future looks grim, unless patterns of consumption change - with rich nations causing less environmental damage and poor ones consuming more, but adopting the newest, cleanest and most efficient technologies for energy use and production of goods and services. It seems likely that by 2050 nuclear, biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction will be in the hands of most nations and many subnational groups. Imagine a well-armed world, still split between rich and poor, with unevenly distributed resources and a ravaged environment. Unless we act now, future generations will not have to imagine.

Growth Good – Population Growth

More link ev - economic failure leads to overpopulation

Rice 6

Susan, Senior Fellow, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/foreign-policy.aspx), [Global Economy and Development](http://www.brookings.edu/global.aspx), The National Security Implications of Global Poverty, Online

Like disease, environmental degradation is linked significantly to poverty in the developing world and can result in long-term adverse consequences for the United States. Much of the world’s environmental stress can be attributed to population pressure. From 1950 to 1998, the world’s population doubled. It has grown a further 14% in the last ten years to 6.4 billion. By 2050, global population is on track to reach 9 billion. This growth is coming disproportionately from the developing world. Poverty substantially fuels population growth, as families have more children in response to high infant mortality rates and the need to raise income potential.

Overpop leads to total ag collapse

Hymel 98

Mona L. Hymel, Associate Professor of Law, University of Arizona College of Law, November 1998, North Carolina Law Review

As the twentieth century draws to a close, humanity faces the daunting prospect of supporting its population without inducing catastrophic and irreversible destruction on Earth's life-support systems. Human and agricultural fertility are on a collision course: the stork is threatening to overtake the plow. 1 More than 600 of the world's most distinguished scientists, including a majority of the living Nobel laureates in the sciences, issued a warning to humanity in 1992. 2 They warned that only a few decades remained to stop unrestrained population growth and environmentally devastating economic practices before efforts to achieve a sustainable future "will be lost and prospects for humanity immeasurably diminished." 3 In 1994, the world's scientific academies echoed this warning. 4 The very rapid rates of human-induced climate change, combined with fragmentation of natural habitats for agriculture and development activities, are unprecedented.

Growth Good – Soft Power Mod

US economic strength key to international influence – encourages allied support

Mead 4

Walter Russell, senior fellow in U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, America’s Sticky Power, Foreign Policy, EBSCO

U.S. military force and cultural appeal have kept the United States at the top of the global order. But the hegemon cannot live on guns and Hollywood alone. U.S. economic policies and institutions act as sticky power, attracting other countries to the U.S. system and then trapping them in it. Sticky power can help stabilize Iraq, bring rule of law to Russia, and prevent armed conflict between the United States and China. Since its earliest years, the United States has behaved as a global power. Not always capable of dispatching great fleets and mighty armies to every corner of the planet, the United States has nonetheless invariably kept one eye on the evolution of the global system, and the U.S. military has long served internationally. The United States has not always boasted the world's largest or most influential economy, but the country has always regarded trade in global terms, generally nudging the world toward economic integration. U.S. ideological impulses have also been global. The poet Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote of the first shot fired in the American Revolution as "the shot heard 'round the world," and Americans have always thought that their religious and political values should prevail around the globe.

Soft power solves 30 wars

Nye 96

Joseph, Washington Quarterly, Winter, Lexis

While generally less threatening to U.S. interests than global or regional balance of power conflicts, communal conflicts are the most likely kind of post-cold war conflict and have thus far proved the most frequent. Less than 10 percent of the 170 states in today's world are ethnically homogenous. Only half have one ethnic group that accounts for as much as 75 percent of their population. Africa, in particular, is a continent of a thousand ethnic and linguistic groups squeezed into some 50-odd states, many of them with borders determined by colonial powers in the last century with little regard to traditional ethnic boundaries. The former Yugoslavia was a country with five nationalities, four languages, three religions, and two alphabets. As a result of such disjunctions between borders and peoples, there have been some 30 communal conflicts since the end of the Cold War, many of them still ongoing. Communal conflicts, particularly those involving wars of secession, are very difficult to manage through the UN and other institutions built to address interstate conflicts. The UN, regional organizations, alliances, and individual states cannot provide a universal answer to the dilemma of self-determination versus the inviolability of established borders, particularly when so many states face potential communal conflicts of their own. In a world of identity crises on many levels of analysis, it is not clear which selves deserve sovereignty: nationalities, ethnic groups, linguistic groups, or religious groups. Similarly, uses of force for deterrence, compellence, and reassurance are much harder to carry out when both those using force and those on the receiving end are disparate coalitions of international organizations, states, and subnational groups. Moreover, although few communal conflicts by themselves threaten security beyond their regions, some impose risks of "horizontal" escalation, or the spread to other states within their respective regions. This can happen through the involvement of affiliated ethnic groups that spread across borders, the sudden flood of refugees into neighboring states, or the use of neighboring territories to ship weapons to combatants. The use of ethnic propaganda also raises the risk of "vertical" escalation to more intense violence, more sophisticated and destructive weapons, and harsher attacks on civilian populations as well as military personnel. There is also the danger that communal conflicts could become more numerous if the UN and regional security organizations lose the credibility, willingness, and capabilities necessary to deal with such conflicts. Preventing and Addressing Conflicts: The Pivotal U.S. Role Leadership by the United States, as the world's leading economy, its most powerful military force, and a leading democracy, is a key factor in limiting the frequency and destructiveness of great power, regional, and communal conflicts. The paradox of the post-cold war role of the United States is that it is the most powerful state in terms of both "hard" power resources (its economy and military forces) and "soft" ones (the appeal of its political system and culture), yet it is not so powerful that it can achieve all its international goals by acting alone. The United States lacks both the international and domestic prerequisites to resolve every conflict, and in each case its role must be proportionate to its interests at stake and the costs of pursuing them. Yet the United States can continue to enable and mobilize international coalitions to pursue shared security interests, whether or not the United States itself supplies large military forces. The U.S. role will thus not be that of a lone global policeman; rather, the United States can frequently serve as the sheriff of the posse, leading shifting coalitions of friends and allies to address shared security concerns within the legitimizing framework of international organizations. This requires sustained attention to the infrastructure and institutional mechanisms that make U.S. leadership effective and joint action possible: forward stationing and preventive deployments of U.S. and allied forces, prepositioning of U.S. and allied equipment, advance planning and joint training to ensure interoperability with allied forces, and steady improvement in the conflict

Growth Good – Soft Power

More ev – growth key to soft power

Mead 4

Walter Russell, senior fellow in U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, America’s Sticky Power, Foreign Policy, EBSCO

The United States' global economic might is therefore not simply, to use Nye's formulations, hard power that compels others or soft power that attracts the rest of the world. Certainly, the U.S. economic system provides the United States with the prosperity needed to underwrite its security strategy, but it also encourages other countries to accept U.S. leadership**.** U.S. economic might is sticky power. How will sticky power help the United States address today's challenges? One pressing need is to ensure that Iraq's economic reconstruction integrates the nation more firmly in the global economy. Countries with open economies develop powerful trade-oriented businesses; the leaders of these businesses can promote economic policies that respect property rights, democracy, and the rule of law. Such leaders also lobby governments to avoid the isolation that characterized Iraq and Libya under economic sanctions. And looking beyond Iraq, the allure of access to Western capital and global markets is one of the few forces protecting the rule of law from even further erosion in Russia.

AT: Transition – No Solvency

Transition fails – people will revert back to the growth mentality

Kornai 00

Janos. Professor of economics at Harvard. Winter 2000. Journal of Economic Perspectives. Volume 14, Number 1. Online.

Self-evidently, a mixed system is in place during the transition from capitalism to socialism, and in the transition from socialism to capitalism. But apart from the countries undergoing the great transformations, several other countries operated in mixed systems for a long time as well. India offers a prime example, with much more state-ownership and bureaucratic control than most other capitalist countries, and a ruling party with an ideology exhibiting some socialist features for two or three decades. However, the party did not include in its program the elimination of private property nor the market, nor did it seek the retention of power at all costs. Combinations similar in many respects can be found in certain periods of the histoty of other developing countries. It is too early to reach a final judgement, but the study of these episodes so far suggests that the mixed cases tend to return eventually to the path of capitalist development.

AT: Transition – No Solvency

Economic crises do not cause a restructured global order – just needless wars and suffering

Mead 9

2/4, Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America, The New Republic

Even before the Panic of 2008 sent financial markets into turmoil and launched what looks like the worst global recession in decades, talk of American decline was omnipresent. In the long term, the United States faces the rise of Asia and the looming fiscal problems posed by Medicare and other entitlement programs. In the short term, there is a sense that, after eight years of George W. Bush, the world, full of disdain for our way of life, seems to be spinning out of our--and perhaps anybody's--control. The financial panic simply brought all that simmering anxiety to a boil, and the consensus now seems to be that the United States isn't just in danger of decline, but in the full throes of it--the beginning of a "post-American" world. Perhaps--but **the long history of capitalism suggests another possibility**. After all, capitalism has seen a steady procession of economic crises and panics, from the seventeenth-century Tulip Bubble in the Netherlands and the Stop of the Exchequer under Charles II in England through the Mississippi and South Sea bubbles of the early eighteenth century, on through the crises associated with the Napoleonic wars and the spectacular economic crashes that repeatedly wrought havoc and devastation to millions throughout the nineteenth century. The panics of 1837, 1857, 1873, 1893, and 1907 were especially severe, culminating in the Great Crash of 1929, which set off a depression that would not end until World War II. The series of crises continued after the war, and the last generation has seen the Penn Central bankruptcy in 1970, the first Arab oil crisis of 1973, the Third World debt crisis of 1982, the S&L crisis, the Asian crisis of 1997, the bursting of the dot-com bubble in 2001, and today's global financial meltdown. And yet, this relentless series of crises has **not disrupted the rise of a global capitalist system**, centered first on the power of the United Kingdom and then, since World War II, on the power of the United States. After more than 300 years, it seems reasonable to conclude that financial and economic crises do not, by themselves, threaten either the international capitalist system or the special role within it of leading capitalist powers like the United Kingdom and the United States. If anything, the opposite seems true--that financial crises in some way sustain Anglophone power and capitalist development.

AT: Transition – No Solvency

No mindset shift – economic crises empirically don’t cause transition and leave social movements devastated. won’t cause a redistribution of wealth

Mead 9

2/4, Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America, The New Republic

Every crisis is different, but there seem to be reasons why, over time, financial crises on balance reinforce rather than undermine the world position of the leading capitalist countries. Since capitalism first emerged in early modern Europe, the ability to exploit the advantages of rapid economic development has been a key factor in international competition. Countries that can encourage--or at least allow and sustain--the change, dislocation, upheaval, and pain that capitalism often involves, while providing their tumultuous market societies with appropriate regulatory and legal frameworks, grow swiftly. They produce cutting-edge technologies that translate into military and economic power. They are able to invest in education, making their workforces ever more productive. They typically develop liberal political institutions and cultural norms that value, or at least tolerate, dissent and that allow people of different political and religious viewpoints to collaborate on a vast social project of modernization--and to maintain political stability in the face of accelerating social and economic change. The vast productive capacity of leading capitalist powers gives them the ability to project influence around the world and, to some degree, to remake the world to suit their own interests and preferences. This is what the United Kingdom and the United States have done in past centuries, and what other capitalist powers like France, Germany, and Japan have done to a lesser extent. In these countries, the social forces that support the idea of a competitive market economy within an appropriately liberal legal and political framework are relatively strong. But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure and look for alternatives. So far, such half-hearted experiments **not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position**, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often **reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth**. This may be happening yet again.

AT: Transition – No Solvency

Crises limit anti-capitalist expansion

Mead 9

2/4, Walter Russell, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America, The New Republic

Indeed, many critics of both capitalism and the "Anglo-Saxons" who practice it so aggressively have pointed to what seems to be a perverse relationship between such crises and the consolidation of the "core" capitalist economies against the impoverished periphery. Marx noted that financial crises remorselessly crushed weaker companies, **allowing the most successful and ruthless capitalists to cement their domination of the system**. For dependency theorists like Raul Prebisch, crises served a similar function in the international system, helping stronger countries marginalize and impoverish developing ones. Setting aside the flaws in both these overarching theories of capitalism, this analysis of economic crises is fundamentally sound--and especially relevant to the current meltdown. Cataloguing the early losses from the financial crisis, it's hard not to conclude that the central capitalist nations will weather the storm far better than those not so central. Emerging markets have been hit harder by the financial crisis than developed ones as investors around the world seek the safe haven provided by U.S. Treasury bills, and commodity-producing economies have suffered extraordinary shocks as commodity prices crashed from their record, boom-time highs. Countries like Russia, Venezuela, and Iran, which hoped to use oil revenue to mount a serious political challenge to American power and the existing world order, **face serious new constraints**. Vladimir Putin, Hugo Chavez, and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad must now spend less time planning big international moves and think a little bit harder about domestic stability. Far from being the last nail in America's coffin, the financial crisis may actually resuscitate U.S. power relative to its rivals.

AT: Transition – No Solvency

Recent evidence proves – no anti-growth movement is burgeoning

Mallaby 8

Sebastian, Director of the Maurice R. Greenberg Center for Geoeconomic Studies and Paul A. Volcker Senior Fellow for International Economics, December, Capitalism: The Remix, Washington Post

The nastier this recession gets, the more people will talk about the discrediting of markets and the failure of deregulation. So the next time the Dow dives off a cliff, splash your face with ice water and remember two things: **This end-of-capitalism talk is bunk**, and it distracts us from the debate we should be having. The real question is how to manage the necessary shift in the balance of our mixed economy. Outlandish though it may sound now, red-blooded capitalism must be part of the answer. Even before the financial crisis, government was expanding. Public spending as a share of the economy jumped under President Bush, and regulation increased, too, notably in the form of the Sarbanes-Oxley law on corporate financial disclosure. Commentators trumpeting the abrupt death of free-market, small-government Republicanism appear to have slept through the Bush years. Yes, the financial crisis has triggered an added surge in government. But this has happened in [every recession](http://www.cfr.org/cgs) since 1980 and **does not represent an intellectual U-turn**. Mainstream economists have always been pro-market, but they have also always recognized numerous qualifications and exceptions. The crisis has triggered two important ones. The first is that, in an acute recession, government spending has to expand aggressively to make up for weak private spending. As a top adviser to Bill Clinton in the 1990s, Larry Summers supported reducing the deficit; as a top adviser to Barack Obama now, Summers supports massive deficit spending. This is not a flip-flop. Summers favors crisis spending now because we are in a crisis. In five years, he will again preach budget discipline. There is no paradox, no tarnished ideology. The second economists' exception is that the financial sector is special. If a big financial institution goes bust, it threatens to sink others; if large parts of the financial sector get clogged, the entire economy goes down with them. Because financial-sector failures can hurt millions of ordinary people, banks will usually be rescued when they get into trouble; because the banks will be rescued, regulators should prevent them from taking excessive risks for which taxpayers end up paying. For decades we have had federal banking oversight, federal deposit insurance and federal bank rescues. **No intellectual revolution is implied by the recent bailouts**.

AT: Transition – Transition Wars

Transition away from growth causes wars

Gubrud 97

Mark Avrum. Center for superconductivity research. <http://www.foresight.org/COnferences/MNT05/Papers/Gubrud/index.html>.

With molecular manufacturing, international trade in both raw materials and finished goods can be replaced by decentralized production for local consumption, using locally available materials. The decline of international trade will undermine a powerful source of common interest. Further, artificial intelligence will displace skilled as well as unskilled labor. A world system based on wage labor, transnational capitalism and global markets will necessarily give way. We imagine that a golden age is possible, but we don't know how to organize one. As global capitalism retreats, it will leave behind a world dominated by politics, and possibly feudal concentrations of wealth and power. Economic insecurity, and fears for the material and moral future of humankind may lead to the rise of demagogic and intemperate national leaders. With almost two hundred sovereign nations, each struggling to create a new economic and social order, perhaps the most predictable outcome is chaos: shifting alignments, displaced populations, power struggles, ethnic conflicts inflamed by demagogues, class conflicts, land disputes, etc. Small and underdeveloped nations will be more than ever dependent on the major powers for access to technology, and more than ever vulnerable to sophisticated forms of control or subversion, or to outright domination. Competition among the leading technological powers for the political loyalty of clients might imply reversion to some form of nationalistic imperialism.

AT: Resource Wars

Their argument is good for hollywood, but bad for social science – poor governance, not resources, drive conflicts

Victor 8

David, professor of law at Stanford Law School, the director of the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development at Stanford University and an adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Smoke and Mirrors, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16530

RISING ENERGY prices and mounting concerns about environmental depletion have animated fears that the world may be headed for a spate of “resource wars”—hot conflicts triggered by a struggle to grab valuable resources. Such fears come in many stripes, but the threat industry has sounded the alarm bells especially loudly in three areas. First is the rise of China, which is poorly endowed with many of the resources it needs—such as oil, gas, timber and most minerals—and has already “gone out” to the world with the goal of securing what it wants. Violent conflicts may follow as the country shunts others aside. A second potential path down the road to resource wars starts with all the money now flowing into poorly governed but resource-rich countries. Money can fund civil wars and other hostilities, even leaking into the hands of terrorists. And third is global climate change, which could multiply stresses on natural resources and trigger water wars, catalyze the spread of disease or bring about mass migrations. Most of this is bunk, and nearly all of it has focused on the wrong lessons for policy. Classic resource wars are good material for Hollywood screenwriters. They rarely occur in the real world. To be sure, resource money can magnify and prolong some conflicts, but the root causes of those hostilities usually lie elsewhere. Fixing them requires focusing on the underlying institutions that govern how resources are used and largely determine whether stress explodes into violence. When conflicts do arise, the **weak link isn’t a dearth in resources but a dearth in governance**.

AT: Resource Wars – China

No resource conflict with china

Victor 8

David, professor of law at Stanford Law School, the director of the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development at Stanford University and an adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, Smoke and Mirrors, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=16530

RESOURCE WARS are largely back in vogue within the U.S. threat industry because of China’s spectacular rise. Brazil, India, Malaysia and many others that used to sit on the periphery of the world economy are also arcing upward. This growth is fueling a surge in world demand for raw materials. Inevitably, these countries have looked overseas for what they need, which has animated fears of a coming clash with China and other growing powers over access to natural resources. Within the next three years, China will be the world’s largest consumer of energy. Yet, it’s not just oil wells that are working harder to fuel China, so too are chainsaws. Chinese net imports of timber nearly doubled from 2000 to 2005. The country also uses about one-third of the world’s steel (around 360 million tons), or three times its 2000 consumption. Even in coal resources, in which China is famously well-endowed, China became a net importer in 2007. Across the board, the combination of low efficiency, rapid growth and an emphasis on heavy industry—typical in the early stages of industrial growth—have combined to make the country a voracious consumer and polluter of natural resources. America, England and nearly every other industrialized country went through a similar pattern, though with a human population that was much smaller than today’s resource-hungry developing world. Among the needed resources, oil has been most visible. Indeed, Chinese state-owned oil companies are dotting Africa, Central Asia and the Persian Gulf with projects aimed to export oil back home. The overseas arm of India’s state oil company has followed a similar strategy—unable to compete head-to-head with the major Western companies, it focuses instead on areas where human-rights abuses and bad governance keep the major oil companies at bay and where India’s foreign policy can open doors. To a lesser extent, Malaysia engages in the same behavior. The American threat industry rarely sounds the alarm over Indian and Malaysian efforts, though, in part because those firms have less capital to splash around and mainly because their stories just don’t compare with fear of the rising dragon. These efforts to lock up resources by going out fit well with the standard narrative for resource wars—a zero-sum struggle for vital supplies. But will a struggle over resources actually lead to war and conflict? To be sure, the struggle over resources has yielded a wide array of commercial conflicts as companies duel for contracts and ownership. State-owned China National Offshore Oil Corporation’s (CNOOC) failed bid to acquire U.S.-based Unocal—and with it Unocal’s valuable oil and gas supplies in Asia—is a recent example. But that is hardly unique to resources—similar conflicts with tinges of national security arise in the control over ports, aircraft engines, databases laden with private information and a growing array of advanced technologies for which civilian and military functions are hard to distinguish. These disputes win and lose some friendships and contracts, but **they do not unleash violence**.

AT: Resource Wars – Climate

Climate doesn’t cause resource wars

Victor 7

David, professor of law at Stanford Law School and the director of the Program on Energy and Sustainable Development. He is also a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, What Resource Wars?, National Interest, Lexis

While there are many reasons to fear global warming, the risk that such dangers could cause violent conflict **ranks extremely low on the list** because it is highly unlikely to materialize. Despite decades of warnings about water wars, what is striking is that water wars don’t happen—usually because countries that share water resources have a lot more at stake and armed conflict rarely fixes the problem. Some analysts have pointed to conflicts over resources, including water and valuable land, as a cause in the Rwandan genocide, for example. Recently, the UN secretary-general suggested that climate change was already exacerbating the conflicts in Sudan. But none of these supposed causal chains stay linked under close scrutiny—the conflicts over resources are usually symptomatic of deeper failures in governance and other primal forces for conflicts, such as ethnic tensions, income inequalities and other unsettled grievances. Climate is just one of many factors that contribute to tension. The same is true for scenarios of climate refugees, where the moniker “climate” conveniently obscures the deeper causal forces.