## Dedevelopment 1NC

#### Growth unsustainable and makes war and environmental degradation inevitable

Ted Trainer, University of New South Wales, 2011[“The radical implications of a zero growth economy”, ***real-world economics review****,* issue no. 57, <http://www.paecon.net/PAEReview/issue57/Trainer57.pdf>]

The planet is now racing into many massive problems, any one of which could bring about the collapse of civilization before long. The most serious are the destruction of the environment, the deprivation of the Third World, resource depletion, conflict and war, and the breakdown of social cohesion. The main cause of all these problems is over-production and over-consumption – people are trying to live at levels of affluence that are far too high to be sustained or for all to share. Our society is grossly unsustainable – the levels of consumption, resource use and ecological impact we have in rich countries like Australia are far beyond levels that could be kept up for long or extended to all people. Yet almost everyone’s supreme goal is to increase material living standards and the GDP and production and consumption, investment, trade, etc., as fast as possible and without any limit in sight. There is no element in our suicidal condition that is more important than this mindless obsession with accelerating the main factor causing the condition. The following points drive home the magnitude of the overshoot. If the 9 billion people we will have on earth within about 50 years were to use resources at the per capita rate of the rich countries, annual resource production would have to be about 8 times as great as it is now. If 9 billion people were to have a North American diet we would need about 4.5 billion ha of cropland, but there are only 1.4 billion ha of cropland on the planet. Water resources are scarce and dwindling. What will the situation be if 9 billion people try to use water as we in rich countries do, while the greenhouse problem reduces water resources. The world’s fisheries are in serious trouble now, most of them overfished and in decline. What happens if 9 billion people try to eat fish at the rate Australian’s do now? Several mineral and other resources are likely to be very scarce soon, including gallium, indium, helium, and there are worries about copper, zinc, silver and phosphorous. Oil and gas are likely to be in decline soon, and largely unavailable in the second half of the century. If 9 billion were to consume oil at the Australian per capita rate, world demand would be about 5 times as great as it is now. The seriousness of this is extreme, given the heavy dependence of our society on liquid fuels. Recent "Footprint" analysis indicates that it takes 8 ha of productive land to provide water, energy, settlement area and food for one person living in Australia. (World Wildlife Fund, 2009.) So if 9 billion people were to live as we do about 72 billion ha of productive land would be needed. But that is about 10 times all the available productive land on the planet. The most disturbing argument is to do with the greenhouse problem. It is very likely that in order to stop the carbon content of the atmosphere rising to dangerous levels CO2 emissions will have to be totally eliminated by 2050 (Hansen says 2030). (Hansen, 2009, Meinschausen et al., 2009.) Geo-sequestration can’t enable this, if only because it can only capture about 85% of the 50% of emissions that come from stationary sources like power stations. These kinds of figures make it abundantly clear that rich world material “living standards” are grossly unsustainable. We are living in ways that it is impossible for all to share. We are not just a little beyond sustainable levels of resource consumption -- we have overshot by a factor of 5 to 10. Few seem to realise the magnitude of the overshoot, nor therefore about the enormous reductions that must be made.

#### Growth collapses the global environment

Glen Barry, President and Founder of Ecological Internet, Ph.D. in Land Resources from the University of Wisconsin, 1/31/12[“Human Family's Ecocidal Death Wish,” <http://www.countercurrents.org/barry310112.htm>]

The ecological foundation of being is unraveling before our very eyes. Without ecosystems there is no life. Fiercely loving Earth is the answer. Let's sustain global ecology together like our shared survival and abundance depends upon it. And while we set out using classic civil disobedience tactics, let's not dismiss out of hand any obstruction, uncivil disobedience, sabotage and targeted insurgency tactics - that are non-terrorist - and that may be necessary to achieve global ecological sustainability. The human family's shared survival depends upon passionately defending Earth using all means necessary. Earth's ecosystems are collapsing under the burden of human growth, destroying our one shared biosphere that makes life possible. Industrial growth - frantically destroying ecosystems to feed insatiable, ever-growing appetites - is an aberration, a mistake, a disease. If left untreated, this will be the end of the human family, all life, and Earth's very being. Infinite economic growth at the expense of ecosystems is impossible, and seeking endless and inequitable growth in consumption and population can only lead to collapse and massive die-off. Humanity's last best chance to justly and equitably sustain a livable planet is to protect and restore ecosystems, end fossil fuels, and a people's power Earth revolution to utterly destroy the ecocidal industrial growth machine. We are all bloody fools to tolerate and not immediately overthrow a violently ecocidal system that is killing us all. If we all understood the implications of global ecosystem collapse, we would go now, together, and slay the global growth machine. It is too late to escape profound ecological decline, yet complete disastrous social and ecological collapse - and possible end to most or all life - may yet be avoided. Sustaining ecology must become society's central organizing principle or humans and all species face horrendous death. Globally it is time for radical change to simply survive converging ecology, food, war, water, inequity, population, climate, jobs, ocean, and extinction crises. It is deeply troubling most "environmentalists" deny the severity of ecosystem collapse, rejecting out of hand revolutionary measures sufficient to sustain ecology. Earth is dying a death of a billion lashes as ecosystems are liquidated for consumption as if nature has no worth. 80% of old forests are gone, 50% of top soil, 90% of big ocean fish, bee populations are collapsing, we are undergoing abrupt climate change, and two billion are hungry and thirsty - to say nothing of acidic and dead oceans, nitrogen pollution, fracking and tar sands, extinction, desertification, water scarcity, pervasive toxics, and how all these ecological crises interact and reinforce each other. Yes, you read this right - EARTH IS DYING - not that humans are going extinct, but Earth will recover. A whole body of global change and ecology science and intuition indicates Earth is well past its carrying capacity and planetary boundaries, that enough ecosystems have been lost, diminished, and changed forever, that the biogeochemical process that make life possible are failing. We face an unprecedented planetary ecological emergency.

#### Growth is the root cause of warming- that culminates in extinction

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. 35-37]

Human economic activities are raising global temperatures through adding greenhouse gases that trap heat from the sun in the atmosphere.20These pollutants are primarily carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide. Concentrations of carbon dioxide, which are higher than they have been for 650,000 years, are rising faster each year. This means that the rate of global warming is accelerating. When climate scientists predict rising temperatures they are talking about longterm global trends. In the short term, weather cycles and regional variations can produce colder or hotter temperatures than average — for example the La Niña effect produced unusually cold weather in the Northern Hemisphere in the winter of 2007/8.21The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) forecasts that if current trends continue, average global temperatures will probably rise between 3.2˚F-7.2˚F (1.8˚C - 4˚C ) by the end of the century. However, it is possible that temperatures will increase as little as 2˚F (1.1˚C) or as much as 11.5˚F (6.4˚C). The implications of increasing temperatures can be seen in Figure 5. Global warming adds energy to the atmosphere, causing weather patterns to change and extreme events to occur more frequently. Over the last 100 years, average global temperatures have risen by 1.4˚F (0.8˚C). Although this appears to be only a small increase, it has been enough to provoke major shifts in the Earth’s climate. Glaciers are retreating, coral reefs are bleaching, deserts are advancing, storms are strengthening, rainforests are burning and polar ice is melting.25 It is easy to see that if an increase of less than 1.8˚F (1˚C) is already having serious impacts, then further increases are likely to have disastrous consequences. The IPCC estimates that if average global temperatures rise by more than 3.6˚F (2˚C), it will probably trigger rapid, major, and irreversible impacts, including the extinction of hundreds of thousands of species, the conversion of rainforests to dry savannah, the spread of deserts, increasing drought in dry areas of the planet, increasing precipitation and floods in wet areas, falling crop yields and rising sea levels.26The impacts of rising temperatures are explained in detail by Mark Lynas in his award-winning book Six Degrees.27 It is not possible to accurately calculate the impacts or costs of climate change since, for example, we can’t put a value on the hundreds of thousands of species that will go extinct if temperatures rise by even a few degrees. The Stern Review on the economics of climate change concluded that rising temperatures “create risks of major disruption to economic and social activity, on a scale similar to those associated with the great wars and the economic depression of the first half of the 20thcentury.”29 At higher temperatures the consequences will be catastrophic. Much of the planet will become uninhabitable, and most of the species alive today will go extinct. It will be almost impossible to maintain advanced civilizations in these conditions. The threat of runaway global warming is worrying an increasing number of scientists.30 If the natural processes that keep the Earth’s climate in equilibrium are seriously damaged, it may become impossible to prevent global temperatures from getting hotter year after year — even if all further greenhouse gas emissions are stopped. Some climate change tipping points have already been passed: for example, the Earth’s ability to reflect sunlight is declining as the massive ice sheets that air-condition our planet melt, and the ability of our planet melt, and the ability of oceans and soils to absorb carbon dioxide has been sharply reduced. Global warming will not only have to be stopped, but also reversed to reduce temperatures back to a level at which biophysical processes can maintain an equilibrium — an equilibrium which was lost in the 1980s when average global temperatures rose higher than 0.9˚F (0.5˚C) above pre-industrial levels. If this isn’t done quickly, global warming will trigger an irreversible destructive cycle in which a warming atmosphere and warming oceans will destroy the rainforests, ocean algae and other vital ecosystems that remove carbon from the air.

#### Collapse now creates a mindset shift towards small local civilizations

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

With the collapse of global industrial civilization, smaller, autonomous, local and regional civilizations, cultures, and polities will emerge. We can reduce the threat of mass death and genocide that will surely accompany this collapse by encouraging the creation and growth of sustainable, self-sufficient regional polities. John Cobb has already made a case for how this may work in the United States and how it is working in Kerala, India. After the collapse of global industrial civilization, First and Third World peoples won't have the material resources, biological capital, and energy and human resources to re-establish global industrial civilization. Forced by economic necessity to become dependent on local resources and ecosystems for their survival, peoples throughout the world will work to conserve and restore their environments. Those societies that destroy their local environments and economies, as modern people so often do, will themselves face collapse and ruin.

Economic collapse doesn’t cause war

Niall Ferguson is the Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University, 10/2006, “ The Next War of the World”,http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61916/niall-ferguson/the-next-war-of-the-world)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.