## NC

Aff’s use of “developing” countries would be defined by GDP.

**S-cool No Date** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Indicators of development** have several uses: They allow us to use a figure for comparing different countries. Countries can be ranked in an attempt to fairly allocate Aid payments. Indicators **give us an idea about what the country is like economically, socially even environmentally. They** do however **have limitations that you should be aware of.** These are discussed later. You need to be able to define the main indicators, explain what they mean and discuss their strengths and weaknesses. You should be aware that this is not a complete list of all indicators as that would be impossible. Did you know that **one of the latest** indicators **is the Big Mac indicator**? Countries are ranked according to how long an average waged worker must work to be able to afford a Big Mac. I'm not sure what happens if they go to Burger King! The main indicators Gross Domestic Product (GDP) - this is the value of all goods and services produced within a country. It is usually measured in US$ and calculated per capita. This makes comparisons between different countries easier. Alternatively you could be faced with Gross National Product (GNP). The difference is that GNP also includes goods and services produced by that country overseas. **GDP is** probably **the most widely used** indicator. It implies a lot about the country. If the figure is high it suggests they have a large number of productive industries producing goods. It also suggests that the service industry is well developed. (Services include things such as hospital and schools. If the figure is low it suggests that the country has few industries and few services so therefore a poor standard of living.)

GDP is the most common metric for growth and turns environmental harm.

**Bloomberg News 13** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

**Which is better for** a country’s **well-being: $10 million spent constructing a jail, or** $10 million spent **producing** a line of **smartphones?** How about clear- cutting rain forests to produce $10 million in lumber? Or a storm that requires $10 million in repairs? **Using today’s most common shorthand of national welfare, g**ross **d**omestic **p**roduct**, all of the above are equal. GDP measures only output**, and makes no claims on the quality of that output, **let alone** on subjective concepts such as social progress or human **happiness**. It does what it was intended to do -- offer a value of marketed goods and services produced in a country in a given time frame -- and does it reasonably well. Unfortunately, as you’ll probably gather from the reaction to this week’s announcement that U.S. GDP unexpectedly declined in the last quarter of 2012, politicians have increasingly come to rely on this measure as a singular tool for calibrating public policy. This is a mistake. As useful as **GDP** is, it has some crucial flaws. It **can obscure** growing **inequality and encourage** the **depletion of resources. It can’t differentiate between spending on good things** (education) **and terrible things** (cigarettes)**.** It doesn’t measure the economic services that nature provides, such as the dwindling wetlands that once protected New Orleans from storms, or those that don’t come with a market price, such as raising children. **It fails to account for the value of** social cohesion, education, health, leisure, **a clean environment** -- in other words, as Robert Kennedy once put it, GDP measures everything “except that which makes life worthwhile.”

Absent AC specification, default to normal means. It’s the most predictable and objective standard for interpreting the aff advocacy and prevents shifty 1AR clarification that spikes out of disads and counterplans.

GDP can’t account for environmental damage or poverty. Rejecting GDP is a prerequisite to the aff.

**Louette 9** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

1. **Everything that can be sold and has** an aggregate **monetary value will increase** the **GDP** and growth, which not necessarily means sustainable development and increased individual and collective well-being. The **GDP positively records** all forms of evil and destruction, such as increase in the number of accidents, progression of illnesses stemming from food insecurity, pollution… (which, to be offset, requires defensive expenditures) the same way it accounts for common well-being resources (education and participation in cultural and leisure activities in a society where people are healthy, for instance). In other words, the two societies would have the same increase in the GDP, once the GDP computes all resources as increase in GDP, regardless of their purpose. It would be necessary to suppress the GDP increase of the first hypothetical society to better assess the actual creation of wealth (the one that contributes to well-being). The same idea can be applied to expenses on repairing **environmental damage caused by** human activities: pollution, **depletion of** natural **resources**, which lead to decreased well-being. 2. Well-being losses caused by economic growth are not measured anywhere. Despite having no commercial value, they may have a huge value for our well-being and that of future generations. The **destruction,** for instance, **of the Amazon** Forest is an activity that **makes** the world **GDP increase (value of** the **timber harvested and the tractor to cut it down**, etc.**).** The resulting loss of natural capital, its effects on the climate, biodiversity, and the long-term needs of future generations are not measured anywhere. In other words, the GDP does not deduct the losses of natural capital, but makes additions to account for its organized destruction. Besides these examples in which well-being losses are not recorded, there are others in which gains – or essential contributions to well-being – are disregarded, including the following: 3. Many **activities** and resources **that contribute to** the **well-being are unaccounted for**, simply **because they are not commercial** or because they have no direct monetary production costs.**Volunteer work and household labor** (not only performed at home, mostly by women, but also the broader realm of our neighborhoods and communities) **are** examples of **forgotten contributions**, which, for being unpaid, are not part of the activities that contribute to the domestic wealth that is measured by the GDP. But is it true that these types of work do not create wealth and well-being as much as the paid work? These are invisible types of work by nature. Nevertheless, they represent huge volumes and contribute to the well-being as much as the paid work. In developed countries, the time spent in household chores is estimated to be equal to the total time spent in paid work. If we decided, for instance, to give it the same monetary value as the working hour, which could double the GDP, representing a considerable amount of ignored wealth. 4. The GDP measures only the amounts produced (outputs) and ignores results in terms of satisfaction and well-being resulting from the consumption of such goods (outcomes), which are more important to measure progress. This measure does not indicate the well-being of a society. **If**, in order **to reach high growth** rates**, we force** or encourage **people to** work more and more and to **have less leisure** and free time**, this** phenomenon **will be considered** as **progress by** the **GDP**, for the GDP does not take into account that increased free time is a wealth that deserves being valued. This example was not taken by chance: in the United States, since 1980, the average annual working hours has risen five hours a year (240 hours), as opposed to what has happened to almost all European countries. Here is a good example of an essential contribution to well-being – free time – that is not part of the wealth accounts. 5. The **GDP** measurement **is also indifferent to** the accounting of **wealth distribution,** to inequalities, **poverty,** economic safety, **etc**, which are, nevertheless, considered almost exclusively as dimensions of a society’s well-being. We do not know, by simply looking at the average GDP, how this income is shared among the local people. The economic development of a country is a necessary condition, by is not enough for social development and improved life conditions of its population to occur. A 2-3% growth for some years might, as the case may be, come together with an increase or a reduction in social inequalities. Does not it make any difference to live in a society where masses of poor coexist with a handful of rich people? Would not one more euro or dollar of growth in the pocket of a poor person generate more well-being than the same amount in the pocket of a rich person? It is definitely not enough to produce more. It is necessary to consider what (criticism 1), to whom (criticism 5), how we are producing (criticisms 2, 3 and 4), and what its balance is. **It is important to rethink how we are measuring** this **wealth**. A wealth that leads us to sustainable development. A development towards common well-being, as a means and not as an end. We must redefine the terms of wealth. **Sustainable development will be possible only if** a **true reconsideration** of the economic pillar **transforms** the **economic** vision and **practice. It is not enough to add an environmental pillar** and then a social pillar **to an economic pillar that would remain unaltered.**

GDP can’t account for long-term harms to growth, including resource exploitation. **Woodard 8** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

Here are three reasons why we should scrap Gross Domestic Product as the key headline metric for analyzing the health of an economy: Life is more than what happens at the office. Myopically focusing on GDP headline numbers skews our sense of what it means to have a healthy economy, and when we use GDP figures to assess the quality of life and strength of our society, we are minimizing or ignoring other extremely important variables. Domestic labor, volunteer work, and other forms of unpaid labor are not tracked by GDP, yet they are extremely important aspects of any economy. And the well-being of a country cannot be inferred solely from the measurements of its consumption and production: life expectancy, infant and maternal mortality, education, literacy, and public health are just some of the crucial variables that are ignored by the GDP formula. A strong economy is a sustainable one. A **high GDP does not necessarily indicate a sound economy**, **since GDP does not measure** the **long-term** sustainability of visible **growth. A country may be in the midst of an asset bubble** (think housing, tech stocks)**,** may be **over-exploiting** its **natural resources** (oil, mining, logging…), **or** may **have a very low savings rate** and/**or misdirected investments; and thus will show a**n artificially **high GDP** number. What’s the point of measuring growth if we can’t tell whether that growth is sustainable over the long or even medium term? **Oil spills, prison cells, and dead smokers are not positives for our economy. But** then **why are those things counted as positive contributors** to growth**?** Robert F. Kennedy said it better than we ever could: “The gross national product includes air pollution and advertising for cigarettes and ambulances to clear our highways of carnage. It counts special locks for our doors and jails for the people who break them. GNP (a slightly different but related measure) includes the destruction of the redwoods and the death of Lake Superior. It grows with the production of napalm, and missiles and nuclear warheads… it does not allow for the health of our families, the quality of their education, or the joy of their play. It is indifferent to the decency of our factories and the safety of our streets alike. It does not include the beauty of our poetry or the strength of our marriages, or the intelligence of our public debate or the integrity of our public officials. It measures everything, in short, except that which makes life worthwhile.” The most immediate response to these criticisms is that **GDP was never intended to be a catch-all measurement for** quality of life or the **overall success of a country. But that’s precisely what it has become**. While we have little to say about the formulas academic economists choose to use in their research, as citizens and individuals we each have every right to insist on accurate and responsible analysis of how our economy and our society are functioning.

Thus the counterplan: Countries with a low sustainable community indicator score should prioritize environmental protection over resource extraction when the two are in conflict.

SCI solves the environment and rejects GDP.

**Milani 1** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

**Virtually every** discipline and **profession needs to be radically transformed** to tap its potential **to create real qualitative wealth**: engineering, medicine, agriculture, etc. But society also needs knowledge to consciously guide overall economic development. Universities can help provide the knowledge needed for realistic planning by mapping natural flows, resources, skills and social needs. One important way **universities can serve progressive community economic planning** is **by helping** to **create** and compile **indicators of real wealth**. **Some** of the most important **indicators are** very **objective:** biophysical **measures of** ecosystems and of human **production and consumption**. They give us some idea of how nature works and how we are affecting nature. Other objective indicators are social: measurements of crime rates, violence against women, income disparities, education levels, etc. **But some** indicators **are more subjective, giving us** some **sense of what our communities value and why**. Universities are already important locales for the development of indicators for scholarly purposes and for government, but **there are** relatively **new** forms of **indicators** that are **closely connected to community economic development. They have been called “sustainable community indicators”** (SCI). **Most media attention has** been **focused on** large national indicator systems, like the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) which is meant to be an alternative to the Gross Domestic Product (**GDP**) as a general measure of the economy’s health. But sustainable community indicator projects—which are growing by leaps and bound—are, I believe, actually much more important as alternative measures of value. They are simultaneously modes of community consciousness, forms of education, means of planning, and ways of actually changing things. While based on all kinds of detailed social and environmental data, **most** of the **SCI projects feature** a relatively small number of **key indicators**, say between 20 and 50, **that** people have decided **best reflects** the **overall quality of social and environmental life.** Sustainable Seattle is probably the best known of the community indicator projects, but they exist in most major cities. **While their educational function is emphasized** in most places, **SCIs can potentially** evolve to **displace money as the measure of real wealth in economic life**, especially if they are combined with community account-money systems that undercut destructive forms of accumulation.

The counter-plan is key to re-thinking environmental protection which currently justifies a bad form of scholarship that distances us from nature, risking extinction.

**Milani 1** writes[[6]](#footnote-6)

The human sense of being separate from nature has a tendency to reproduce itself in insidious and sometimes paradoxical ways. A case in point is in environmental education, where **efforts to encourage** “nature appreciation” and **“environmental protection” often reinforce the chasm between the human economy and non-human nature. Environmental protection is certainly an important concern**, and it is the overwhelming preoccupation of the mainstream environmental movement. **But it can** also **become a mindset that** distracts us from seeing fundamental problems and relationships. This mindset **assumes** a basic conflict between humanity and nature. It presumes **an intrinsically destructive human economy** from which nature must always be shielded. But must the human economy be so intrinsically destructive, or do we possess the capacity to adapt and fit benignly within natural processes? Does our preoccupation with limiting and controlling brown industry divert our attention from redesigning and implementing sustainable, and even regenerative, agricultural, energy and manufacturing systems? In this article, I am arguing this is precisely the case, and that it has huge implications, not just for “environmental education” but for the entire educational system, because **our survival depends on transforming our economic system along ecological design principles. This includes** primary, secondary, post-secondary and adult **education**, but adult education occupies a particularly strategic position. Adult Ed is much more embedded in civil society, and civil society is far ahead of the established educational system in engaging in this crucial transformative learning. Work for Regeneration I teach a course at Toronto’s Metro Labour Education Centre on green economic alternatives. Every week we feature an expert guest speaker from one sector of the economy: energy, manufacturing, urban design, agriculture and the food system, money and finance, etc. The guests are innovators in ecological initiatives like community-supported agriculture, green power coops, off-the-grid housing, community currencies, and more. Our focus is at once visionary and practical. We try to highlight the principles that reveal the ultimate potentials of eco-development, and also guide the practical activity that is already taking place in every sector. The course is a guide to economic possibilities. But it is also an introduction to the imaginative, knowledgeable, committed, articulate, and personable activist-professionals who are living testaments to the wonderful opportunities for community service through “right livelihood”. For these reasons, the course can often be a real “high” to the students involved—most of whom are already very knowledgeable and self-motivated. (I’m not immune to the same intoxication myself, since hosting the course allows me to conveniently update myself on new initiatives, and they never cease to amaze me). The students’ highs are, however, often closely followed by frustration. They say, “wow, this is great stuff—but where can we get the education to do this work?” My sad answer is that, aside from the odd course in this school or that college, there is nowhere that provides comprehensive education on ecological alternatives. The most relevant education is provided by workshops, seminars, courses and conferences offered by movement groups or individuals in civil society. This education is sometimes of very high quality, but does not usually assure fair remuneration to those who provide it. That which does is usually very expensive. And there is a lot of education that is not of the greatest quality, but again primarily because of insufficient resources. Education for eco-alternatives suffers from the same syndrome as most work geared to social and ecological regeneration. By and large, the work most of us get paid to do contributes to destroying our communities and the environment. The work that regenerates our communities or ecosystems must be done “for free”. We do it as volunteer community service, or social activism, or in the informal economy as what the mainstream economy considers simply forms of consumption: self-help building, gardening, preventive healthcare, etc. Many of us reinforce this dilemma by acquiescing too easily to the voluntary status of our most socially productive work. After all, “we’re not in this for the money”. This attitude is certainly admirable, but our **social and environmental crises are deep-seated and will not be remedied by part-time** spare-time **action. Saving the planet must become a full-time job. We must insist on** a **revaluation of work, and find ways to remunerate what is truly important**. This remuneration might take different forms than cash, but the point is that this activity must be recognized and rewarded. People must be able to build their livelihoods around this positive action. Certainly, we must try to make these changes in the economy as a whole. But the realm of **education is a crucial arena** of struggle, especially **because ecological alternatives are** much **more knowledge-intensive than mainstream forms of work** and development. OISE sociologist David Livingstone (2001) has been showing that our highly-touted corporate-global economy is by no means “knowledge-based”. Truly high-skill jobs are concentrated in a fairly narrow band of the work force. Many more low-skill than high-skill jobs are being generated, and most people in the developed countries are far more educated and skilled than they need to be for the available jobs. It is civil society that is knowledge-based, suggesting latent but unrealized potentials for truly regenerative economic development. The current cultural and educational capacity of society provides a base for a different kind of economy, but the specific skill sets and even attitudes cultivated by our educational system must be qualitatively transformed. The Crisis of Environmental Studies  In this context, the ridiculous status of environmental education today was dramatized for me by a conference I attended in March 2000 at York University on the future of environmental studies in Canada. Representatives of the various university environmental studies faculties in Canada reported on a widespread crisis in their field, reflected in substantial declines in enrollment. Ostensibly the reason was that students were choosing academic areas, like business and computing, that were more likely to provide them jobs on graduation. This struck me as absolutely ludicrous since I knew that most forms of ecological production are far more people-intensive than mainstream development. The existing capitalist “information economy” is still resource-intensive and geared to displacing human labour with technology. Green development, by contrast, replaces materials, energy and capital with human intelligence and ingenuity. It does “more with less”; and “more” is defined qualitatively because it directly targets human need. This is true in eco-agriculture, in reutilization-based manufacturing, in eco-building, in alternative health-care, and more. **Environmental studies should**, by rights, **be the place to get job skills.** The reason why **existing ES fails** to do this is **because it is largely defined by “environmental protection” rather than ecological alternatives. Faculties** of environmental studies **do not** generally **produce** permaculturalists, **solar engineers**, living machine or eco-infrastructure designers, **industrial ecologist**s, experts in Carbohydrate chemistry, eco-footprint accountants **or social investment specialists. They churn out policy wonks**, bureaucrats, **and technical people to help the regulators**. They also produce lawyers and engineers to help corporations get around the regulators. They also produce many academics, including some exceptionally cross-disciplinary ones, to contribute to society’s knowledge about nature, and relationships among nature, society, gender, technology, etc.—except where it comes down to practical alternatives. The knowledge generated is exceedingly abstract. **Environmental studies**, therefore, like the rest of the university, **remains quite divorced from the surrounding community.**

1. S-cool (largest A-level and GSCE revision site in the UK). Measuring Differences in Development.” No date. http://www.s-cool.co.uk/a-level/geography/world-development/revise-it/measuring-differences-in-development [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The editors of Bloomberg News. “GDP: An Imperfect Measure of Human Progress.” January 30th, 2013. http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-01-30/gdp-an-imperfect-measure-of-progress.html [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Anne Louette (from Brazil, created the Sustainability Compendium). “Sustainability Indicators of Nations: A Contribution to Dialogue.” Wills Harman House/Antakarana. 1st edition. 2009. http://www.compendiosustentabilidade.com.br/2008/imagens/banco/arquivos/compendio\_indicadores\_ing.PDF [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Jared Woodard (“principal of Condor Options. With over a decade of experience trading options, equities, and futures, he publishes the Condor Options newsletter (iron condors) and associated blog. Jared has been quoted in various media outlets including The Wall Street Journal, Reuters, Bloomberg, Yahoo! Finance, Financial Times Alphaville, and The Chicago Sun-Times. He is the author of Options and the Volatility Risk Premium and Iron Condor Spread Strategies: Timing, Structuring, and Managing Profitable Options Trades, both published by FT Press. In 2008 he was profiled as a top options mentor in Stocks, Futures, and Options magazine, and in 2010 was interviewed for Technical Analysis of Stocks & Commodities magazine. He is a founder and contributing editor of Expiring Monthly: The Option Trader’s Journal, and is a daily contributor to TheStreet’s Options Profits premium service. He is also an associate member of the National Futures Association and registered principal of Clinamen Financial Group LLC, a commodity trading advisor. He graduated with a Ph.D. in philosophy from Fordham University in 2013”). “Three Reasons to Scrap GDP.” Condor Options. April 6th, 2008. http://condoroptions.com/2008/04/06/three-reasons-to-scrap-gdp/ [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Brian Milani (coordinator of Toronto's Eco-Materials Project, an ecological building materials information and advocacy group.  He also teaches courses on green political-economy and ecological economics at the Metro Labour Education Centre, OISE/UT's Transformative Learning Centre, and York University's Faculty of Environmental Studies.  A former carpenter and builder, he was a partner and co-founder of Toronto's Green City Construction.  A longtime labor, community, and environmental activist, he has been active with Carpenters locals 27 and 452, the Green Work Aliance, Environmentalists Plan Toronto, the BC and Ontario Greens, and Citizens for Local Democracy.  For the last eight years, he has been involved with the Coalition for a Green Economy in Toronto). “Beyond Environmental Protection: Ecological Alternatives and Education for a Green Revolution.” Paper Submitted to Multiple Currents:

   Conference on Transformative Learning, November 2001. http://www.greeneconomics.net/EnvironEducation.html [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Brian Milani (coordinator of Toronto's Eco-Materials Project, an ecological building materials information and advocacy group.  He also teaches courses on green political-economy and ecological economics at the Metro Labour Education Centre, OISE/UT's Transformative Learning Centre, and York University's Faculty of Environmental Studies.  A former carpenter and builder, he was a partner and co-founder of Toronto's Green City Construction.  A longtime labor, community, and environmental activist, he has been active with Carpenters locals 27 and 452, the Green Work Aliance, Environmentalists Plan Toronto, the BC and Ontario Greens, and Citizens for Local Democracy.  For the last eight years, he has been involved with the Coalition for a Green Economy in Toronto). “Beyond Environmental Protection: Ecological Alternatives and Education for a Green Revolution.” Paper Submitted to Multiple Currents:

   Conference on Transformative Learning, November 2001. http://www.greeneconomics.net/EnvironEducation.html [↑](#footnote-ref-6)