## First Off

#### Restrictions are a limitation that prohibits an action.  It excludes terms for acting

Court of Appeals 12 STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, DIVISION I, RANDALL KINCHELOE Appellant. vs. Respondent, BRIEF OF APPELLANT, <http://www.courts.wa.gov/content/Briefs/a01/686429%20Appellant%20Randall%20Kincheloe's.pdf>  
3. The ordinary definition of the term "restrictions" also does not include the reporting and monitoring or supervising terms and conditions that are included in the 2001 Stipulation. Black's Law Dictionary, 'fifth edition,(1979) defines "restriction" as; A limitation often imposed in a deed or lease respecting the use to which the property may be put.¶ The term "restrict' is also cross referenced with the term "restrain." Restrain is defined as;¶ To limit, confine, abridge, narrow down, restrict, obstruct, impede, hinder, stay, destroy. To prohibit from action; to put compulsion on; to restrict; to hold or press back. To keep in check; to hold back from acting, proceeding, or advancing, either by physical or moral force, or by interposing obstacle, to repress or suppress, to curb.¶

**“On” means directly targeted at and focused on production**

**Oxford Dictionary** online, **12**The World’s most trusted Dictionary, http:~/~/oxforddictionaries.com/definition/american\_english/[com/definition/american\_english/on](http://opencaselist.paperlessdebate.com/xwiki/bin/create/%2F%2Foxforddictionaries/com%2Fdefinition%2Famerican_english%2Fon?parent=Emory.Pesce%2DSigalos+Neg)

5.  having (the thing mentioned) as a *target, aim, or focus*: *five*air raids *on the city,* thousands marching *on Washington* ,*her*eyes were fixed *on his dark profile*

**Violation—the aff only approves applications for export- they’re already allowed, just expensive now, plus those restrictions aren’t on production they’re on trade of LNG**

**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA  93**  Howard v. Babcock, No. S027061. , SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA, 6 Cal. 4th 409; 863 P.2d 150; 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 80; 1993 Cal. LEXIS 6006; 28 A.L.R.5th 811; 93 Cal. Daily Op. Service 8975; 93 Daily Journal DAR 15372, December 6, 1993, Decided ,  Rehearing Denied February 3, 1994, Reported at: 1994 Cal. LEXIS 534.

 \*\*156 \*\*\*86 Rule 1-500 provides: "(A) A member shall not be a party to or participate in offering or making an agreement, whether in connection with the settlement of a lawsuit or otherwise, if the agreement restricts the right of a \*419 member to practice law, except that this rule shall not prohibit such an agreement which: ¶ (1) Is a part of an employment, shareholders', or partnership agreement among members provided the restrictive agreement does not survive the termination of the employment, shareholder, or partnership relationship; or ¶ (2) Requires payments to a member upon the member's retirement from the practice of law; or ¶ (3) Is authorized by Business and Professions Code sections 6092.5, subdivision information or 6093 providing for authority of State Bar Court to impose conditions of probation on disciplined attorneys. ¶ (B) A member shall not be a party to or participate in offering or making an agreement which precludes the reporting of a violation of these rules." 6¶ CA(4)(4) We are not persuaded that this rule was intended to or should prohibit the type of agreement that is at issue here. HN10 An agreement that assesses a reasonable cost against a partner who chooses to compete with his or her former partners does not restrict the practice of law. Rather, it attaches an economic consequence to a departing partner's unrestricted choice to pursue a particular kind of practice.¶ We agree with the Court of Appeal in Haight, supra, 234 Cal.App.3d 963, declaring HN11an agreement between law partners that a reasonable cost will be assessed for competition is consistent with rule 1-500. Rejecting an interpretation of rule 1-500 like that proffered by plaintiffs here, the court stated: "We do not construe rule 1-500 in such a narrow fashion. . . . The rule does not . . . prohibit a withdrawing partner from agreeing to compensate his former partners in the event he chooses to represent clients previously represented by the firm from which he has withdrawn. Such a construction represents a balance between competing interests. On the one hand, it enables a departing attorney to withdraw from a partnership and continue to practice law anywhere within the state, and to be able to accept employment should he choose to do so from any client who desires to retain him. On the other hand, the remaining partners remain able to preserve the stability of the law firm by making available the withdrawing partner's share of capital and accounts receivable to replace the loss of the stream of income from the \*420 clients taken by the withdrawing partner to support the partnership's debts." (Haight, supra, at pp. 969-970.) Concluding that the agreement was not invalid on its face, the court held that the validity of the agreement depended on whether it "amounts to an agreement for liquidated damages or an agreement resulting in a forfeiture." (Id. at p. 972.)

Vote neg-

1.) Limits- they justify any aff that makes it easier to sell energy to any mix of countries with a relations advantage- allows extra topical planks and circumvents limiting effect of “production”- undermines predictable basis of neg ground

2.) Ground- could reasonably not increase amount of LNG produced with their plan- that crushes core neg ground if we can’t even read “your energy is bad” DA’s

Topicality is a question of competing interpretations- any other standard does not maximize clash, which is the only education unique to debate

## Next Off

#### Consumption practices ensure extinction – cause overshoot and collapse of the environment, only re-organizing society can solve

Smith 11

(Gar, Editor Emeritus of Earth Island Journal, “NUCLEAR¶ ROULETTE¶ THE CASE AGAINST A¶ “NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE” Pgs. 46)

Even if all of the world’s current energy output could be produced by renewables, this level of¶ energy consumption would still inflict terrible harm on Earth’s damaged ecosystems. In order to¶ survive, we need to relearn how to use less. It is critical that we adopt a Conservation Imperative.¶ Faced with the inevitable disappearance of the stockpiles of cheap energy we have used to move and¶ transform matter, we need to identify society’s fundamental needs and invest our limited energy resources¶ in those key areas. A Post-Oil/Post Coal/Post-Nuclear world can no longer sustain the one-time extravagances¶ of luxury goods, designed-to-be-disposable products, and brain-numbing entertainment devices.¶ The long-distance transport of raw materials, food and manufactured goods will need to decline in favor¶ of local production geared to match local resources and needs. Warfare—the most capital-, resource- and¶ pollution-intensive human activity—must also be diminished. Neither the costly inventory of nuclear¶ arms nor the Pentagon’s imperial network of 700-plus foreign bases is sustainable. There will doubtless¶ still be wars but, in the Post-oil World, they will be either be waged with solar-powered tanks or fought¶ on horseback.¶ Modern economies insist on powering ahead like competing steamboats in an upstream race. We have¶ become addicted to over-consumption on a planet that was not designed for limitless exploitation. As¶ the late environmental leader David Brower noted: “In the years since the Industrial Revolution, we¶ humans have been partying pretty hard. We’ve ransacked most of the Earth for resources….We are living¶ off the natural capital of the planet—the principal, and not the interest. The soil, the seas, the forests, the¶ rivers, and the protective atmospheric cover—all are being depleted. It was a grand binge, but the hangover¶ is now upon us, and it will soon be throbbing.” 224¶ On the eve of India’s independence, Mahatma Gandhi was asked whether his new nation could expect¶ to attain Britain’s level of industrial development. Noting that “it took Britain half the resources of this¶ planet to achieve its prosperity,” Gandhi famously estimated that raising the rest of the world to British¶ levels of consumption would require “two more planets.” The United Nations Development Program¶ recently reconsidered Gandhi’s equation as it applies towards “a world edging towards the brink of¶ dangerous climate change.”¶ Working from the assumed “sustainable” ceiling of climate-warming gases (14.5 Gt CO2 per year),¶ UNEP confirmed that “if emissions were frozen at the current level of 29 Gt CO2, we would need two¶ planets.” Unfortunately, UNEP noted, some countries are producing more CO2 than others. Fifteen¶ percent of the world’s richest residents are using 90 percent of the planet’s sustainable budget of shared¶ resources. According to UNEP’s calculations, just sustaining the current lifestyle of Canada and the U.S.¶ would require the resources of 16 planets—eight planets each. 225

Our alternative is to reject the politics of technological production

Rather than focusing on production of technology, we should embrace our ability to shape and transform our subjectivity as consumers, embracing voluntary simplicity – this debate offers a crucial moment to produce alternative knowledge about everyday living practices

Alexander ‘11

(Samuel, University of Melbourne; Office for Environmental Programs/Simplicity Institute, “

Voluntary Simplicity as an Aesthetics of Existence”, Social Sciences Research Network, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1941087)

The aim of this paper, however, is not to present a thorough analysis of Foucault’s notion of an aesthetics of existence. Several such analyses have appeared in recent times (after years of unfortunate scholarly neglect), and much of this emerging commentary is very probing and insightful.12 But this is not the time to focus on furthering that critical discussion or even providing a comprehensive literature review of it. Instead, after providing a brief exposition of Foucault’s ethics, this paper will undertake to actually apply the idea of an aesthetics of existence to a particular subject of ethical concern, namely, to our role as ‘consumers’ in the context of First World overconsumption. This is an area that raises ethical questions concerning how we ought to live for two main reasons: firstly, due to the impact Western--‐style consumers are having on the natural environment; and secondly, due to the continued existence of poverty amidst plenty. There is, however, another perspective to consider also. A large body of sociological and psychological literature now exists indicating that Western--‐style consumption practices are often failing to provide meaning and fulfillment, even to those who have ‘succeeded’ in attaining a high material standard of living.13 These three consumption--‐related issues – ecological degradation, poverty amidst plenty, and consumer malaise – provide ample grounds for thinking that consumption is a proper subject for ethical engagement, in the Foucauldian sense of ethics as ‘the self enfgaging the self.’ If it is the case that our individual identities have been shaped, insidiously perhaps, by a social system that celebrates and encourages consumption without apparent limit – and it would not be unfair to describe consumer societies in these terms14 – then it may be that ethical practice today calls for a rethinking of our assumptions and attitudes concerning consumption, which might involve a deliberate reshaping of the self by the self. This paper will explore the possibility of such an ethics of consumption in the following ways. First, by explaining how neoclassical economics, which is arguably the most influential paradigm of thought in the world today, conceptualizes consumption as something that benefits both ‘self’ and ‘other’ and, therefore, as something that should be maximized. To the extent that modern consumers have internalized this conception of consumption, an ethics of consumption might involve engaging the self for the purpose of changing the self and creating something new. The second way an ethics of consumption will be explored will be through an examination of the theory and practice of ‘voluntary simplicity,’ a term that refers to an oppositional living strategy or ‘way of life’ with which people, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps, seek an increased quality of life through a reduction and restraint of one’s level of consumption.15 The paradox, so-­‐ called, consists in the attempt to live ‘more with less.’ Since voluntarily living simply means heading in the opposite direction to where most people in consumer societies (and increasingly elsewhere) seem to want to go, one would expect living simply to require a fundamentally creative engagement with life and culture, especially in contemporary consumer societies that seem to be predicated on the assumption that ‘more consumption is always better.’ This need for a fundamentally creative engagement with life is what prompted the present attempt to elucidate the idea of ‘voluntary simplicity as aesthetics of existence,’ and it is this attempt to infuse Foucauldian ethics with an emerging post-­‐consumerist philosophy of life that constitutes the original contribution of this paper. It is hoped that this practical application of Foucault’s ethics might also prompt others to consider how ethical engagement might produce new ways of being that are freer, more fulfilling, and yet less resource-­‐intensive and damaging than the modes of being which are dominant in consumer societies today. Could it be, for example, that the ‘Death of Man,’ to use Foucault’s phrase, was actually the first (and a necessary) phase in the demise of what one might call ‘homo consumicus’? And what forms of life, what modes of being, would or could materialize with the voluntary emergence of ‘homo post-­‐consumicus’? These are the large questions that motivated this study and in the following pages a preliminary attempt is made to grapple with them. The aim, however, is not to legitimate ‘what is already known,’16 since that would not be a very Foucauldian endeavor; rather, the aim is to explore whether or to what extent it is possible to ‘free thought from what it silently thinks,’17 in the hope that this might open up space to ‘think differently,’18 to think otherwise.

#### Tech advances can’t solve– it doesn’t address the main cause: over consumption; increases in tech only exacerbates the rich/poor gap risking conflict.

Fauset ‘8

Claire Fauset, researcher. “Techno-fixes: a critical guide to climate change technologies”. Corporate Watch Report. http://www.corporatewatch.org/?lid=3126

As the climate crisis looms, choices about solutions become ever more important. However, the debate on the future is surrounded by hype and vested interests. This briefing seeks to assess the large-scale technologies that corporations and government are putting forward as solutions to climate change. It explains why they are unlikely to prevent climate catastrophe, looks at where the decisions about our strategies for survival are being made, and goes in search of more realistic and socially just solutions. This report includes an overview of the issues surrounding each of the key technologies that are being held up as solutions to climate change, and provides a joined-up analysis and a framework for comparisons. Making the right decisions about technology is vital to avoiding devastating climate change. But many of the technologies being put forward as solutions to this crisis simply won’t work, will worsen the situation, cause significant environmental destruction or are not going to be available with a short enough timeframe to help us. Even combined, they would fail to address the whole problem - for example, there can be no big technofix for deforestation, which currently causes around a fifth of all greenhouse gas emissions. Technofixes are very appealing. They appeal to leaders who want huge projects to put their name to. They appeal to governments in short electoral cycles who don’t want to have to face hard choices of changing the direction of development from economic growth to social change. Technofixes appeal to corporations which expect to capture new markets with intellectual property rights and emissions trading. They appeal to advertising-led media obsessed with the next big thing, but too shallow to follow the science. They appeal to a rich-world population trained as consumers of hi-tech gadgets. They appeal to (carbon) accountants: technological emissions reductions are neatly quantifiable, if you write the sum properly. Technofixes appeal, in short, to the powerful, because they offer an op- portunity to maintain power and privilege. But why are they the wrong answers? Surely technology is important? The discourse of ‘magic bul- lets’ completely ignores the complexities of different situations and needs, and the widely distributed and poorly measured sources of climate change. In short, it isn’t addressing the problem. If we are to have socially just and sustainable solutions to climate change, then we have to all look very criti- cally at how our social and economic systems are failing. If the approach to this problem is primarily technological it has the potential to deepen inequalities between rich and poor as the rich are able to afford access to proprietary technology which enables them to maintain high standards of living while the poor suffer the worst effects of climate change on top of continuing social injustice. This is a recipe for conflict. Climate change is already happening. Already the air and oceans are warming, growing seasons are shifting, and ice and snow cover have decreased across the world. Extreme weather events such as floods, cyclones and droughts are increasing across the world.1 The World Health Organization estimates that 150,000 people died in 2000 due to the impacts of climate change.2 It’s going to get worse. Business as usual means that a temperature rise of around four degrees centigrade above 1990-2000 levels can be expected this century - possibly as much as six degrees..3 Many scientists consider that limiting temperature increases to a maximum of two degrees above pre-industrial levels is necessary if we are to avoid devastating climate change.4 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which represents the international scientific consensus on the issue, suggests that to have a reasonable chance of limiting warming to two degrees would require a peak in global greenhouse gas emissions by 2015 at the latest, with emissions falling by 50-80% below 2000 levels by 2050 and in particular will need industrialized countries to reduce their emissions by 25% to 40% before 2020, and by 80% to 95% before 2050.5 This represents a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of about 5% per year, every year. *Who owns the technology?* Not just the hardware (power stations, pipelines) but the patents and other intellectual property. Some technologies in particular – second-generation agrofuels, hydrogen, nano-solar – are likely to be dominated by a few companies owning fundamental patents and charging royalties for their use. How will this affect deployment if these technologies can be made to work? With over four thousand patents on ‘clean technologies’ granted in 2006 in the USA alone,9 is it legitimate that possible solutions to climate change be held to ransom? *Who controls the technology?* This is a question of control, and of democracy. If supplies are short, who gets them – those in need, or those who can pay? Beyond this, who should decide what the solutions to climate change are and which technologies represent the best way forward? How can these decisions be made democratically with participation from the people who will be most af- fected? Governments make decisions on which technologies to support through public funding. But much more money comes from the private sector, which invests based on potential for profit, not social benefit. And even then, govern- ment money often follows the corporate lead – corporations are widely represented on the Research Councils and other bodies which make public funding decisions. *Who gains from the technology? Who loses?* Is the balance of winners and losers just or equitable? For example, agrofuels benefit the companies that grow and trade them. They may keep fuel prices down for vehicle owners, but push up food prices for everyone, and cause land conflicts between plantations and small farmers. New technologies can also improve social justice: for example deployment of small-scale hydroelectric systems can make reliable, cheap, controllable electricity supplies available to people in areas without a centralised grid. In most discourse on climate mitigation, economic efficiency is prized above social justice. But promoting new tech- nologies which do not help social justice will entrench and exacerbate existing problems, making them all the harder to deal with in the future. Preferring those new technologies which intrinsically promote equality, democratic control and accessibility has wider benefits than the simple reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. In relation to climate change, emissions have largely been the fault of the over-consuming rich, while the impacts are being felt most strongly by people in poorer countries. Climate change itself is thus a social justice issue and it is dou- bly unjust to promote solutions which would worsen the position of those who are already suffering. Inter-generational justice must also be considered - does a technology impose costs on future generations without conferring any benefits? For example, nuclear waste must be stored indefinitely, long after power stations are closed down; captured and stored carbon dioxide would have to be monitored for centuries after cheap fossil-fuel reserves have been exhausted. *How sustainable is the technology?* Greenhouse gas emissions reductions alone are not sufficient evidence of a technology’s benefits. Does the technol- ogy deplete other resources, for example by consumption of rare minerals or through its impact on natural ecosys- tems and biodiversity? Does it have other pollution impacts, such as hazardous waste? Does it encourage or rely on other damaging activities? For example, carbon capture and storage relies on coal mining and encourages greater oil extraction when used for ‘enhanced oil recovery’. Can the technology continue to be used in the long term without increasing negative impacts? *What scale of operations can the technology reach?* If a technology is being presented as the answer to a problem, eg a new source of vehicle fuel, it needs to be avail- able at a sufficient scale. So, for example, waste cooking oil is a sustainable source of vehicle fuel, but only available in very small quantities. First-generation agrofuels, even if social justice and sustainability issues could be overcome, could never supply current world vehicle fuel use. Scalability does not rule out a technology as such, but it is a crucial means of detecting hype around wrong answers which are promoted to allow continuation of business as usual. *When will it be available*? Climate science shows that emissions need to start falling within the next few years, and fall massively in 20 to 30 years. Technologies that are unlikely to be available at an effective scale within that timeframe are not helpful – re- sources should be diverted from these to more immediately available systems – and to ones which can be proven to work. The focus of governments and corporations on emissions targets for 2050 can also be viewed as part of a distraction strategy. 2050 is conveniently distant – a target for 2050 allows time to continue business-as-usual in the short term in the expectation of future technological breakthroughs. Tough targets for 2050 are not tough at all. Where are the techno-fix plans for a peak in global emissions by 2015? Ignoring the scale and source of the problem Focusing on technological solutions ignores how the problem of climate change is caused, why it continues to worsen and how much needs to be done to stop it. Climate change is the result of over-consumption of fossil fuels and of forest and land resources; about one third of emissions currently come from deforestation and agriculture.10 This consumption continues to grow in line with economic growth. Technological improvements will not tackle overconsumption or growth in demand; this requires radical changes to economic systems. Without such changes, any technology-based emissions reductions will eventually be eaten up by continued rising demand for energy and consumer goods – efficiency gains will be converted into greater consumption not long-term reduced emissions. Technologies which encourage consumers to maintain high energy use and fossil fuel dependency, such as carbon capture and storage, fail to address unsustainable consumption levels which are the basis of rich country economies and the cause of both climate change and other critical sustainability crises such as declining soil fertility and fresh water supplies. Even the IPCC now suggests that 85% cuts in global greenhouse gas emissions are needed by 2050,11 other sources suggest as much as 90% reductions for the UK by 2030.12 Technology simply cannot deliver these levels of reduction without accompanying changes to demand, which requires economic and social transformation. Techno-fixation has masked the incompatibility of solving climate change with unlimited economic growth. A rational approach to a certain problem and a set of uncertain solutions might be to say that consumption should be limited to sustainable levels from now, with the possibility of increasing in future when new technologies come on stream. In- stead the approach taken has been to continue consuming to the same destructive levels in the expectation that new technologies will come on stream. The persistent claim that a solution is just around the corner has allowed politicians and corporations to cling to the mantra that tackling climate change will not impact on economic growth. In 2005, in his address to the World Economic Forum, Tony Blair said: ‘If we put forward, as a solution to climate change, some- thing that would impact on economic growth, it matters not how justified it is, it will simply not be agreed to [emphasis added]’.13 While this view may be slowly changing, it has delayed real action for years. Climate change is not the only crisis currently facing the planet. Peak oil (the point at which demand for oil outstrips available supply) is likely to become a major issue within the coming decade; while competition for land and water, de- forestation and destruction of ecosystems, soil fertility depletion and collapse of fisheries are already posing increas- ing problems for food supply and survival in many parts of the world. That’s on top of the perpetual issues of equity and social justice. Technological solutions to climate change generally fail to address most of these issues, except where they may reduce oil use. Yet even without climate change, this systemic environmental and social crisis threatens society, and demands deeper solutions than new technology alone can provide. Scarcity of investment Governments spend a limited amount of money on mitigating climate change. Investment in energy R&D (research and development) increased massively in the 1970s as a result of the 1973 OPEC oil embargo, but in the last 30 years R&D investment as a proportion of GDP has continually declined to the point where it is roughly comparable to pre-1973 levels.14 Where this investment goes is a major issue. While it makes sense to research many options for mitigating climate change, time and resources are limited. In this context, it is worth looking at the distinction between inventions, or technological breakthroughs, and engineer- ing improvements. Some proposed technologies rely on things which simply don’t exist yet; synthetic microbes which ‘eat’ carbon dioxide and excrete hydrocarbons; a safe and efficient system for distributing and using hydrogen vehicle fuel; nuclear fusion power. This is not in itself an argument against any investment in these technological possibilities, but it is an argu- ment against reliance on such future technological breakthroughs. Claims that something which doesn’t exist yet will solve a known problem, and that it should take most of the available resources, should be viewed simply as a stalling tactic on the part of vested interests. Other technologies exist, but are benefiting from ongoing improvement; the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of pho- tovoltaic solar panels; devices for exploiting wave and tidal power; energy-efficient electrical appliances. These areas can be relied on to improve, though the timescale may be unpredictable. This is where technology investment needs to focus. At present, it is the technologies that allow business-as-usual to continue that are receiving the lion’s share of invest- ment, regardless of either potential benefit or feasibility. Investment in agrofuels or CCS means less investment in wave power, in decentralised energy or in economic and social changes to limit the need for high energy consumption. The US government is investing $179m (£89m) in agrofuels in 2008.15 €10bn (£7.9bn) is being spent on an interna- tional experimental nuclear fusion reactor in France.16 Diverting this money away from more immediately practical solutions makes the target of peaking greenhouse gas emissions by 2015 less achievable. It both delays the transition to a low-carbon economy and endangers the future by making devastating climate change more likely. Transition – the period of change between the high-emitting societies of today and a distant sustainable future, is a hot topic. But while this change must come, the ‘transition’ discourse coming from governments and corporations is frequently a cover for arguments that would permit use of technologies in the short term which are known to be unjustifi- able in the long term – geoengineering, first generation agrofuels, ‘carbon-capture ready’ coal fired power stations are argued to be necessary now. But why? Largely to prevent serious change to the rich world’s over-consuming lifestyles. The discourse of transition delays the inevitable. When is the real transition to a low-emission, more equitable society even going to start? How long is it going to last? Technological change is part of the solution. But only part. It is useful only as long as it is compatible with, and prefer- ably supports, other changes to the way society works. Even though these changes are not the focus of this report, a brief summary follows. Economic change Current government approaches to climate change consist largely of tinkering with policy and expecting the market to deliver emissions reductions. But the market doesn’t want to deliver emissions reductions, it wants to deliver profits. Carbon prices are an arbitrary figure unrelated to the real social and environmental cost of emissions. Meanwhile, poli- cies which may ‘harm’ the economy have been shied away from. This green capitalist approach is asking the wrong question. Instead of asking how to continue to grow the economy while living on the limited resources left on this planet, it should be asking – why is economic growth seen as more important than survival? What is growth and do we need it? The current global economic system is based on the assumption of indefinite growth. While ongoing growth in some areas is possible without more consumption of natural resources and emissions of greenhouse gases, this covers only relatively small sectors of the economy – some services and purely information-based products. Growth of the whole global economy means consumption of an ever-increasing amount of goods, using an ever-increasing quantity of en- ergy, mineral, agricultural and forest resources. Even if energy intensity per unit of economic activity can be reduced, ongoing growth eats up the improvement and overall energy consumption still rises. Renewable energy alone cannot decouple consumption from climate change.

#### North-South disparity causes global nuclear wars

Goldstein ‘10

Joshua S. Goldstein, Professor Emeritus, School of International Service, American University. 2010. “Changing World Order - Engaging the South”. http://wps.ablongman.com/long\_goldstein\_ir\_7/35/8977/2298242.cw/index.html

In the last chapter’s “Changing World Order” section, there was mention of how a smallpox epidemic launched from the global South and aimed at the global North would most likely return to do most damage in the South. This quality of global rebound operates from North to South as well. Actions the North takes in the South, such as arming Islamic extremists to fight Soviet occupiers in Afghanistan in the 1980s, come back to haunt the North later—as when Afghan-based Islamic extremists attacked the United States. The problem of unintended consequences of distant actions has been called “blowback.”\* September 2001 demonstrated the increased interdependence of the global North and South. The extreme disparities of wealth and power between North and South create conflicts and resentments that can reach out of the South to punish the privileged citizens of the North who had been oblivious to the problems of poor countries. In the world order of the 1990s, disparities sharpened and prosperity cut unevenly with both winners and losers. The continent of Africa, along with zones of festering war and poverty in countries like Afghanistan, were losers in the 1990s. To let a continent or even a country descend into despair may no longer be practical in the era of terrorism. Their fate ultimately may be the fate of the North that ignores them. This is the century in which desperate African states will be able to press their demands with weapons of mass destruction, and in which fanatics may destroy cities with nuclear weapons. To combat terrorism may—though this is disputed—require addressing poverty, repression, and war throughout the poorest world regions. Furthermore, these issues may be less amenable to unilateral U.S. actions than are military responses to terrorism. Thus, the need to address “root causes” of terrorism may draw the United States into closer cooperation with the UN and other international institutions in the years to come. It is unclear how these relationships will play out in practice. But if in fact the new world order is moving toward closer engagement of the global North with the South, and toward seriously addressing the South’s problems, this move would mark a shift from the world order that was developing in the 1990s, with its sharpened disparities. Do you think that investing in development, democracy, and peace in the world’s poorest countries is an important principle that should govern world order in the era of terrorist attacks? If you think this is a good idea, should it extend globally or just to countries currently “breeding” terrorists? Can Argentina or Democratic Congo fall apart without upsetting the rest of the world? Could all of Latin America or all of Africa? Will the emerging world order bring together the North and South in new ways?

## East China Sea

#### No US draw-in: we don’t care about the issues.

Layne in ‘6

[Christopher, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to Present, Cornell University Press (Ithica), p. 166-167]

Throughout the cold war, the Western Europeans never were confident that the United States would use nuclear weapons on their behalf. Just as important, because they understood the risks to their own country, US. policymakers equally were uncertain whether, if it had been put to the test, the United States would have done so. Thus, or example, in 1959 Secretary of State Christian Herter stated, “I can’t conceive of the President of the United States involving us in an all-out nuclear war unless the facts showed clearly’ that we are in danger of devastation ourselves, or that actual moves have been made toward devastating ourselves. “20 Herter’s remarks caused a furor in Western Europe.2~ Twenty years later, in Brussels, speaking (supposedly off the record) at the annual meeting of the Institute for International Strategic Studies, former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger—echoing Herter’s concerns—asked, “Don’t you Europeans keep asking us to multiply assurances we cannot possibly mean, and that if we do mean, we should not want to execute, because it would destroy our civilization?” Playing devil’s advocate, it could be argued that, notwithstanding U.S. and Western European doubts about the credibility of the U.S. commitment, extended deterrence really did “work” during the cold war in the sense that it dissuaded the Soviets from attacking Western Europe. If so, it should work in East Asia both to deter China and reassure Japan. This counterargument is not a strong one, however, because the strategic context has changed significantly since the cold war. Perhaps the most important change is that, as Robert Jervis has observed, “few imaginable disputes will engage vital U.S. interests.” There is a crucial link between intrinsic value to the United States of what is being protected, the likely risks and costs of going to war if deterrence fails, and the credibility of America’s extended deterrence commitments. Here, the key question is whether the likely stakes in a future U.S-China showdown—Taiwan, the Senkaku Islands (claimed by both Beijing and Tokyo), or contested claims to the reputedly mineral-rich South China Sea underwater seabed—rise to the same level of grand strategic importance for the United States as Western Europe purportedly did during the cold war. Taiwan, the Senkaku Islands, and the disputed waters of the South China Sea may be important—for substantive and symbolic reasons—to China and Japan, but they have no intrinsic strategic value to the United States. Preserving Taiwan’s independence or vindicating Japan’s claims in the East and South China Seas confers no “value-added” to America’s own security. This greatly impairs the credibility of America’s commitments to Taiwan and Japan, because, in a crisis, motivational asymmetries would shift the “balance of resolve” in China’s favor. For sure, in the case of Taiwan, China is very highly motivated to reclaim what it regards as its own territory, which means that China is likely to be willing—or will believe that it is willing—to take more risks to reincorporate Taiwan than the United States will be to prevent Beijing from doing so.

#### Asian war or conflict over the Senkakus unlikely

Bitzinger and Desker ‘8 – Senior Fellow @ International Studies Perspectives

Richard and Barry, PhD from UCLA and Senior Fellow @ International Studies Perspectives, Dean of the S Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Why East Asian War is Unlikely, [Survival](http://www.informaworld.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/smpp/title~content=t713659919~db=all), Volume [50](http://www.informaworld.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/smpp/title~content=t713659919~db=all~tab=issueslist~branches=50#v50), Issue [6](http://www.informaworld.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/smpp/title~content=g906414492~db=all) December 2008 , pages 105 – 128

The Asia-Pacific region can be regarded as a zone of both relative insecurity and strategic stability. It contains some of the world's most significant flashpoints - the Korean peninsula, the Taiwan Strait, the Siachen Glacier - where tensions between nations could escalate to the point of major war. It is replete with unresolved border issues; is a breeding ground for transnational terrorism and the site of many terrorist activities (the Bali bombings, the Manila superferry bombing); and contains overlapping claims for maritime territories (the Spratly Islands, the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands) with considerable actual or potential wealth in resources such as oil, gas and fisheries. Finally, the Asia-Pacific is an area of strategic significance with many key sea lines of communication and important chokepoints. Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but **the break-up of states is unlikely**. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, especially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, including the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common geopolitical and economic organisation - the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) - which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, **ASEAN+3** (China, Japan and South Korea) **and the ASEAN Regional Forum**. **All this suggests tha**t war in Asia - while not inconceivable - is unlikely.

#### US won’t be drawn in – No escalation.

Jeffrey Record 01, professor of strategy and international security at the Air War College at Maxwell AFB, senior research fellow at the Center for Int’l Strategy, Technology, and Policy at the Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD from Johns Hopkins School of Advanced Int’l Studies, Winter 2001, Aerospace Power Journal, v15 i4, “Thinking about China and War,” p. InfoTrac OneFile

Chinese military action against Asian mainland states not allied with the United States probably would not occasion a direct, armed US response. Sino-Russian, -Indian, and -Vietnamese war scenarios of the kind that transpired in 1962, 1969, and 1979, respectively, would not directly engage the vital interests of the United States--unless they spilled over into attacks on US forces and allies. Why would the United States intervene in such conflicts? To be sure, it has a general interest in peace and stability on the Asian mainland and a specific interest in deterring nuclear war between other states. But would it go to war to prevent a nuclear exchange between, say, Russia and China? It was certainly not prepared to do so to deter an Indo-Pakistani exchange during the South Asian nuclear-war scare of 1999.

#### No US-Sino war – China is settling border disputes diplomatically

Rosecrance et al 10 (Richard, Political Science Professor @ Cal and Senior Fellow @ Harvard’s Belfer Center and Former Director @ Burkle Center of IR @ UCLA, and Jia Qingguo, PhD Cornell, Professor and Associate Dean of School of International Studies @ Peking University, “Delicately Poised: Are China and the US Heading for Conflict?” Global Asia 4.4, <http://www.globalasia.org/l.php?c=e251>)

Will China and the US Go to War? If one accepts the previous analysis, the answer is “no,” or at least not likely. Why? First, despite its revolutionary past, China has gradually accepted the US-led world order and become a status quo power. It has joined most of the important inter-governmental international organizations. It has subscribed to most of the important international laws and regimes. It has not only accepted the current world order, it has become a strong supporter and defender of it. China has repeatedly argued that the authority of the United Nations and international law should be respected in the handling of international security crises. China has become an ardent advocate of multilateralism in managing international problems. And China has repeatedly defended the principle of free trade in the global effort to fight the current economic crisis, despite efforts by some countries, including the US, to resort to protectionism. To be sure, there are some aspects of the US world order that China does not like and wants to reform. However, it wishes to improve that world order rather than to destroy it. Second, China has clearly rejected the option of territorial expansion. It argues that territorial expansion is both immoral and counterproductive: immoral because it is imperialistic and counterproductive because it does not advance one’s interests. China’s behavior shows that instead of trying to expand its territories, it has been trying to settle its border disputes through negotiation. Through persistent efforts, China has concluded quite a number of border agreements in recent years. As a result, most of its land borders are now clearly drawn and marked under agreements with its neighbors. In addition, China is engaging in negotiations to resolve its remaining border disputes and making arrangements for peaceful settlement of disputed islands and territorial waters. Finally, even on the question of Taiwan, which China believes is an indisputable part of its territory, it has adopted a policy of peaceful reunification. A country that handles territorial issues in such a manner is by no means expansionist. Third, China has relied on trade and investment for national welfare and prestige, instead of military conquest. And like the US, Japan and Germany, China has been very successful in this regard. In fact, so successful that it really sees no other option than to continue on this path to prosperity. Finally, after years of reforms, China increasingly finds itself sharing certain basic values with the US, such as a commitment to the free market, rule of law, human rights and democracy. Of course, there are still significant differences in terms of how China understands and practices these values. However, at a conceptual level, Beijing agrees that these are good values that it should strive to realize in practice. A Different World It is also important to note that certain changes in international relations since the end of World War II have made the peaceful rise of a great power more likely. To begin with, the emergence of nuclear weapons has drastically reduced the usefulness of war as a way to settle great power rivalry. By now, all great powers either have nuclear weapons or are under a nuclear umbrella. If the objective of great power rivalry is to enhance one’s interests or prestige, the sheer destructiveness of nuclear weapons means that these goals can no longer be achieved through military confrontation. Under these circumstances, countries have to find other ways to accommodate each other — something that China and the US have been doing and are likely to continue to do. Also, globalization has made it easier for great powers to increase their national welfare and prestige through international trade and investment rather than territorial expansion. In conducting its foreign relations, the US relied more on trade and investment than territorial expansion during its rise, while Japan and Germany relied almost exclusively on international trade and investment. China, too, has found that its interests are best served by adopting the same approach. Finally, the development of relative pacifism in the industrialized world, and indeed throughout the world since World War II, has discouraged any country from engaging in territorial expansion. There is less and less popular support for using force to address even legitimate concerns on the part of nation states. Against this background, efforts to engage in territorial expansion are likely to rally international resistance and condemnation. Given all this, is the rise of China likely to lead to territorial expansion and war with the US? The answer is no.

#### -- No risk of Sino-Japanese conflict

Sutter 2 (Robert, Professor – Georgetown, “China and Japan: Trouble Ahead?”, Washington Quarterly, Autumn, Lexis)

Little appears to be on the horizon that will substantially change the recent balance between friction and cooperation in Sino-Japanese relations in a way that would pose serious challenges for U.S. leadership in Asia or U.S. interest in regional stability and development. The shock of the September 11 attacks on the United States along with the U.S.-led war in Afghanistan had the effect of somewhat reducing China's relative influence in Asia while providing Japan an opportunity to expand its role in South and Central Asia. Policy changes after the presidential elections in South Korea late this year could upset the delicate equilibrium on the peninsula, though few see viable alternatives to some continued South Korean engagement with the North. The Chinese leadership transition in 2002 -- 2003 is not expected to result in significant changes in policy toward Asia, as Beijing strives to maintain a calm external environment and focuses on internal priorities. An Indo-Pakistani nuclear war, a U.S.-led attack against Iraq, a terrorist attack using weapons of mass destruction against the United States, or other conceivable international conflicts would strongly affect the United States, though the impact on Sino-Japanese friction in Asia would probably be relatively small. Realistically, the probability is low that a Sino-Japanese entente may emerge that would seriously complicate the existing U.S. security architecture in Asia or possibly challenge the leading U.S. economic role in the region. Thus, Sino-Japanese wariness probably means that the United States has little to worry about from ASEAN Plus Three or other Japan and China -- led groups that endeavor to exclude the United States. Although increased Sino-Japanese friction could divide Asian governments, with some feeling compelled to side with Japan (and presumably the United States) and others seemingly pressed to side with China, neither Beijing nor Tokyo sees such rivalry as in its broad national interests. Both powers appear more likely to continue pursuing priorities focused on domestic issues and economic development that require broad regional cooperation and avoiding confrontation and conflict.

## Econ

#### On the brink of total environmental catastrophe – change in growth patterns allows the environmental movement to take root and solve extinction\*

Shekhar 9

Manisha, 1/30, Professor in the Research Department of Electronics and Communications @ Centre for Strategic Analysis & Research Dept, Environment does not allow further economic growth in the world?, http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/articles/12807\_environment\_does\_not\_allow\_further\_economic\_growth\_in\_the\_world

The world is currently facing an unprecedented [health](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/health) and environmental [Crisis](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/crisis). Despite progress in both the health and the environment fields, the situation is approaching the brink of global disaster. So extensive and far-reaching are the [problems](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/problems) that the future wellbeing of humanity, together with that of many other life forms on the planet, is in jeopardy. On one level, individuals and communities—especially those who are poorest, most marginalized and suffering the most discrimination are facing the direct consequences of local environmental destruction, which often result from exploitative [business](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/business) practices and destructive development projects. Those who are worst off pay with their health for the destruction of their local environment. On another level, people all over the world are beginning to be affected by regional and global environmental [changes](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/changes). These drastic environmental problems, e.g. the changing climate and the depletion of the ozone layer, are mainly the result of unsustainable lifestyles, over consumption and unhealthy patterns of development. Also these environmental problems are likely to hit the poor and marginalized first—and with the most drastic consequences—but will sooner or later also affect the privileged. Unless curbed (through wide ranging, structural changes) these global environmental trends threaten to cause havoc to whole ecosystems and essential life-supporting systems. This may in turn lead to an immense, unprecedented crisis for the whole of humanity. It is thus of utmost relevance for everyone involved in the People’s Health Assembly to understand the links and interconnections between health, the environment as well as underlying factors such as social, political and economic structures which determine the current patterns of development. Ultimately, the health and environment crisis relates to issues of social justice. Analyzing health in an ecological and environmental framework calls for a broad, intersect oral, holistic understanding of health. It shows how many of the pressing health and environmental problems of today [share](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/share) the same root causes and the same barriers to being effectively tackled and solved. It encourages a long-term perspective on health and its future challenges. And it provides, through the experiences of the environmental movement, exciting examples of how people—or ‘civil society’—can successfully influence current thinking and policies. To achieve environmentally sustainable societies will require drastic changes in the current world order and the formulation of alternative ways of thinking. Within the environmental movement there is a huge wealth of ideas, experience and visions of what an alternative—just, environmentally sustainable and people-oriented—society would look like. The health movement can draw on this experience while, on the other hand, influencing the environmental movement to incorporate human health into their analyses and actions. A closer integration of the health and environmental movements is essential to counter the [present](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/present) environmentally destructive and exploitative course of development. In order to solve the current crisis, both humans and the environment must be taken into full [account](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/account).

#### Growth leads to great power conflict

Sachs 8

Jeffrey, Professor of Sustainable Development, A User’s Guide to the Century, http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=18682

THE NEW world order is therefore crisis prone. The existence of rapidly emerging regional powers, including Brazil, China and India, can potentially give rise to conflicts with the United States and Europe. The combination of rapid technological diffusion and therefore convergent economic growth, coupled with the natural-resource constraints of the Anthropocene, could trigger regional-scale or global-scale tensions and conflicts. China’s rapid economic growth could turn into a strenuous, even hot, competition with the United States over increasingly scarce hydrocarbons in the Middle East, Africa and Central Asia. Conflicts over water flow in major and already-contested watersheds (among India, Bangladesh and Pakistan; China and Southeast Asia; Turkey, Israel, Iraq and Jordan; the countries of the Nile basin; and many others) could erupt into regional conflicts. Disagreements over management of the global commons—including ocean fisheries, greenhouse gases, the Arctic’s newly accessible resources, species extinctions and much more—could also be grounds for conflict.

#### Growth leads to environmental collapse and disease epidemics

Shekhar 9

Manisha, 1/30, Professor in the Research Department of Electronics and Communications @ Centre for Strategic Analysis & Research Dept, Environment does not allow further economic growth in the world?, http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/articles/12807\_environment\_does\_not\_allow\_further\_economic\_growth\_in\_the\_world

Throughout time, environmental problems have been some of the most important factors affecting people’s health, both on the individual and the [community](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/glossary#term3543) level. Floods, plagues and the environmental consequences of war have continuously led to ill health and premature death. However, as the scale of human societies has steadily increased and technology has developed ever faster, the pressure on the environment has likewise increased enormously. Fuelled, by a runaway global economic system—which has created both unprecedented affluence (over consumption) and enormous levels of poverty —environmental deterioration now threaten to [increase](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/increase) inequalities and cause irreversible harm to ecosystems on a global scale. While many environmental problems remain immediate, local problems whose causes may be relatively easy to understand and for which solutions can be identified (although not necessarily easy to implement), many others are incredibly complex and difficult to handle. These involve much uncertainty, affect whole continents or even the whole [earth](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/earth), and are the combined result of millions or billions of people’s behaviors. They are often deeply embedded in societal structures maintained by powerful interests. Even worse, many of the current problems cause irreversible damage, so we cannot afford to make certain mistakes even once! Moreover, there may be a considerable time lag between the harmful action and the visible effects. The [history](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/history) of the environment is partly a story of unpredictable, unexpected problems. Often, environmental abuses are absorbed until a threshold is crossed and a catastrophe [results](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/results). At this stage it may be too late, or more costly, to reverse the damage. There is no reason to believe that the future does not have new unpleasant surprises in store.  Environmental threats to health  Degradation of the environment threatens health both directly and indirectly; and both immediately and in the long term. The environmental problems we most easily observe are those with immediate and direct effects. People—and mostly the poorest and the marginalized—get sick from drinking polluted water, eat contaminated food, suffer from exposure to polluted air and poisonous chemicals, and [spend](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/spend) much of their time in harmful working conditions. People’s health suffers in immediate and indirect ways from, for example, food shortages caused by the environmental degradation of both farmland and forests. Environmental refugees—people who have been forced to leave their homes because of the destruction of their local environment—often suffer severe hardships and are prone to ill health.  Many people are also being killed or maimed in wars fought over scarce natural resources. Accidents resulting from environmentally induced natural disasters, such as floods caused by the destruction of forests, are another example of the immediate and indirect effects of environmental degradation. Many environmental threats to health have direct, long-term (delayed delayed) effects about which awareness may be slow to develop. For example, [cancer](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/cancer) is increasing rapidly in all areas of the world, largely as a result of exposure to pesticides, carcinogenic chemical substances included in the goods we consume, and increased exposure to various forms of radiation. These threats concern every person on the planet, although we might not even know what is making [us](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/us) sick and where it is coming from. Toxic substances accumulate in our bodies and are mixed in new and potentially lethal ways. Health may result several decades after exposure. Yet, the possible indirect effects of environmental [change](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/change) in the long term may pose some of the most alarming threats to human health. The disturbance of the world’s climate due to enhanced global warming is already underway, and may cause severe damage to health. Droughts and floods could kill millions of people and introduce new epidemics. New scarcity of valuable resources might increase tensions and lead to drastic increases in wars and violent conflicts.

#### No causality – economic decline doesn’t cause war

Ferguson 6

Niall, Professor of History @ Harvard, The Next War of the World, *Foreign Affairs* 85.5, Proquest

There are many unsatisfactory explanations for why the twentieth century was so destructive. One is the assertion that the availability of more powerful weapons caused bloodier conflicts. But there is no correlation between the sophistication of military technology and the lethality of conflict. Some of the worst violence of the century -- the genocides in Cambodia in the 1970s and central Africa in the 1990s, for instance -- was perpetrated with the crudest of weapons: rifles, axes, machetes, and knives. 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.

#### Empirical studies show no causal relationship between economic decline and war

Miller 1

Morris, Professor of Economics, Poverty: A Cause of War?, http://archive.peacemagazine.org/v17n1p08.htm

Library shelves are heavy with studies focused on the correlates and causes of war. Some of the leading scholars in that field suggest that we drop the concept of causality, since it can rarely be demonstrated. Nevertheless, it may be helpful to look at the motives of war-prone political leaders and the ways they have gained and maintained power, even to the point of leading their nations to war. Poverty: The Prime Causal Factor? Poverty is most often named as the prime causal factor. Therefore we approach the question by asking whether poverty is characteristic of the nations or groups that have engaged in wars. As we shall see, poverty has never been as significant a factor as one would imagine. Largely this is because of the traits of the poor as a group - particularly their tendency to tolerate their suffering in silence and/or be deterred by the force of repressive regimes. Their voicelessness and powerlessness translate into passivity. Also, because of their illiteracy and ignorance of worldly affairs, the poor become susceptible to the messages of war-bent demagogues and often willing to become cannon fodder. The situations conductive to war involve political repression of dissidents, tight control over media that stir up chauvinism and ethnic prejudices, religious fervor, and sentiments of revenge. The poor succumb to leaders who have the power to create such conditions for their own self-serving purposes. Desperately poor people in poor nations cannot organize wars, which are exceptionally costly. The statistics speak eloquently on this point. In the last 40 years the global arms trade has been about $1500 billion, of which two-thirds were the purchases of developing countries. That is an amount roughly equal to the foreign capital they obtained through official development aid (ODA). Since ODA does not finance arms purchases (except insofar as money that is not spent by a government on aid-financed roads is available for other purposes such as military procurement) financing is also required to control the media and communicate with the populace to convince them to support the war. Large-scale armed conflict is so expensive that governments must resort to exceptional sources, such as drug dealing, diamond smuggling, brigandry, or deal-making with other countries. The reliance on illicit operations is well documented in a recent World Bank report that studied 47 civil wars that took place between 1960 and 1999, the main conclusion of which is that the key factor is the availability of commodities to plunder. For greed to yield war, there must be financial opportunities. Only affluent political leaders and elites can amass such weaponry, diverting funds to the military even when this runs contrary to the interests of the population. In most inter-state wars the antagonists were wealthy enough to build up their armaments and propagandize or repress to gain acceptance for their policies. Economic Crises? Some scholars have argued that it is not poverty, as such, that contributes to the support for armed conflict, but rather some catalyst, such as an economic crisis. However, a study by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik shows that this hypothesis lacks merit. After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis in 22 countries in Latin American and Asia since World War II, they concluded that much of the conventional thinking about the political impact of economic crisis is wrong: "The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... or (in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another)."

#### Empirically denied – 11 times

-This one isn’t bad, relatively

Ecommerce Journal 8

December, The U.S. economy is now well into its 11th postwar recession, http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/articles/11618\_the\_u\_s\_economy\_is\_now\_well\_into\_its\_11th\_postwar\_recession

The National Bureau of Economic [Research](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/research) has finally confirmed what the real world has known for at least a year: The [U.S. economy](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/u_s_economy) is now well into its 11th postwar [recession](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/recession)**.** Although the bureau says that it takes anywhere from six to 18 months to determine that a peak in economic activity has been reached, this one has taken longer than its four immediate predecessors.  The bureau says that the latest [business](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/business) [cycle](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/cycle) peak was reached a year ago, in December 2007.  By contrast, the March 2001 peak was announced eight months later, while the July 1990 peak was determined within nine months. The July 1981 peak was set six months after the [fact](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/fact), while it took only five months to establish that a peak was reached in January 1980.  To be fair, some members of the bureau's Business Cycle Dating Committee have felt for several months that the [economy](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/economy) was in a recession. However, they have deferred to the collective judgment of the committee, which was not reached until Friday.  The next question is, Who cares? The answer: Anyone who is interested in forecasting. This means economists, [investors](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/investors), policymakers and business people, just to name four categories.  By dating the beginning and end of recessions, comparisons can be made with the previous downturns in order to determine the odds of a further decline. And while different recessions have different causes, such comparisons can be useful.  For example, the shortest postwar recession lasted only six months, while the longest was 16 months. The average, according to the bureau, is 10 months in length.  At 11 months, the current recession is already longer than average, and rapidly closing in on the two longest recessions: 1973-75 and 1981-82.  If the latest recession does no more than equal these two, then it could be over as early as the end of April. However, given the way the data are unfolding and the causes of this particular [downturn](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/downturn), this seems a bit optimistic.  Most economists figure that the economy will decline at least until the middle of [2009](http://www.ecommerce-journal.com/tags/2009). That would make this recession the longest of the postwar era, at 18 months in length. Some think it could be even longer than that.  But as unique as the current recession might seem, what also is different is how quickly both monetary and fiscal policies have been marshaled to cushion this downturn.

#### These movements are different- crumbling economies in the global north have created *material* solidarity between the North and South- creates an effective mindset shift

Harvey 10/27

(Ryan, writer, an organizer with the Civilian-Soldier Alliance, “Globalization” Is Coming Home: Protests Spread as Financial Institutions Target Global North”, Thursday 27 October 2011, http://www.truth-out.org/world-finally-fighting-infection-neoliberalism/1320164620?q=globalization-coming-home-protests-spread-financial-institutions-target-global-north/1319721791)

Shortly before the once-prized economy of Argentina collapsed at the end of 2001, a “European Summer” saw massive protests across Europe against “neoliberalism”, the corporate economic system behind what is commonly called “globalization.” Emphasizing the privatization of public services and resources and the removal of environmental and human rights regulations deemed “barriers to trade”, neoliberal globalization was widely recognized as the key factor exacerbating the gulf between rich and poor on a global scale. These protests were the largest and most brutal events that this movement experienced in the Global North; with In Gothenburg, three protesters would be shot by the police, and in Genoa, 21 year-old Carlo Giuliani would be shot twice in the face and then run over by a police truck, killing him instantly. The echoes of these events can still be heard throughout Europe, especially among those who experienced the traumatic police repression or served jail time for their role in the events. A few weeks ago, I saw a beautiful stencil memorial to Carlo in a hallway of one of Austria’s last political squats – just one reminder that the political memory of these uprisings is very much part of the fabric of the European autonomous left. But there’s a much louder echo being heard in Europe right now, the echo of corporate-globalization itself. And as in the last decade, a rage that has built up over many years is beginning to emerge in the form of a mass, loosely coordinated social movement. In Europe, young and old alike have been facing the dissolution of what had long been considered staples of western European countries; England’s health care system is on the privatization block; the right to squat abandoned houses is being stripped in England and The Netherlands; the International Monetary Fund has tightened its grip on Greece, Ireland, and Portugal with increasing austerity measures, and tuition rates for students across the continent are rising dramatically. Alongside these economic conditions, increasingly militarized restrictions to immigration into what has been dubbed “Fortress Europe” stand as a drastic reminder that money and products, but not people, travel freely into and out of neoliberal economies. What is happening is that “globalization” is coming home to the countries that helped create it. The rich economies of the global north, which long relied on the exploitation of southern peoples and economies, are coming under the same restrictions they once imposed on the rest of the world. Though many poor people in these countries have long suffered from domestic exploitation, the present wave of budgets cuts threatens to expose both the poor and middle-classes to harsher realities, unifying them in a social movement that is now attempting to maintain this often-fragile alliance. What we are seeing now is the emergence of a similar political discussion to the days after Seattle, only this time we have turned inward in the Global North: we are now not just talking about solidarity with the Global South, rather we are addressing issues both global and local, as we are feeling the harsh effects of a global economy designed for a minority of the world’s wealthiest people.

#### Evaluate all of their impacts in the context of MNC-fueled growth- MNCs eliminate governmental regulation and increase environmental pressures.

Speth ‘8

James, dean of the [Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yale_School_of_Forestry_and_Environmental_Studies) at [Yale University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yale_University), [New Haven, Connecticut](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Haven,_Connecticut). Currently he serves the school as the Carl W. Knobloch, Jr. Dean and Sara Shallenberger Brown Professor in the Practice of Environmental Policy. The Bridge at the Edge of the World. P. 61-62

But the system that drives today’s unsustainable growth includes other powerful elements beyond these. First, there is what the modern corporation has become. The corporation, the most important institution and agent of modern capitalism, has become both huge and hugely powerful. There are today more than sixty-three thousand multinational corporations. As recently as 1990, there were fewer than half that. Of the one hundred largest economies in the world, fifty-three are corporations. Exxon Mobil is larger than 180 nations.28 Corporations are required by law and driven by self-interest to increase their monetary value for the benefit of their owners, the shareholders, and pressures to show quick results in this regard have grown steadily. The corporate sector wields great political and economic power and has routinely used that power to restrain ameliorative governmental action.29 And it has driven the rise of transnational capital as the basis for economic globalization. The international system of investing, buying, and selling is becoming a single global economy. Unfortunately, what we have today is the globalization of market failure.

#### Sustainable growth is impossible – attempts to create reform can’t change the focus away from material growth

Trainer 8

Ted, Lecturer @ University of New South Wales, A short critique of the Stern Review, real-world economics review, issue no. 45

If the question is “How can we provide the energy to run a society committed to affluent living standards and economic growth?” then the answer is that we cannot. A number of distinct lines of argument show clearly that the lifestyles and per capita resource and ecological impacts of the rich countries are far beyond sustainable limits. For instance the Australian footprint of approximately 7 ha of productive land per capita is about 6 times the global average, and by the time we have 9 billion people on earth the multiple will be about 10. Even if none of these alarming sustainability problems confronted us, rich world living standards would not be possible without the grotesquely unjust global economy which delivers most of the world’s resource wealth to the enrichment of our corporations and supermarket shelves. The problems consumer society is running into are due to massive faults deep within the foundations of this society, most obviously to do with an economy driven by market forces, profit and growth, and a culture obsessed with material wealth. It is not just that consumer-capitalist society is unsustainable and unjust -- it can not be made sustainable or just.

#### Their rosy picture of economic growth is terminally flawed – only a bumpy road will allow a powerdown and avert civilization collapse

Heinberg 4

Richard, MA, Senior Fellow of Post Carbon Institute, Book Excerpt: Powerdown: Options and Actions for a Port-Carbon World, http://www.energybulletin.net/node/2291

Most of us would like to see still another possibility – a painless transition in which market forces come to the rescue, making government intervention in the economy unnecessary. This rosy hope is extremely unrealistic, and serves primarily as a distraction from the hard work that will be required in order to avert violent competition and catastrophic collapse.  Facile solutions merely draw our attention away from the problem too soon – and we’re often quite happy to have our attention so diverted. But then the problem just continues to fester and grow. Facile solutions are a form of denial. We must not allow our excitement over partial answers to cause us to lose sight of the real dilemma that confronts us – which, ultimately, is the fact that there are simply too many of us using too many of Earth’s resources too quickly. Our real problem is that we are trapped in a perpetual growth machine. As long as modern societies need economic growth I order to stave off collapse, we will continue to require ever more resources on a yearly basis from our already overtaxed earthly environment. But the Earth has limited resources; even renewable like resources like trees and rainfall are replenished only at a certain rate. The energy conundrum is thus intimately tied to the fact that we anticipate perpetual growth within a finite system.

#### Even if the US model is strong, the U.S. is ineffective at using its economic power.

Gelb December ‘10

Leslie, President Emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations. He was a senior official in the U.S. Defense Department from 1967 to 1969 and in the State Department from 1977 to 1979, November/December Foreign Affairs, Proquest

Most nations today beat their foreign policy drums largely to economic rhythms, but less so the United States. Most nations define their interests largely in economic terms and deal mostly in economic power, but less so the United States. Most nations have adjusted their national security strategies to focus on economic security, but less so the United States. Washington still principally thinks of its security in traditional military terms and responds to threats with military means. The main challenge for Washington, then, is to recompose its foreign policy with an economic theme, while countering threats in new and creative ways. The goal is to redefine "security" to harmonize with twenty-first-century realities. The model already exists for such an economic-centric world and for a policy to match: the approach of U.S. Presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower. They understood that a strong economy is the basis of both a vibrant democracy at home and U.S. military might abroad. They also knew that no matter how strong the U.S. economy and military, Washington would need a lot of help in checking communism. Accordingly, they bolstered U.S. power by resurrecting the economies of Western Europe and Japan, and they added legitimacy to that power by establishing international institutions such as the World Bank and nato. To respond to threats from the Soviet Union and communism, Truman and Eisenhower fashioned the policies of containment and deterrence, backed up by military and economic aid. The idea was to check Soviet military power without bankrupting the United States. Today, of course, any U.S. approach must account for the complexity of the global economy as well as new threats from terrorists and weapons of mass destruction. All this can be done-but not without causing some intellectual and political mayhem. The most ferocious fight will be over how to rejuvenate the U.S. economy. Everyone agrees that it must be fixed, lest the nation face further decline and more dangers. But few agree on how. The basic must-do list is lengthy, unforgiving, and depressingly obvious: improve public schools to sustain democracy and restore global competitiveness; upgrade the physical infrastructure critical to economic efficiency and homeland security; reduce public debt, the interest on which is devouring revenue; stimulate the economy to create jobs; and promote new sources of energy and freer trade to increase jobs, lower foreign debt, and reduce dependence on Middle Eastern oil. Even as politicians and experts do their war dances on these do-or-die domestic issues, they will grapple over foreign policy, as they should. The United States is less and less able to translate its economic strength into influence abroad, even though it will remain for some time the world's largest economy. Why this gap between U.S. power and results? In part, it is because many problems internal to states today are beyond all external ministrations. It is also because U.S. power has been squandered and employed inefficiently. Having overlooked profound changes in the world, U.S. leaders have done little to modernize their national security strategy. Present U.S. strategy offers too little bang for its buck because there is not enough buck in the strategy. A new way of thinking about U.S. interests and power must aim for a foreign policy fitted to a world in which economic concerns typically-but not always-outweigh traditional military imperatives

War II didn’t rise in spite of crisis. They rose because of it. The parallels to the modern-day United States, though not exact, are plain enough. This country’s long

**No protectionism – economy is resilient**

Dani Rodrik (professor of political economy at Harvard, recipient of the Social Science Research Council’s Hirschman Prize) 2009 “The myth of rising protectionism”, <http://www.business-standard.com/india/news/dani-rodrikmythrising-protectionism/373102/>

There was a dog that didn’t bark during the financial crisis: protectionism**.** Despite much hue and cry about it, governments have, in fact, imposed remarkably few trade barriers on imports. Indeed, the world economy remains as open as it was before the crisis struck. Protectionism normally thrives in times of economic peril**.** Confronted by economic decline and rising unemployment, governments are much more likely to pay attention to domestic pressure groups than to upholding their international obligations. As John Maynard Keynes recognised, trade restrictions can protect or generate employment during economic recessions. But what may be desirable under extreme conditions for a single country can be highly detrimental to the world economy. When everyone raises trade barriers, the volume of trade collapses. No one wins. That is why the disastrous free-for-all in trade policy during the 1930’s greatly aggravated the Great Depression. Many complain that something similar, if less grand in scope, is taking place today. An outfit called the Global Trade Alert (GTA) has been at the forefront, raising alarm bells about what it calls “a protectionist juggernaut”. The GTA’s latest report identifies no fewer than 192 separate protectionist actions since November 2008, with China as the most common target. This number has been widely quoted in the financial press. Taken at face value, it seems to suggest that governments have all but abandoned their commitments to the World Trade Organization and the multilateral trade regime. But look more closely at those numbers and you will find much less cause for alarm. Few of those 192 measures are, in fact, more than a nuisance. The most common among them are the indirect (and often unintended) consequences of the bailoutsthat governments mounted as a consequence of the crisis. The most frequently affected sector is the financial industry. Moreover, we do not even know whether these numbers are unusually high when compared to pre-crisis trends. The GTA report tells us how many measures have been imposed since November 2008, but says nothing about the analogous numbers prior to that date. In the absence of a benchmark for comparative assessment, we do not really know whether 192 “protectionist” measures is a big or small number. What about the recent tariffs imposed by the United States on Chinese tires? President Barack Obama’s decision to introduce steep duties (set at 35 per cent in the first year) in response to a US International Trade Commission (USITC) ruling (sought by US labour unions) has been widely criticised as stoking the protectionist fires. But it is easy to overstate the significance of this case, too. The tariff is fully consistent with a special arrangement negotiated at the time of China’s accession to the WTO, which allows the US to impose temporary protection when its markets are “disrupted” by Chinese exports. The tariffs that Obama imposed were considerably below what the USITC had recommended. And, in any case, the measure affects less than 0.3 per cent of China’s exports to the US. The reality is that the international trade regime has passed its greatest test since the Great Depression with flying colours. Trade economists who complain about minor instances of protectionism sound like a child whining about a damaged toy in the wake of an earthquakethat killed thousands**.** Three things explain this remarkable resilience: ideas, politics, and institutions. Economists have been extraordinarily successful in conveying their message to policymakers—even if ordinary people still regard imports with considerable suspicion. Nothing reflects this better than how “protection” and “protectionists” have become terms of derision. After all, governments are generally expected to provide protection to their citizens. But if you say that you favour protection “from imports”, you are painted into a corner with Reed Smoot and Willis C. Hawley, authors of the infamous 1930 US tariff bill. But economists’ ideas would not have gone very far without significant changes in the underlying configuration of political interests in favour of open trade. For every worker and firm affected by import competition, there is one or more worker and firm expecting to reap the benefits of access to markets abroad. The latter have become increasingly vocal and powerful, often represented by large multinational corporations. In his latest book, Paul Blustein recounts how a former Indian trade minister once asked his American counterpart to bring him a picture of an American farmer: “I have never actually seen one,” the minister quipped. “I have only seen US conglomerates masquerading as farmers.” But the relative docility of rank-and-file workers on trade issues must ultimately be attributed to something else altogether: the safety nets erected by the welfare state. Modern industrial societies now have a wide array of social protections – unemployment compensation, adjustment assistance, and other labour-market tools, as well as health insurance and family support — that mitigate demand for cruder forms of protection**.**

#### Overconsumption culminates in extinction and collapses value to life.

Robins in ‘94

Vicki Robin, New Road Map Foundation president, speech delivered at the United Nations, 1994, “A Declaration of Independence from Overconsumption,” http://www.sacredlands.org/independence.htm

Quantity as well as type of consumption defines the individual's impact on the environment. With population rising and expectations for more, better and different stuff increasing, humanity is taxing the earth's life-sustaining systems, its "carrying capacity." Each overconsumer is responsible; we must face this catastrophe in the making. Overconsumption Is A Catastrophe for Ourselves: \* Declining quality of life. Our habit of overconsumption enslaves many of us to longer hours at tedious or morally questionable jobs. We say we value relationships over possessions, yet our behavior says the opposite. As we spend less time with our families and communities, we end up with more crime, violence and teen suicides. Overconsumption Is A Catastrophe For Our Country: \* Economic weakness. Our habit of overconsumption has led to debt, bankruptcy and the lowest savings rate in the industrialized world. We don't have money to invest in infrastructure, in education, in the future. \* Personal excess encourages institutional abuses. The more-is-better mentality allows us to tolerate wars over oil, and corporate practices that are wasteful, polluting and unethical. We can't say "no" to Nintendos for our children or new gadgets for ourselves, so how can we expect our government to say "no" to deficit spending or CEO's to say "no" to exorbitant salaries? Overconsumption Is A Catastrophe For Humanity: \* Modeling an unattainable and unsustainable lifestyle to the global community. The earth cannot support everyone in the manner to which Americans have become accustomed. We must find a way to limit our excess and maintain or increase our quality of life while providing the world's people with our best knowledge and technologies so that they too can enjoy sustainable livelihoods and lifestyles. Overconsumption Is A Catastrophe For The Earth: \* Environmental destruction. Overconsumption accelerates species extinction, water and air pollution, global warming, and accumulation of toxic waste and garbage. \* Resource depletion. Overconsumption means we're using renewable resources faster than nature can restore them. Twenty percent of the groundwater we use each year is not restored. One million acres of cropland are lost to erosion annually. Ninety percent of our northwestern old-growth forests is gone.