# Autonomous Transport Critique

**Brought to you by Joel & Spencer**

### 1nc

#### ---Government transportation infrastructure serves to control the movements of the people, undermine moral autonomy and precludes the development of effective stateless transportation infrastructure.

Darian Worden ’10 (left-liboertarian writer and activist. He hosts an internet radio show, Thinking Liberty, “Who Would Maintain Roads Worse Than the State?”, June 22, 2010, <http://c4ss.org/content/2961>)

The question of transportation infrastructure is often posed to those who reveal themselves to be anarchists. “Without government, how would roads be built?” One can give plenty of reasons and examples concerning why coercion is not needed to construct something in such high demand. But let’s start with “Without government, how could roads be worse?” Roads are currently built according to political demand in an economy dominated by the state, which exists to secure power and ultimately answers to the powerful. The US Interstate and Trans-Canada highway systems, which owe their existence to government intervention, appear to be a comparatively efficient and safe way to travel. But what is not seen are transportation methods that could have developed in a society free of state controls. For example, high-speed roads might have been built over existing throughways. Some might be exclusive to smaller passenger vehicles and some might expand vertically to accommodate more traffic without stealing from people who live beside them. Connected networks of local rail systems might be prominent, or more people could travel by personal aircraft (which could of course be shared). Considering the numerous ways that certain modes of transportation are subsidized by state force shows the difficulty of calculating what method would be most efficient in a free society. Governments use the power of eminent domain to take land for roads and for the massive commercial and residential developments they are built to serve. Large commercial airplanes are likely more economically viable because their production lines depend on military contracts. In the past, large rail companies were subsidized. And governments have always controlled the use of land on behalf of the politically powerful. Interstate highways might reduce trip time when compared to other options in the state-controlled transportation infrastructure, but they are an integral part of a state-dominated economy that makes it necessary to drive farther, drive more often, and drive at certain times. If authoritarian obstructions were done away with, it is likely that people could work for less time, and at hours more of their choosing. And it would be easier to support oneself from home or neighborhood economic activity. A free economy would increase available options and the opportunity to create new arrangements. As for local roads in suburbia, some may have originally been built as mixed-use roadways back before the internal combustion engine caught on, but they now often function to limit the types of travel that can be practiced. When government roads make motor vehicles the only safe way to travel between home and work or the store, then government roads work together with zoning laws to enforce the use of motor vehicles. And those who are not able to afford cars or are not permitted by the state to operate cars have their choices further limited. So government action converts roads from tools of personal mobility into means of controlling the movement and settlement of people. Roads were often constructed in American frontier towns before the arrival of formal government. Recognizing that having an accessible throughway would be in their interests, local residents constructed and maintained roads and benefitted from the labor they put into them. More recently, residents of the Hawaiian island of Kauai bypassed the state bureaucracy to repair a road vital to the local economy, using much less time and money than the state said would be needed. But the issue of transportation should be considered in terms of all transit options. New York’s Metropolitan Transportation Authority, which constantly fails to support itself financially, recently announced more service cuts after increasing fares last year. Amtrak is expensive and frequently delayed. New Jersey Transit train lines have experienced service cuts and fare increases. This will cause more congestion on trains as well as on the roads as the costs of using trains outweigh the benefits for many potential customers. Clearly government is not very good at managing something that is in high demand — convenient mobility. Maybe railway workers know more about managing trains than politicians do. In a stateless society, transportation infrastructure would be built and operated on a consensual basis according to the demand of users. Any form of transportation that could be operated without coercion would be free to develop, and human creativity and cooperation would no longer be restrained by political domination. Without state control and state privilege, roads would be better.

#### ---State transportation infrastructure is mass murder --- Tens of thousands will and continue to die do to sovereign mismanagement, incompetence and indifference.

Block 1979 (Walter, Professor of Economic at Rutgers, “Free Market Transportation Denationalizing the Roads”, http://mises.org/journals/jls/3\_2/3\_2\_7.pdf)

Were a government to demand the sacrifice of 46,700 citizens' each year, there is no doubt that an outraged public would revolt. If an organized religion were to plan the immolation of 523,335 of the faithful in a decade,' there is no question that it would be toppled. Were there a Manson-type cult that murdered 790 people to celebrate Memorial Day, 770 to usher in the Fourth of July, 915 to commemorate Labor Day, 960 at Thanksgiving, and solemnized Christmas with 355 more deaths,3 surely The New York Times would wax eloquent about the carnage, calling for the greatest manhunt this nation has ever seen. If Dr. Spock were to learn of a disease that killed 2,077 children4 under the age of five each year, or were New York City's Andrew Stein to uncover a nursing home that allowed 7,346 elderly people to die annually,~ there would be no stone unturned in their efforts to combat the enemy. To compound the horror, were private enterprise responsible for this butchery, a cataclysmic reaction would ensue: investigation panels would be appointed, the justice department would seek out antitrust violations, company executives would be jailed, and an outraged hue and cry for nationalization would follow. The reality, however, is that the government is responsible for such slaughter-the toll taken on our nation's roadways. Whether at the local, state, regional, or national level, it is government that builds, runs, manages, administers, repairs, and plans for the roadway network. There is no need for the government to take over; it is already fully in charge, and with a vengeance. I believe there is a better way: the market place. Explaining how a free market can serve to provide road and highway service, as it has furnished us with practically every other good and service at our disposal, is the objective of this article.

#### ---The terminal impact is both individual and collective extinction.

Beres, 99 ( Louis, professor of political science and international law at Purdue, “Death, The herd, and human survival”, September 1999, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20753213)

 Perhaps, over time, humankind will envisage the eternal and detach its affections from the world of flux, but that time is far in the future. For now, we must rely on something else, something far less awesome and far more mundane. We must rely on an expanding awareness that states in general, and the United States in particular, are not the Hegelian "march of God in the world,55 but the vicars of annihilation and that the triumph of the herd in world politics can only hasten the prospect of individual death. This, then, is an altogether differ ent kind of understanding. Rather than rescue American foreign policy by free ing the citizenry from fear of death, it recommends educating this populace to the truth of an incontestable relation ship between death and geopolitics. By surrendering ourselves to states, we en courage not immortality but extinction. It is a relationship that can be more widely understood. There are great ironies involved. Although the corrosive calculus of geo politics has now made possible the de liberate killing of all life, populations all over the planet turn increasingly to states for security. It is the dreadfiil in genuity of states that makes possible death in the millions, but it is in the expressions of that ingenuity that people seek safety. Indeed, as the threat of nuclear annihilation looms ever larger, the citizens of nuclear states reaf firm their segmented loyalties, moved by the persistent unreason that is, after all, the most indelible badge of humankind. It follows from this that increasing human uncertainty brought about by an unprecedented vulnerability to disappearance is likely to undermine rather than support the education we require. Curiously, therefore, before we can implement such education we will need to reduce the perceived threat of We must rely on an expanding awareness that states in general, and the United States in particular, are not the Hegelian "march of God in the world," but the vicars of anni hilation and that the triumph of the herd in world politics can only hasten the pros pect of individual death. 18 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON WORLD PEACE VOL. XVI NO. 3 SEPTEMBER 1999 DEATH, THE HERD AND HUMAN SURVIVAL nuclear war and enlarge the belief that nuclear stability (as a short-term objective) is within our grasp. To make this possible we must continue to make progress on the usual and mainstream arms control measures and on the associated strategies of international cooperation and reconciliation.

#### ---The alternative is to abandon the game of transport planning and sovereign rule making and instead embrace individual moral autonomy that allows escape from sovereign dependence and space for new forms of transportation politics.

Shaffer, 1o (Butler, professor of law and author, “Anarchy in the Streets”, 4/7/10, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer223.html)

Formal rules divide us from one another; the more rules that are imposed upon our conduct, the greater the distances among us. Of course, this is the logic upon which the state always acts: to insinuate itself into our relationships with others, substituting its coercively-enforced edicts for our interpersonal bargaining. We become conditioned to look upon strangers as threats, and to regard political intervention as our only means of looking after our own interests. One sees this mindset of social impotence expressed throughout our lives. I am fond of asking my students why they do not negotiate with retailers for groceries, clothing, and other consumer items. They look at me as though I had suggested they attend movies in the nude. "You can't do that," they instinctively respond. I then offer examples of persons I have known who make a habit of such bargaining, managing to save themselves hundreds or more dollars each year. Incredulity still prevails. On one occasion, a student raised his hand to inform the class that he had been an assistant manager of a major retail store in Los Angeles, adding "we did this all the time." How easily we give up on our own social skills, and at what costs. These experiments with traffic-sign abandonment remind us how much we rely upon informal methods of negotiating with other drivers, and the socially-harmonious benefits of our doing so. My own freeway driving experiences provide an example: if another driver signals to move into my lane, or I signal to move into his, more than a simple lane-change takes place. From that point on, there is nothing this other motorist can do — short of intentionally crashing into my car — that will cause me to feel anger toward him. He's "my guy," and I will feel a sense of neighborliness to him that will generate feelings of protectiveness toward him. "Neighborliness" is a good word to use here: how many of us could honk our horn or make angry hand-gestures at another driver we recognized to be someone that we know? **This is one of the unintended consequences of taking the state out of the business of directing our traffic: we regain our sense of society with others; strangers lose their abstractness, and become more like neighbors to us. If you doubt the pragmatic and social benefits of these experiments, try recalling those occasions in which a traffic light goes out at a major intersection. Motorists immediately — and without any external direction — begin a "round-robin" system of taking turns proceeding through the intersection**. One of my seminar students related her experience in this connection. She was parked at the curb, waiting to pick up her mother. She noted that traffic was flowing quite smoothly, and without any significant delays. Then a police officer showed up to direct the traffic, with gridlock quickly ensuing. A number of years ago, someone wrote an op-ed piece in the Los Angeles newspaper, reporting on a major Beverly Hills intersection where some six lanes of traffic converge. There were no traffic lights governing the situation, with motorists relying on the informal methods of negotiating with one another. The writer — who lives in the area — commented upon the resulting orderliness, going so far as to check police records to confirm just how free of accidents this intersection was. How counter-intuitive so much of this is to those who have become conditioned to think that the state is the creator of order in our lives. In much the same way that people are discovering how widespread gun ownership reduces violent crime in society, putting power back into the hands of individuals is the most effective way of fostering both the responsible and harmonious relationships we have so childishly expected to arise from our dependence upon, and obedience to, external authorities. What if the idea of living without coercively imposed rules was to spread from the streets into all phases of our lives? What if we abandoned our habits of looking to others to civilize us and bring us to order, and understood that obedience to others makes us irresponsible? As government people-pushers continue their efforts to micro-manage the details of our lives — what foods and drugs we may ingest; how we are to raise and educate our children; the kinds of cars we may drive and light bulbs we may use; the health-care we are to receive; our optimal weight levels; how we are to provide for our retirement; ad nauseam — might we summon the courage to end our neurotic fixations on "security?" Might the quality of our lives be greatly enhanced by the transformation in thinking implicit in these traffic experiments? Might they offer flashes of insight into how the individual liberty to assess our own risks and freely act upon the choices we make provide the necessary basis for a life that is both materially and spiritually meaningful? As our institutionalized subservience and dependency continues to destroy us, can we learn that what we and our neighbors have in common is our need to negotiate with and to support one another as autonomous and changing people in a changing and uncertain world?

## Link

### ‘Cars Bad’ --- 2nc Link

#### ---Government sponsored alternatives to automobiles are collectivist methods of control that eliminates individual value and liberty at the expense of effective policy.

Gibbs 2011

Douglas V., Collectivists To Force People Out Of Their Cars, <http://politicalpistachio.blogspot.com/2011/07/collectivists-to-force-people-out-of.html>

Democrats hate cars, or at least they hate those that are not a part of the "ruling class" driving cars. The liberal left is pushing for us to become a nation of public transportation. In Europe, as compared to the United States, few people drive. Most people are dependent upon the public transportation system. The liberals will tell you that they want us to ride a bike, walk, ride the bus, or board trains, more because they wish to save the environment. That, however, is just the excuse they use. The reason they want you out of your car is much more sinister than that. The Democrats told us that they needed much of the stimulus money to get the economy going again, and part of that was to build a new transportation infrastructure. However, most of the money went to other sources, and much of the spending went to places that is still unknown to the public. They do want us out of our cars, and signs of that include the leftist push for a high speed rail system. The collectivist blueprint eliminates cars because cars give individuals, as far as they are concerned, too much independence. If you are on a bus, or a train, they know where you are and where you are going. With public transportation they have more control over your movement. That is the liberal dream: control and power. Politicians hate cars because cars make people free. The fact that bullet trains are impractical, or that public transportation is inefficient and a waste outside of a buzzing hive like New York City, seems not to sway the liberal collectivists from their push for more public transportation. The truth is a mere obstacle. The goal of domination over the populace is too important to them to worry about the fact that public transportation is not something that most people in America care to use. The reasons for wanting you out of your car, however, goes deeper than merely controlling you, and taking away yet another slice of liberty. Packing the people into buses and trains goes way beyond the collectivist mentality. The drive is one that fits the Global scheme, and Agenda 21 - an international agreement that seeks to blur the lines of sovereignty, and bring the world under a single global system of governance. The transportation system of the future, in the minds of these people, excludes private auto mobility. In an effort to remove people from cars, living areas where travel is discouraged are being created with a generous offer of public transportation. Rural areas are combating this agenda, but this agenda to move us toward a collective society is part of the reason we are seeing a push to eliminate the Electoral College, and a push to change the Senate to eliminate equal suffrage among the States (which is prohibited by Article V). Doing these things would eliminate the voice of the small states, and remove yet another obstacle to removing us from our cars and creating a communal society using public transportation for all modes of travel. Getting us out of our cars limits, and eventually eliminates, our unalienable rights in many ways. Removing us from our cars compromises our choices, limits our movement, and further abolishes private property ownership (privately owned cars). The elimination of a society that is free to move about with cars also pushes us closer to a controlled industrialized society, achieved by depopulation and heavy regulations on personal freedoms. Getting us out of our cars also takes away yet another symbol of wealth - leftism wants this to be an equitable society where everyone is equally poor, and unable to do anything to unseat the power structure. An end to personal mobility opens up the opportunity for full control over the people, and would keep Americans from venturing out to much of America's lands. They wish to keep the populations concentrated in the cities, leaving most of the land vacated. Populations are easier to control in this manner. To achieve a communal utopia, they need to regulate travel and destroy choice.

###  “Job Creation” --- 2nc Link

#### ---Infrastructure investment cannot create jobs --- Government and subsidies always siphon resources and wealth from the working class.

Darnato, 11 (David, “All Aboard the money train”, member of the center for a stateless society, 2/9/11, http://c4ss.org/content/6090)

The Associated Press reports that the President “is calling for a six-year, $53 billion spending plan for high-speed rail, as he seeks to use infrastructure spending to jumpstart job creation.” Whatever you make of the President’s intentions — whether they pivot on the purpose of spawning billions of dollars worth of contracts for politically-connected Big Business or on some altruistic desire to “get America back to work” — those pesky details of the policy must be dealt with. 53 billion dollars worth of jobs sounds like either a felicitously-timed piece of propagandist puffery or a miraculous gift from the heavens depending on your political viewpoint or, perhaps more accurately, depending on your orientation to empirical reality. Because if we’re really meant to believe that the economy is floundering just to pull its way up out of a serious recession, then we have to wonder where all these magical — and completely unaccountable — billions are coming from, where the state’s ability to create manna for the hungry derives from. Along with these tiresome details, we may also puzzle over just where all of these new rail lines will go, a question apparently answered by the edict that the Department of Transportation will, reports Reuters, “choose corridors for new projects.” One can only guess what that morsel of circumlocution means, but we might postulate that it will translate into more Kelo-style land grabs for the Corporate Bosses. Commenting on the fact that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (“fighting for your business”) is “a big fan of Obama’s push for infrastructure investment,” Tanya Snyder of Streets Blog had it right when she called such investment a “fruitcake” for Big Business. It may be worth noting, for the benefit of those who insist that the business lobby longs for untrammeled free markets, that the Chamber also hailed the President’s stimulus packages. The reality of the grand plan for high-speed rail, packaged with all of its “helping hand for the worker” rhetoric, is very much at variance with the Vice President’s statement today. Although a meaningful transference of wealth will accompany this prodigious public works project, it’ll manifest as the same kind of regressive redistribution that the state’s intervention consistently creates. Billions will be siphoned from the average worker, and, sure, some will go card-punching, construction union wage-earners, but on balance the managers will reap the windfall of our contemporary patronage. We should never be outwitted into believing that the state, sitting at the nucleus of the American corporate system, would ever do anything that wasn’t ultimate facilitating the Bosses’ Economy (and, therefore, against a real free market). Peter Kropotkin saw through the “endless discussions” of reform-minded “practical people” who dismissed anarchists as “Utopian dreamers.” He rightly scoffed at the middle-of-the-road apologists for the state who regarded “‘public works’ … as a means of giving food to the unemployed.” Anarchists on the free market left likewise penetrate the opaque euphemisms of the state that cast corporate welfare as public-spirited populism, as some kind of impetus for positive change in the life of the common man. “Infrastructure” like the rail system is just that — the framework for a rigid, exploitative economy domineered by and enthralled to the interests of a small elite class. And that economy bears no relation to a market freed from those interests, one composed of the freely-undertaken exchanges of individuals who approach one another on an equal footing. Even with all of their pretty words for “free enterprise,” it’s this latter kind of economy that the Chamber and the President stand in the way of.

### “Green Infrastructure” --- 2nc Link

#### ---The States endorsement of “Green infrastructure projects” masks the real identity of their environment destroying subsidies- By continuing this pattern, people become detached from the realities of consumption, reliant on the state and unable to help the environment themselves.

Carson,11 (Kevin, senior fellow of the Center for a stateless society, “One of these things just doesn’t belong here”, 9/20/11, http://c4ss.org/content/8381)

Recently MSNBC’s Rachel Maddow quoted — with raised eyebrow — Republican presidential contender Rick Perry’s qualified endorsement of the transportation infrastructure projects in US president Barack Obama’s proposed jobs program. It was “qualified” in the sense that he was willing to consider it as part of the same package with — or as a quid pro quo for — continuing or expanding refundable tax credits to the fossil fuel industries. Maddow suggested, with her usual fairly good-natured sarcasm, that one of these things just doesn’t belong here. (When I say “good-natured,” I mean without that insufferable air of superiority that makes me want to bash Olbermann’s and O’Donnell’s skulls in.) Actually, the two things go very well together. They’re just two sides of the same coin. Subsidies to infrastructure not funded entirely by user fees on those who impose the costs by using it, and subsidies to energy that make it artificially cheap, are both aspects of a phenomenon that’s at the structural foundations of our corporate-statist economy: The artificial cheapness and artificial prevalence of long-distance distribution which have shifted our economy toward a centralized corporate model of artificially large firm size and artificially extended market areas. The 20th century industrial model of gigantic, capital-intensive, mass-production industry serving continental and global markets, relying on things like planned obsolescence and the military-industrial complex to keep the plants running at full capacity, is largely a product of a series of state interventions that started with railroad land grants in the Gilded Age. There are things that just don’t go together, sure enough. But they’re actually the mid-20th century liberal and Green strands of the contemporary “Progressive” movement. If you watch MSNBC much, you’ve probably seen Maddow’s spots filmed in front of humongous bridges and hydroelectric dams, celebrating the Interstate Highway System and other Capital-I Infrastructure (cue in “Also Sprach Zarathustra”) projects. Standing in front of some giant Stalinist blockbuster engineering project, she presents a stark contrast between those who say America can still do “great things” and those who think we can only afford the “small stuff.” In Maddow’s universe, the only alternatives are “progressive” centralized mass-production economies governed on the Social Democratic model, and the kinds of banana republics falsely called the “free market” by people like Dick Armey and Rick Perry. She seems to be completely unaware of a decentralist left, made up of people like Ralph Borsodi, E.F. Schumacher, Ivan Illich, Paul Goodman and Colin Ward — people who would denounce the Hoover Dam and the Interstate as corporatist collusion between big business and big government. Maddow has to be wearing blinders not to see the connection between her mid-20th century, Schumpeter-Galbraith worship of gigantism and capital-intensiveness, and the car culture and “warehouses on wheels” big box retail model that are its direct byproducts. Meanwhile, Ed Schultz is cheering for the revival of Detroit as a result of the Bush-Obama bailout. Now, imagine if you will a successor to our current economic model of capital-intensive, large-batch mass-production with expensive product-specific machinery, and using push distribution techniques like planned obsolescence to keep industrial capacity fully utilized. Its industrial processes look like Rube Goldberg contraptions, aimed at throwing stuff away as fast as possible so people will buy more stuff and keep the wheels turning — all to prevent catastrophic deflation of the investment economy and maximize the number of “jobs” that are the moral equivalent of digging holes and filling them back in. In its place visualized a relocalized, lean economy of networked manufacturing, using less expensive general-purpose digitally controlled machine tools to make stuff in short production runs, constantly adjusting output to shifts in demand on a demand-pull basis. Because machinery is cheap, flexible, and multiple purpose, there’s no imperative of maximizing utilization of capacity by producing long runs of one thing and then finding ways to compel people to buy it. Without the patent system as a bulwark to planned obsolescence, without annual model changes, cars are a lot more likely to involve product ecologies sharing common platforms and modular components. Without subsidies to sprawl and legally mandated monoculture development, more people will take the bus, or live within walking or bicycle distance of where they work and shop. Now please explain how Schultz can have his ideal of an auto industry churning out eighteen million new units a year in this economic model. People like Maddow and Schultz can make all the noises they want about “green jobs” and “walking softly on the earth.” But it’s simply incompatible — as incompatible as matter with anti-matter — with the mid-twentieth century economic model of the Hoover Dam, the Interstate and the Detroit auto industry celebrated by people like her and Schultz.

### Trains --- 2nc Link

#### ---Promoting trains allows sovereign control over lines of transportation resulting in a collectivist nightmare.

Will 2011

George F., High Speed to Insolvency, Newsweek, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/02/27/high-speed-to-insolvency.html

So why is America’s “win the future” administration so fixated on railroads, a technology that was the future two centuries ago? Because progressivism’s aim is the modification of (other people’s) behavior. Forever seeking Archimedean levers for prying the world in directions they prefer, progressives say they embrace high-speed rail for many reasons—to improve the climate, increase competitiveness, enhance national security, reduce congestion, and rationalize land use. The length of the list of reasons, and the flimsiness of each, points to this conclusion: the real reason for progressives’ passion for trains is their goal of diminishing Americans’ individualism in order to make them more amenable to collectivism. To progressives, the best thing about railroads is that people riding them are not in automobiles, which are subversive of the deference on which progressivism depends. Automobiles go hither and yon, wherever and whenever the driver desires, without timetables. Automobiles encourage people to think they—unsupervised, untutored, and unscripted—are masters of their fates. The automobile encourages people in delusions of adequacy, which make them resistant to government by experts who know what choices people should make. Time was, the progressive cry was “Workers of the world unite!” or “Power to the people!” Now it is less resonant: “All aboard!”

## Impact

### Root Cause of Harms --- 2nc Impact

#### ---The critique is a prerequisite to solving any affirmative advantage --- Government Intervention in transportation limits freedom causing dependence and every major negative externality.

Carson 10 (Kevin, Senior fellow and holder of the Karl Hess Chair in Social Theory at the Center for a Stateless society, “The Distorting Effects of Transportation Subsidies”, November 2010, http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-distorting-effects-of-transportation-subsidies/)

Although critics on the left are very astute in describing the evils of present-day society, they usually fail to understand either the root of those problems (government intervention) or their solution (the operation of a freed market). In Progressive commentary on energy, pollution, and so on—otherwise often quite insightful—calls for government intervention are quite common. George Monbiot, for instance, has written that “[t]he only rational response to both the impending end of the Oil Age and the menace of global warming is to redesign our cities, our farming and our lives. But this cannot happen without massive political pressure.” But this is precisely backward. Existing problems of excess energy consumption, pollution, big-box stores, the car culture, and suburban sprawl result from the “massive political pressure” that has already been applied, over the past several decades, to “redesign our cities, our farming, and our lives.” The root of all the problems Monbiot finds so objectionable is State intervention in the marketplace. In particular, subsidies to transportation have probably done more than any other factor (with the possible exception of intellectual property law) to determine the present shape of the American corporate economy. Currently predominating firm sizes and market areas are the result of government subsidies to transportation. Adam Smith argued over 200 years ago that the fairest way of funding transportation infrastructure was user fees rather than general revenues: “When the carriages which pass over a highway or a bridge, and the lighters which sail upon a navigable canal, pay toll in proportion to their weight or their tonnage, they pay for the maintenance of those public works exactly in proportion to the wear and tear which they occasion of them.” This is not, however, how things were actually done. Powerful business interests have used their political influence since the beginning of American history to secure government funding for “internal improvements.” The real turning point was the government’s role in creating the railroad system from the mid-nineteenth century on. The national railroad system as we know it was almost entirely a creature of the State. The federal railroad land grants included not only the rights-of-way for the actual railroads, but extended 15-mile tracts on both sides. As the lines were completed, this adjoining land became prime real estate and skyrocketed in value. As new communities sprang up along the routes, every house and business in town was built on land acquired from the railroads. The tracts also frequently included valuable timberland. The railroads, according to Matthew Josephson (The Robber Barons), were “land companies” whose directors “did a rushing land business in farm lands and town sites at rising prices.” For example, under the terms of the Pacific Railroad bill, the Union Pacific (which built from the Mississippi westward) was granted 12 million acres of land and $27 million worth of 30-year government bonds. The Central Pacific (built from the West Coast eastward) received nine million acres and $24 million worth of bonds. The total land grants to the railroads amounted to about six times the area of France. Theodore Judah, chief engineer for what became the Central Pacific, assured potential investors “that it could be done—if government aid were obtained. For the cost would be terrible.” Collis Huntington, the leading promoter for the project, engaged in a sordid combination of strategically placed bribes and appeals to communities’ fears of being bypassed in order to extort grants of “rights of way, terminal and harbor sites, and . . . stock or bond subscriptions ranging from $150,000 to $1,000,000” from a long string of local governments that included San Francisco, Stockton, and Sacramento. Government also revised tort and contract law to ease the carriers’ way—for example, by exempting common carriers from liability for many kinds of physical damage caused by their operation. Had railroad ventures been forced to bear their own initial capital outlays—securing rights of way, preparing roadbeds, and laying track, without land grants and government purchases of their bonds—the railroads would likely have developed instead along the initial lines on which Lewis Mumford speculated in The City in History: many local rail networks linking communities into local industrial economies. The regional and national interlinkages of local networks, when they did occur, would have been far fewer and far smaller in capacity. The comparative costs of local and national distribution, accordingly, would have been quite different. In a nation of hundreds of local industrial economies, with long-distance rail transport much more costly than at present, the natural pattern of industrialization would have been to integrate small-scale power machinery into flexible manufacturing for local markets. Alfred Chandler, in The Visible Hand, argued that the creation of the national railroad system made possible, first, national wholesale and retail markets, and then large manufacturing firms serving the national market. The existence of unified national markets served by large-scale manufacturers depended on a reliable, high-volume distribution system operating on a national level. The railroad and telegraph, “so essential to high-volume production and distribution,” were in Chandler’s view what made possible this steady flow of goods through the distribution pipeline: “The revolution in the processes of distribution and production rested in large part on the new transportation and communications infrastructure. Modern mass production and mass distribution depend on the speed, volume, and regularity in the movement of goods and messages made possible by the coming of the railroad, telegraph and steamship.”

### War --- 2nc Impact

#### ---State structure causes war.

Brian Martin ’90 (Professor of Social Sciences at the University of Wollongong, Australia, “Uprooting War”, <http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/90uw/>)

What are the roots of war? They are not the weapons or the soldiers or the political or military elites. Take these away and new ones would soon take their places. The roots of war are the social structures which maintain centralised political and economic power, inequality and privilege, and monopolies over organised violence to protect power and privilege. Some of the key roots of war are the state system, bureaucracy, the military and patriarchy. When I refer to war, I refer to 'modern war': the organised violence of professional military forces on behalf of states. 'War' is not a timeless and unchanging category: it reflects historical and social conditions, such as the prevailing forms of technology and the gender division of labour. In addressing the modern war system it is necessary to concentrate on the contemporary social structures most implicated in it.

### State Infrastructure Fails --- 2nc Impact

#### ---State based transportation infrastructure fails

#### (a.) Not responsive to consumer demand --- State intervention externalizes transportation costs and eliminates the connection between consumer and producer resulting in inefficiency and policy failure.

Carson 10 (Kevin, Senior fellow and holder of the Karl Hess Chair in Social Theory at the Center for a Stateless society, “The Distorting Effects of Transportation Subsidies”, November 2010, http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-distorting-effects-of-transportation-subsidies/)

It’s hard to avoid the conclusion that the dominant business model in the American economy, and the size of the prevailing corporate business unit, are direct results of such policies. A subsidy to any factor of production amounts to a subsidy of those firms whose business models rely most heavily on that factor, at the expense of those who depend on it the least. Subsidies to transportation, by keeping the cost of distribution artificially low, tend to lengthen supply and distribution chains. They make large corporations operating over wide market areas artificially competitive against smaller firms producing for local markets—not to mention big-box retailers with their warehouses-on-wheels distribution model. Some consequentialists treat this as a justification for transportation subsidies: Subsidies are good because they make possible mass-production industry and large-scale distribution, which are (it is claimed) inherently more efficient (because of those magically unlimited “economies of scale,” of course). Tibor Machan argued just the opposite in the February 1999 Freeman: Some people will say that stringent protection of rights [against eminent domain] would lead to small airports, at best, and many constraints on construction. Of course—but what’s so wrong with that? Perhaps the worst thing about modern industrial life has been the power of political authorities to grant special privileges to some enterprises to violate the rights of third parties whose permission would be too expensive to obtain. The need to obtain that permission would indeed seriously impede what most environmentalists see as rampant—indeed reckless—industrialization. The system of private property rights . . . is the greatest moderator of human aspirations. . . . In short, people may reach goals they aren’t able to reach with their own resources only by convincing others, through arguments and fair exchanges, to cooperate. In any case, the “efficiencies” resulting from subsidized centralization are entirely spurious. If the efficiencies of large-scale production were sufficient to compensate for increased distribution costs, it would not be necessary to shift a major portion of the latter to taxpayers to make the former profitable. If an economic activity is only profitable when a portion of the cost side of the ledger is concealed, and will not be undertaken when all costs are fully internalized by an economic actor, then it’s not really efficient. And when total distribution costs (including those currently shifted to the taxpayer) exceed mass-production industry’s ostensible savings in unit cost of production, the “efficiencies” of large-scale production are illusory.

#### ---Hierarchical structure of state transportation policy results in preferential treatment disconnected from fair market competition that undermines solvency.

Servodio, 04 (Paul, “Snowed by Road Statism”, Member of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, 12/27/04, http://mises.org/daily/1704/)

There is a slogan: "Everyone talks about the weather but no one does anything about it." It is especially true because so much of our transportation infrastructure is publicly owned. Every winter of bad weather brings us the same scenes of bleak road and highway conditions. Spinning tires, "beached" cars the shoulder of the road, cars stuck in the median and spun-out cars, impassable roads, banks of snow interfering with traffic flow, hazards of all sorts. The economic costs are high indeed. Northeast Ohio experienced its first significant snowfall of the fresh winter season. The snowstorm was quite a surprise; the weather reports did not indicate an oncoming snowstorm for the day. Nonetheless, the snow began falling at 11:00 a.m. and did not relent until sometime the next day. By 3:00 p.m. conditions had substantially worsened. The lake effect snow (The weather front moves across Lake Erie, picks up more moisture and dumps it on Cleveland.) became a force to reckon with on top of the gusting wind. The driving conditions were terrible; it was a white-out. My friend Ben and I were leaving downtown Cleveland after a day of job searching in Cleveland's financial district. As we came out of the parking garage we realized just how horrendous the drive home would be. City traffic was what one would expect it to be for rush hour, slow going. Interstate traffic was another story. It was not moving. What normally would be a 45 minute drive home turned into a 90 minute drive because of the atrocious conditions of Interstates 71 and 90. As time passed we did not see even one plow/salt truck. This prompted a discussion between my friend and I on how much better the roadways would be if they were privately owned. Obviously with privatized roads, the owners of these roads would have huge incentives to keep the roadways as clean as they possibly could during snowstorms. The profit incentives of being able to claim that one's roadway is much safer during inclement weather than a competitor's would be tremendous. Surely word of mouth would spread through consumers on which roadways were consistently safer to travel during inclement weather. The road owner who does nothing to keep his roadways clean during snowstorms would certainly suffer large profit losses. What seems to be the state's problem with keeping roadways clean of snow is that there simply are not enough plow/salt trucks to do all of the work. Isn't there a word for that scenario? What is it called? Ah yes, shortage! The state has a shortage of plow/salt trucks. The process works like this: all limited access highways are taken care of first, followed by primary city streets, and in a distant third are residential streets. I say a distant third because many of these streets do not get cleaned until the middle of the night or the next day. Some people have to wait until the sun gets around to being warm enough to melt the snow. Instead, road entrepreneurs would have their own teams of plow/salt trucks and know the precise number of these vehicles to have in order to efficiently keep their roadways clean of snow and ice. Some nonbelievers may think that privatized roads will never function as well as the current system of state owned roads. That it is impossible for the plow/salt trucks to operate efficiently to clean the roadways during rush hour because they are bogged down in traffic with the rest of the drivers. This is true; however, the market has already devised inventions to invalidate that assertion. As my friend mentioned, some bridges are currently being installed with a system that monitors road conditions for ice and snow. When weather conditions reach a certain threshold sprinkler heads pop up from the road and spray a non-corrosive agent onto the road to melt the snow and ice. Brilliant! The noncorrosive melting agent is currently used on select bridges in order to help keep the I-beams from rusting too quickly. Currently, the plow/salt trucks spread salt on the roadways as they drive along the road. When the salt interacts with the snow and ice it makes salt water, which then washes down over the I-beams, causing them to rust. This would be another selling point for the private road owner because his bridges would need less construction, meaning less traffic jams as a result of less construction. Where else would this noncorrosive melting agent be useful? I know, along the entire roadway, making those roads car-friendly as well. No more salt water washing up on cars causing premature corrosion. Every car owner who has to deal with these driving conditions knows that the salt water is harsh on the entire car, causing premature corrosion on the underbody, aluminum or chrome wheels and on the body. What a great way to attract consumers by not only having cleaner roadways, but also roadways that do not damage one's car. To be sure, the price to travel on a road that has an electronic monitoring system of road conditions and the noncorrosive melting agent would be a premium over other private roads that use the traditional method of salt to keep the road clean. However, it is entirely the consumer's decision in his willingness to pay for more safety and less corrosion versus a road that is less clean and uses corrosive agents to aid in snow and ice removal. Surely the road owners would always be seeking new methods to keep their roads as clean and safe as possible during snowstorms in the most efficient manner. Thus, other entrepreneurs would pursue avenues to meet the demands of road owners. Of course the state did not invent the noncorrosive melting agent, it was the free market motivated by the profit incentive. The state has no interest in improving driving conditions in the snow and ice because the state does not have to bother with such trivial aspects as profits and losses and competition in the way private firms do. Therefore, the state does not invest in ways to improve its capital. Besides, people are conditioned to driving on treacherous roads during snowstorms; they only wish the roads could be safer to travel. As Ben and I discussed this topic I began to realize why initially I did not think that the drive home would be so arduous. We were walking on the sidewalk to different office buildings. These buildings were not owned by the state, but rather by private firms. The owners of these buildings have an incentive to keep their walkways clear of snow and ice so that their customers do not slip, fall and break their bones or sustain a head injury. I noticed at one building there was a team of FIVE people shoveling snow and spreading salt over an area of approximately 1,000 square feet. That's probably the same number of plow/salt trucks operating to clean the city streets of Cleveland. In all honesty, the sidewalks were cleaner than the roadways! Unfortunately, the idea of private roadways is alien for most people; they are used to the hazardous roadways of the state. As shown though, the private market would provide safer road conditions and substantially less corrosive melting agents on the road. Therefore, it cannot be denied that privately owned roads are surely the solution to the unsafe, corrosive roads of the state because through the private sector consumers would have more choices in which roads to use instead of the current situation of the state's horrendous roads.

#### ---View their solvency claims with skepticism --- Organizing transportation policy from a centralized epistemology is doomed to failure do to the inability of anyone party to access total market knowledge.

Ross Kenyon ‘11 (serves on the Executive Board of Alumni For Liberty, on the Board of Directors of the Association of Libertarian Feminists, Center for Stateless Society, “But what about the roads?”, <http://c4ss.org/market-anarchism-faq/but-what-about-the-roads>)

This is of those “gotcha!” questions that when asked libertarians are supposed to shrivel up and concede the point that in a free society we would all just lay in the mud and cry. Road provision needs to be addressed from several angles. The first point that needs to be brought up is that the central planning of transportation or anything else is inefficient due to what F.A. Hayek refers to as ‘the knowledge problem.‘ The individuals directly responsible and affected by projects should be the ones planning it, not a top-down and distant bureaucratic entity. The costs of acquiring all of the local information necessary to calculate such a complicated endeavor is insurmountable. People who invest in developing infrastructure should not be allowed to force everyone inside of an arbitrary geographical area (like the United States of America) to subsidize its construction and maintenance either. Why should you have to pay for a road you will never see in St. Augustine, Florida? A port in Galveston, Texas? The people who want such development should bear the full cost o their actions and allow consumers to support or not support their plans at the point of consumption (i.e. voting with one’s dollar). Kevin Carson and Noam Chomsky have both posited the extremely negative dislocating effects of state transportation infrastructure. By socializing the costs of the transportation of goods amongst all people, rather than amongst those who produce and consume the goods, there is far less of an incentive for consumers to consume locally. As a result, this series of policies artificially suppresses local industry and benefits distant producers. This is to some degree responsible for the unnatural centralization of major market players like Walmart, whom desperately needs the state to externalize the large costs of its goods’ transport.

#### ---Empirically the State’s iron fist on infrastructure have been disastrous

Carson 10 (Kevin, Senior fellow and holder of the Karl Hess Chair in Social Theory at the Center for a Stateless society, “The Distorting Effects of Transportation Subsidies”, November 2010, http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-distorting-effects-of-transportation-subsidies/)

As new forms of transportation emerged, the government reprised its role, subsidizing both the national highway and civil aviation systems. From its beginning the American automotive industry formed a “complex” with the petroleum industry and government highway projects. The “most powerful pressure group in Washington” (as a PBS documentary called it) began in June 1932, when GM president Alfred P. Sloan created the National Highway Users Conference, inviting oil and rubber firms to help GM bankroll a propaganda and lobbying effort that continues to this day. Whatever the political motivation behind it, the economic effect of the interstate system should hardly be controversial. Virtually 100 percent of roadbed damage to highways is caused by heavy trucks. After repeated liberalization of maximum weight restrictions, far beyond the heaviest conceivable weight the interstate roadbeds were originally designed to support, fuel taxes fail miserably at capturing from big-rig operators the cost of pavement damage caused by higher axle loads. And truckers have been successful at scrapping weight-distance user charges in all but a few western states, where the push for repeal continues. So only about half the revenue of the highway trust fund comes from fees or fuel taxes on the trucking industry, and the rest is externalized on private automobiles. This doesn’t even count the 20 percent of highway funding that’s still subsidized by general revenues, or the role of eminent domain in lowering the transaction costs involved in building new highways or expanding existing ones. As for the civil aviation system, from the beginning it was a creature of the State. Its original physical infrastructure was built entirely with federal grants and tax-free municipal bonds. Professor Stephen Paul Dempsey of the University of Denver in 1992 estimated the replacement value of this infrastructure at $1 trillion. The federal government didn’t even start collecting user fees from airline passengers and freight shippers until 1971. Even with such user fees paid into the Airport and Airways Trust Fund, the system still required taxpayer subsidies of $3 billion to maintain the Federal Aviation Administration’s network of control towers, air traffic control centers, and tens of thousands of air traffic controllers. Eminent domain also remains central to the building of new airports and expansion of existing airports, as it does with highways. Subsidies to airport and air traffic control infrastructure are only part of the picture. Equally important was the direct role of the State in creating the heavy aircraft industry, whose jumbo jets revolutionized civil aviation after World War II. In Harry Truman and the War Scare of 1948, Frank Kofsky described the aircraft industry as spiraling into red ink after the end of the war and on the verge of bankruptcy when it was rescued by the Cold War (and more specifically Truman’s heavy bomber program). David Noble, in America by Design, made a convincing case that civilian jumbo jets were only profitable thanks to the government’s heavy bomber contracts; the production runs for the civilian market alone were too small to pay for the complex and expensive machinery. The 747 is essentially a spinoff of military production. The civil aviation system is, many times over, a creature of the State.

### A2 There’s Always Value to Life --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Proves the link --- The fact that state coercion has become so normalized that we don’t even notice it means populations can be mobilized for war or genocide at anytime; the alternative is needed more than ever.

Shaffer, 12 (Butler, Butler Shaffer is professor of law at Southwestern University School of Law and author of Calculated Chaos:, 3/22/12, <http://lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer248.html>)

In the cosmic sense of time, such inquiries generally lasted anywhere from five to ten seconds. Exploring how one’s thinking has contributed to his or her downfall is particularly discomfortin. When one becomes aware of the presence and influence of "dark side" energies within, the desire to rid oneself of such traits often leads to projecting them onto others, and then taking punitive actions against the designated scapegoat. It is this tendency – which Carl Jung so thoughtfully analyzed – that underlies Ron Paul’s difficulties in explaining to the boobeoisie how American military aggression in the Middle East led to the 9/11 attacks. By repressing our own dark side ambitions for coercive power over others, it becomes easy for Boobus to fall for the line that others wish to dominate us; that those upon whom we trespass want to destroy us because of our virtues! These habits have been within us for centuries, and provide the foundations for the divisions and conflicts upon which all political systems depend. Thus have Americans succumbed to the Civil War fiction that the inflated power of the state over people’s lives was occasioned by the desire to end slavery. Likewise, many post-World War II Germans were convinced that "they were free" under Nazi rule. In much the same way, the self-awareness explorations undertaken in the 1960s, and which spanned race, gender, political dispositions, and often age, quickly deteriorated into a reinforcement of the divisiveness and inter-group conflicts upon which state power depends. The civil rights and feminist movements began turning to the state to use its powers to rectify past wrongs; a split occurred among libertarians, with many continuing to insist upon a transformation of individual thought, while others turned to electoral politics and/or moving their organizations to the Washington, D.C. area which, to their minds, was the meaningful setting for change. These efforts reflected rudimentary inquiries that too often lacked a central focus. For the same reason that recent converts to a political cause or religion become eager proselytizers – out of a felt need to shore up their own thinking – those who had a brief glimpse of a world better suited to their interests became impatient for change. This lack of focus was nowhere more evident than in the anti-war movement of the ‘60s and early ‘70s. Reactions to the Vietnam War – responses that could be either increased or diminished by the intensity with which that war was conducted – had little to do with exploring the conditions that generated peace. More recently, anti-war sentiments have taken on a partisan tone: wars conducted by Bill Clinton received scant attention, while those begun by the George W. Bush administration evoked vigorous reactions that continued until Barack Obama took over their management. Our divisive, contradictory, and irrational thinking has been a major contributor to the demise of Western Civilization. Most of us have lost a principled center to our lives. We have conditioned our minds to look to institutions – particularly the state, schools and universities, organized religions, the media – for our identities and direction, a theme I explored in my Calculated Chaos book. We have, in other words, bought into Plato’s pyramidal model of society run, from the top-down, by "philosopher kings." In recent decades, we have experienced the fallacy of the idea that complex systems could be organized and managed by elites of "experts;" that social order could be mandated by the few, if only they enjoyed sufficient coercive powers to enforce their edicts. The failure of one group of authorities to accomplish such ends has generally led only to demands to replace this group with another, and rarely to a questioning of the model of formally-structured order itself. But as the failures of collective thinking continue to pile up; as systems of centralized economic planning are outperformed by free markets; as political systems – to which people looked for the protection of their lives, liberty, and property – expose their savage, plunderous, inhumane foundations; as wars, looting, and police brutalities come to be seen as the raison d’etre of the state; and as other institutions were unable to make any principled responses that might rehabilitate the avowed purposes of governments, societal turbulence arose. Such qualities as respect for life, liberty, contractual obligations, and property; the inviolability of the individual; and the insistence upon voluntary as opposed to violent relationships among people, went into free-fall and were sucked into an existential black hole dominated by the collective energies that bring down civilizations. Most Americans seem to recognize that something is amiss in a world that no longer meets their expectations. But lacking in what the late Joseph Campbell referred to as "invisible means of support," they remain rudderless regarding the direction to be taken. Like their 1960s’ predecessors, their frustrations have led many of them into such cul-de-sacs as the Tea Party or the Occupy Wall Street demonstrations, efforts that allow the political establishment to marginalize and redirect their energies to reinforcing the status quo. Such appeasements are offered in the form of politicians who pick up the rhetoric of "peace" and "liberty" but continue advocating statist practices; and legislative or judicial inquiries into peripheral matters that do not challenge the sacred center of political interests.

### A2 People Kill People (State is Neutral) --- 2nc Impact

#### ---The State decimates human nature-we become slaves in an elitist oppressive machine

Shaffer, 11 (Butler, professor of law and author, “The Silence of Institutions”, 4/4/11, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer223.html)

There is little doubt that political systems represent the most destructive, repressive, anti-life, and dehumanized form of social organization. If one were to consciously design and carry out a scheme that would prove disastrous to human well-being, it would be difficult to improve on what we now find in place. Such entities thrive on the energies generated by the mobilization of our inner, dark-side forces, a dynamic that can be brought about only through us, by you and me agreeing to structure our thinking to conform to the preeminence of such institutionalized thinking. I explored these processes in my book Calculated Chaos. But it is not sufficient for the state, alone, to organize and direct how we think of ourselves, others, and the systems to be employed in conducting ourselves in society. Organizations that began as flexible tools that allowed us to cooperate with one another through a division of labor to accomplish our mutual ends, soon became ends in themselves, to which we attached our very sense of being. Tools became our identities; our shared self-interests became co-opted by the collective supremacy of the organization. In this way were institutions born. In order to clearly distinguish one form of organization from another, I have defined an "institution" as "any permanent social organization with purposes of its own, having formalized and structured machinery for pursuing those purposes, and making and enforcing rules of conduct in order to control those within it." In short, an "institution" is a system that has become its own reason for being, with people becoming fungible resources to be exploited for the accomplishment of collective ends. While the state is the most apparent and pervasive example, our institutionally-centered thinking dominates how we conduct ourselves in society. Economic organizations (e.g., business corporations, labor unions), religions, educational systems, the news media, are the more familiar forms of human activity engaged in through hierarchically-structured institutions. The values by which we measure our personal success or social benefits arising from such systems are those of particular interest to institutions themselves. These include, among others, such considerations as material well-being (e.g., income, employment, money, GDP); institutional certification (e.g., diplomas and degrees, SAT scores, professional licensing); and social status (e.g., fame, wealth, power, and other consequences of achieving success within institutions). In the vernacular of modern psychology, institutions are largely driven by such left-brained factors as linear and logical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and applied science (i.e., engineering).

### A2 Realism --- 2nc Impact

#### ---International Realism feeds the state and leaves society as no more than a bloodless corpse.

Beres, 99 ( Louis, professor of political science and international law at Purdue, “Death, The herd, and human survival”, September 1999, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20753213)

Let us pause for a moment to consider the changing place of the State in world affairs. Although it has long been observed that states must con tinually search for an improved power position as a practical matter, the sacralization of the state is a development of modern times. This sacraliza tion, representing a break from the traditional political realism of Thucydides, Thrasymachus and Machiavelli, was fully developed in Ger many. From Fichte and Hegel, through Ranke and von Treitschke, the modern transformation of Realpolitik has led states to their current ren dezvous with war and genocide. Today the state assumes its own rationale. Holding its will as preemi nent, it has become intent upon sacrificing private interests and personal life at the altar of global competition. A new god, the state is now a provi dence of which everything is accepted and nothing expected. The fact that it is prepared to become an executioner state is not hard to reconcile with its commitment to "Goodness,53 as war can be a legitimate expression of the sacred. The problem of the omnivorous state, subordinating all individual sen sibilities to the idea of unlimited internal and external jurisdiction, was foreseen brilliantly in the 1930s by Jose Ortega y Gasset. In his The Revolt of the Masses, Ortega correcdy identifies the state as "the greatest danger,55 mustering its immense and unassailable resources "to crush beneath it any creative minority which disturbs it?disturbs it in any order of things: in politics, in ideas, in industry.55 Set in motion by individuals whom it has already rendered anonymous, the state establishes its machinery above so ciety so that humankind comes to live for the state, for the governmental apparatus: And as, after all, it is only a machine whose existence and maintenance depend on the vital supports around it, the State, after sucking out the very marrow of society, will be left bloodless, a skeleton, dead with that rusty death of machinery, more gruesome than the death of a living organism. Ortega5s characterization of the State was prefigured by Nietzsche. "State,55 he exclaims in the First Part of Zarathustra, "is the name of the coldest of all cold monsters. Coldly, it tells lies too and this lie crawls out of its mouth: , the state, am the people.5 That is a lie! It was creators who created peoples and hung a faith and a love over them: thus they served life

### A2 State Inevitable --- 2nc Impact

#### ---The state is not inevitable --- Their sovereign epistemology clouds their minds and limits political imagination.

Molyneux, 8 (Stefan, Master of Arts, “Practical Anarchy”, November 08, https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:sry-L-q4ja0J:dwardmac.pitzer.edu/anarchist\_archives/practicalanarchy.pdf+statism+bad+transportation+infrastructure+anarchy+liberation&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESjZgo0P\_h0TWYCZ3Yo2b6B9jlxdUoIsqK5JD5qGpijVrC8ElEwVc0vrUXNzCskjDLAOeXM0jvlKO\_NnxznOI83aur85GpI2pMC8r\_WknxITF0tP5ZiVO8a785Q5ZRJ0mNywR5IM&sig=AHIEtbTdQymRO0Uq3TbHA\_-XkWHnFVYIAQ)

There is something about statism, some aspect of it, which profoundly isolates us from our fellow citizens. We turn from animated problem-solvers to mindless defenders of the status quo. As an example, I offer up the inevitable response I receive when I provide an anarchic solution to an existing State function. When I say that theoretical entities called Dispute Resolution Organizations (DROs) could enforce contracts and protect property, the immediate response is that these DROs will inevitably evolve into a single monopoly that will end up recreating the State that they were supposed to replace. Or, when I talk about private roads, I inevitably hear the argument that someone could just build a road in a ring around your land and charge you a million dollars every time you wanted to cross it. Or, when I talk about private defense agencies that can be used to protect a geographical region from invasion, I am promptly informed that those private agencies will simply turn their guns on their subscribers, take them over, and create a new State. Or, when I discuss the power of economic ostracism as a tool for maintaining order and conformity to basic social and economic rules, I am immediately told that people will be “marked for exclusion” unless they pay hefty bribes to whatever agencies control such information. It is the same story, over and over – an anarchic solution is provided, and an immediate “disaster scenario” is put forward without thought, without reflection, and without curiosity. Of course, I am not bothered by the fact that people are critical of a new and volatile theory – I think that is an essential process for any new idea. 32 | P a g e What does concern me is the fundamental lack of reciprocity in the minds of the people who thoughtlessly reject creative solutions to trenchant problems. I don’t mean reciprocity with regards to me – though that is surely lacking as well – but rather with regards to any form of authority or influence in general. For instance, if people in a geographical region want to contract with an agency or group of agencies for the sake of collective defense, what is the greatest fear that will be first and foremost in their minds? Naturally, it will be that some defense agency will take their money, buy a bunch of weapons, and promptly enslave them. How does a free society solve this problem? Well, if there is a market need or demand for collective defense, a number of firms will vie for the business, since it will be so lucrative in the long term. The economic efficiency of having a majority of subscribers would drive the price of such defense down – however, the more people that you enroll in such a contract, the greater everyone’s fear will be that this defense agency will attempt to become a government of some kind. Thus no entrepreneur will be able to sell this service in the most economically efficient manner if he does not directly and credibly address the fear that he will attempt to create a new government. We are so used to being on the one-sided receiving end of dictatorial edicts from those in power – whether they are parents, teachers, or government officials, that the very idea that someone is going to have to woo our trust is almost incomprehensible. “If I am afraid of something that someone wants to sell me, then it is up to that person to calm my fears if he wants my business” – this is so far from our existing ways of dealing with statist authority that we might as well be inventing a new planet. It is so important to understand that when we are talking about a free society – and I will tell you later how this habit is so essential for your happiness even if anarchism never comes to pass – we are essentially talking about two sides of a negotiation table. When it comes to government as it is – and all that government ever could be – we are never really talking about two sides of the table. You get a letter in the mail informing you that your property taxes are going to increase 5% – there is no negotiation; no one offers you an alternative; your opinion is not consulted beforehand, and your approval is not required afterwards, because if you do not pay the increased tax, you will, after a fairly lengthy sequence of letters and phone calls, end up without a house. It is certainly true that your local cable company may also send you a notice that they’re going to increase their charges by 5%, but that is still a negotiation! You can switch to satellite, or give up on cable and rent DVDs of movies or television shows, or reduce some of the extra features that you have, or just decide to get rid of your television and read and talk instead. 33 | P a g e None of these options are available with the government – with the government, you either pay them, give up your house, go to jail, or move to some other country, where the exact same process will start all over again

#### ---Even if the state is inevitable under the current political climate we must imagine a world where we can act out of our own will --- When an individual commits himself to stateless society it is but one more step to complete liberation, every endorsement is necessary.

Beres, 99 ( Louis, professor of political science and international law at Purdue, “Death, The herd, and human survival”, September 1999, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20753213)

Nevertheless, even if a global necropolis is not psychologically ab sorbable at the moment, imaginings of such a world must be encouraged. In the unsentimental theatre of modern world politics, the time is at hand for a new kind of dramaturgy, a "new naturalism" that touches pro foundly the deepest rhythms of human imagination. Our playgoing sensibili ties must no longer be confined to the implausible pap of sanitized political discourse. We now require honest pas sages of down-to-earth exposition, even if the necessary tracts and tirades become endless and unbearable. The world is full of noise, but it is still possible to listen for real music. In the fashion of Hesse's Steppenwolf, who behind a mixture of the trumpet's chewed rubber discovers the noble outline of divine music, we may "tune out" the eternal babble of global politics and the herd to hear?like an old master beneath a layer of dirt? the majestic structure and full broad bowing of the strings. Caught up in a war of extermination against the individual, the murdered and murderous sounds ooze on and on, but the original spirit of music can never be de stroyed. Although life in the herd seeks to strip this music of its sensuous Only when enough persons have learned to listen can the herds themselves be trans formed. Understood in terms of international relations, this means that states themselves can become purpose ful communities? communities that sus tain individuals who in turn ensure harmoni ous and dignified for eign policies?but not until civic virtue has yielded to real virtue. 20 INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON WORLD PEACE VOL. XVI NO. 3 SEPTEMBER 1999 DEATH, THE HERD AND HUMAN SURVIVAL tones, spoiling, scratching and degrading it, for those who learn to listen even the most ghasdy of disguises give way to beauty. When this happens, states themselves will be self-affirmed and inter-state conflict replaced by planetization. Under current conditions, faith in the herd mythology of Realpolitik can serve only anguish and collapse. Reaffirming our faith in survival we will be justified on only one path, the path to authentic bases of self-worth and personal meaning. Defied again and again by a world politics that will always be inimical to truth, we must once again recognize ourselves as a species of mortal individuals. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON WORLD PEACE VOL. XVI NO. 3 SEPTEMBER 1999 21

### A2 State K to Infrastructure Security --- 2nc Impact

#### ---The alternative both solves infrastructure security better in the short term by enabiling individuals the moral courage to do what is necessary to prevent catastrophe and in the long term by eliminating the root cause of security threats.

Shaffer, 01 (Butler, professor of law and author, “Another meaning to September 11th”, 9/19/01, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer223.html)

Which is not to say that there is nothing anyone can do. The only people who were able to make a difference in thwarting these well-orchestrated attacks were not SWAT team members, or fighter pilots, or air marshals, but a handful of courageous passengers who, devoid of any formal training or authority, and armed with what one passenger told his wife was only his "butter knife," were apparently able to subdue the terrorists and bring down the plane, perhaps saving hundreds of lives. These passengers represent the real "new world order": men and women taking control over and responsibility for their own lives and, in the process, bringing decision-making back to the individual. We are once again reminded that whatever orderliness prevails in our world is determined by how ordinary people respond to the immediate events in their lives. As I thought about these events, my mind kept going back to H.G. Wells’ novel, The War of the Worlds, wherein the earth was attacked by Martian invaders, and the political order responded with guns, tanks, bombs, and atomic weapons, all of which the invaders were able to resist. Just as humanity was prepared to give in to its apparent fate, however, the Martian spacecrafts began crashing to the ground, the victims not of massive weaponry, but of bacteria to which their bodies were not immune. There is a valuable lesson in all of this, if only we can move beyond the anger and fear that most of us feel. That lesson has to do with our rethinking who we are, how we are to live our lives, and how we are to deal with one another in a complex world. If you think that these are only abstract philosophical matters that have no bearing upon "reality," take another look at your television screen and see if you can locate the World Trade Center! The massive destruction that is going on in our world – and which did not begin on September 11th – has been brought about by our thinking; our world will change only when our thinking changes: to think otherwise is to put our trust in magic. As Richard Weaver once said, "ideas have consequences." Perhaps at no time in recent history has so much clarity of thought been demanded from each of us. The world has an abundance of anger; what it needs right now is our intelligence. There are only two people in the world who can change any of this: you and me, and we can make our world more peaceful, creative, and cooperative only by affecting a change in our individual consciousness. We must give up our dependence upon external authorities and learn, as Carl Jung has suggested, that "the salvation of the world consists in the salvation of the individual soul."

#### ---Protection can be provided at the local level without the state

Rothbard, 74 (Murray, American economist, historian, and political theorist. He was a prominent exponent of the Austrian School of economics who helped to define libertarianism, “Society without a State”, 12/28/74, http://www.lewrockwell.com/rothbard/rothbard133.html)

Nor is our definition of the state arbitrary, for these two characteristics have been possessed by what is generally acknowledged to be states throughout recorded history. The state, by its use of physical coercion, has arrogated to itself a compulsory monopoly of defense services over its territorial jurisdiction. But it is certainly conceptually possible for such services to be supplied by private, non-state institutions, and indeed such services have historically been supplied by other organizations than the state. To be opposed to the state is then not necessarily to be opposed to services that have often been linked with it; to be opposed to the state does not necessarily imply that we must be opposed to police protection, courts, arbitration, the minting of money, postal service, or roads and highways. Some anarchists have indeed been opposed to police and to all physical coercion in defense of person and property, but this is not inherent in and is fundamentally irrelevant to the anarchist position, which is precisely marked by opposition to all physical coercion invasive of, or aggressing against, person and property.

### A2 State K to Tech/Innovation --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Their obsessive need for new technology and constant innovation creates a society of complexity that is substantially more likely to fail into disorder and transition wars.

Connor 12 (John , Green Anarchist, “Interview with John Connor of Green Anarchist”, 5/21/12, http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/john-filiss-interview-with-john-connor-of-green-anarchist.lt.pdf)

You’ve got to laugh, haven’t you? Bob Black once said that the anarchist critique of voting was just a special case of the anarchist critique of organization. The same is true of technology. That’s just a special case of the critique of organization too. Pro-tech types try to evade this by refusing to distinguish between tool use and technology, between the slave gang and its spades and the army and its spears, despite Lewis Mumford’s key distinction between using tools and becoming them drawn the better part of a century ago! By accepting technology as organization, they have to accept a horizontal division of labour that means alienation will never be ended in techno-industrial society however it is administered. Much more upsetting for them is that to administer, regulate and coordinate this horizontal division of labor, there has to be a vertical one between managers and managed, a class division. These types often accuse GA of having no class analysis, precisely because our class analysis poses a more fundamental challenge to the existing social order than theirs does. They really are on the horns of a dilemma: if they want the diversity and complexity of production that they use to sell their post-capitalist utopia, they need a worldwide and production and distribution infrastructure. But to have such an infrastructure, they need tier after tier of delegates, somehow supposedly “accountable to the base.” How they reconcile this with their critiques of the oligarchical tendencies of established trade unions or oxymoronic “representative democracy” beats me — by treating it as no more than an article of ideological faith not to be thought upon, no doubt. Certainly, I was amused to note debating this with old guardists that those at the top of their informal anarcho-hierarchies defend delegation and representation whilst those that aren’t always manage fail to understand what I’m arguing — thus the way of things is preserved! To go on with this class analysis, there’s also the small matter of the international division of labor. Those that see techno-industrial society as a cornucopia aren’t the ones stuck in the fields and mines and steel mills, the ones on the bottom of the productive pyramid and get very little back for it. Because of horizontal division of labor (specialization), they’re likely to remain there after the “revolution” because given the opinion of doing something else, they will and the whole pyramid’s going to come tumbling down. Of course, they don’t need to be told this — it’s just common sense that by taking back your own time, you’re better able to sus out better means of survival than sweating for some boss. In wrecked Uganda, people took to uprooting cash crops for export and replacing them with their own for subsistence, thus absenting themselves from the international economic order. There’s more food in Russian gardens now than Russian stores, so how long’s that country going to hold together as a viable entity? In Brazil, the MST, described by some as “the most important social movement in the world today” are doing pretty much the same thing. I’m not arguing for agriculture here as an end in itself — I’m pointing out how the most oppressed are making revolution themselves by recovering autonomous means of living. Those arguing for technological society are arguing against these people. If they claim to be arguing “for the working class,” then they’re voiding that term of any worthwhile meaning. Many will say that you can’t just walk away from Civilization. Paradoxically, the revolutionaries I’ve touched upon above are both central to production and peripheral to the worldwide techno-grid socially and geographically. Equally paradoxically, Civilization’s control is both cruder and weaker there — it’s easier to see an enemy, to want to free yourself of it as well as to actually do so. The more that break away, the easier it is for others to in the future as well — revolution on the periphery. Deeper within Civilization, there are others marginalized, movements of refusal and resistance, counterculturals, stigmatized and oppressed groups, etc., who find it so difficult to leave (except through the illusion of culture) that attack is a better opinion. Because of the intense division of labor, each isolated from but dependent on another, techno-industrial society is uniquely vulnerable to attack — one thing leads to another, just as fighting one oppression in a evolutionary manner leads you to fighting oppression as a totality. Smashing the infrastructure of control will force everyone to be free, to make what they can of the pieces. An Arab proverb portrays society as a ship, the privileged on deck and the rest in the hold. The proverb warns that those on deck had best share their water with those below or else, maddened by thirst, they’ll break through the hull and sink everyone. Though skewed, this is a useful analogue. The old Marxist dictums about extraction of surplus value hold true and should be obvious to anyone that thinks about them. Why then is a revolt not generalized? I think because those in the hold are told there’s always a chance they’ll be allowed onto the deck if only they behave. We’re talking embourgeoisement here — those that don’t strive for better jobs for themselves or for their kids via a better education than they had so far down the pile that they fall into the periphery. By commodifying everything — including their identity — workers are individualized and made competitive and insecure. Of course, they can never buy enough and what they buy’s not worth it anyway, but in the process they come to think that living any other way will be a kind of suicide, a destruction of their manufactured identities. Anarcho-orthodoxy’s traditional tactic of tail-ending reformist industrial demands is therefore obviously doomed as a revolutionary strategy, just another way of saving Civilization. The proverb is skewed in the assumption that if the ship sinks, all will drown, and that the water beyond the hull is undrinkable rather than sweet, abundance for all denied through conditions of artificial scarcity imposed by those on deck. I’ve returned to the proverb here because its original meaning here is the one put out by orthodoxy, as above. They ask “what’s to be gained by giving up technology?” when they’re really thinking about what they’ll lose commodityand power-wise. Their whole thing is about keeping as much of the means of production as possible, as if that won’t force people back into exactly the same roles, except with anarchist rhetoric. The more of the system that’s preserved, the more difficult it’ll be to get rid of the rest. Years ago, an old Stalinist was boasting about a riot at a car plant he was a shop steward at: “They smashed up the canteen but left the line alone. That’s where their power is.” If that was the case, why were they rioting? It was a mark of their domestication that they didn’t destroy what made them most dependent on the system, what had stolen away their lives. No doubt the shop steward helped inculcate this attitude, their traditional role. John Zerzan’s Who Killed Ned Ludd? is excellent in contrasting this domesticated attitude with an older millenarian tradition about refusal and sweeping away a whole world that only enslaves us. Liberating ourselves from that should be enough in itself, but what we gain by this is an end of commodified identity and separation, a return to the abundance of the proverbial sea, to unalienated Oneness between each other and Nature. I’ll take authenticity and self-determination over any truckful of techno-industrial trinkets

### A2 State (S) Economic Exploitation --- 2nc Impact

#### ---The State makes economic exploitation worse --- It coerces and violently takes over our lives through the economy.

Shaffer 11 (Butler, professor of law and author, “Does Integrity Matter”, November 11, http://lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer243.html)

I become exasperated reading or listening to chuckleheaded people who are unable – or unwilling – to distinguish the peaceful and voluntary nature of a free market, from the violent and coercive character of the corporate-state system that long ago took over our economic lives. Murray Rothbard’s words come to mind, wherein he observed that it was no great wrong to not understand economics, but that one ignorant of the subject ought not be offering advice on such matters. I would no more go to a lawyer, or an orthodontist, or Lew Rockwell, to have brain surgery performed on me, than would I take seriously the prescriptions offered by economic ignoramuses on how to "grow" an economy (an idea as absurd as that of misguided, controlling parents who believe it is their role to "grow" their children). Many of the signs and comments of participants in the varied "Occupy Wall Street" demonstrations reflect this confusion between the impersonal nature of markets and the politically-enforced interests of marketplace participants. "End corporate greed" is a common sentiment expressed, no doubt, by persons who embrace the "power greed" that drives those who want the state to enforce their visions. It is such simplistic thinking that insists on labeling the pursuit of individual self-interest as "greed," while political power ambitions get defined as "public service." The slothful-minded then find it easy to condemn all marketplace pursuit of self-interest as "anti-social" (at best) or downright "criminal" at worst, and to regard the politically-driven as the embodiment of "public spiritedness." "Businessmen" are then collectivized as persons lacking in any principled integrity who will do anything to increase profits to their firms. As a response to such muddled thinking, I would like to offer two examples: the first of literary derivation, the second from real-life. Each involves manufacturers of airplane parts who have contracted with the federal government to help produce military aircraft. For purposes of this illustration, I will overlook the difficulties associated with government-contracting itself. My focus will be upon how each of these men responded to defects in either the manufacture or design of their products; imperfections each understood to be a danger to pilots flying the planes involved.

## Alternative

### Solves Case --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---The alternative solves the case because local individuals will fill in the absence of state infrastructure. A world without the state is a dream not a nightmare --- We encounter successful non-state action every day in our lives.

Shaffer, 1o (Butler, professor of law and author, “Anarchy in the Streets”, 4/7/10, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer223.html)

How often do discussions on the prospects of a stateless society produce the response that, without government, there would be "anarchy in the streets"? To many people, the streets are symbolic of society, and with good reason: they are the most visible networks through which we interact with one another. They are much like the major arteries (we even use that word to describe streets), veins, and capillaries that transport blood throughout our bodies. Each can be thought of as the carrier of both food and waste to and from individual cells. The thought that city streets — upon which we depend for daily functioning — could ever become disorderly, leads most people to accept a governmental policing function of such avenues without much question. We imagine that without speed limits, traffic lights at busy intersections, and all of the varied warnings plastered on tens of thousands of signs that encumber streets in our cities, driving would become a turbulent and destructive undertaking. For a number of years now, a number of cities in Europe have been experimenting with the removal of all traffic signs — including traffic lights, stop signs, speed limit directives — and with surprising results. Various towns in the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, Sweden, New Zealand — even the UK! — have joined in the experiment. Contrary to the expectations of those who might expect multi-car pileups throughout the cities, traffic accidents have been dramatically reduced (in one town, dropping from about eight per year to fewer than two). Part of the reason for the increased safety relates to the fact that, without the worry of offending traffic sign mandates, or watching for police speed-traps, or checking the rear-view mirror for police motorcycles, drivers have more time to pay attention to other cars and pedestrians. The architect of this experiment, the late Hans Monderman, attributed its success to the fact that "it is dangerous, which is exactly what we want." "Unsafe is safe" was the title of a conference held on this practice. Monderman added that this effort "shifts the emphasis away from the Government taking the risk, to the driver being responsible for his or her own risk." Equally significant, drivers now focus more of their attention on other motorists — taking visual cues from one another, informally negotiating for space, turning into an intersection, etc. — instead of mechanistically responding to signs and electronic machines. Monderman stated: "When you don't know exactly who has right of way, you tend to seek eye contact with other road users. You automatically reduce your speed, you have contact with other people and you take greater care." He added: "The many rules strip us of the most important thing: the ability to be considerate. We're losing our capacity for socially responsible behavior." In words so applicable to the rest of our politically-structured lives, he declared: "The greater the number of prescriptions, the more people's sense of personal responsibility dwindles." Monderman expressed the matter more succinctly in saying: "When you treat people like idiots, they'll behave like idiots."

#### ---New Innovation solves your specific turns --- Abandoning sovereign limits to individual creation allows for previously impossible solutions.

Hedlund 11 (Joshua, Senior Fellow of the Post Liberetarian, “Thank Government for something: Interstate highway system”,11/4/11, http://www.postlibertarian.com/2011/11/thank-government-for-something-interstate-highway-system/)

These roads and highways are, instead, just what the public wants and is willing to pay for in full — it’s just that the alleged public-goods nature of these goods means that they can be supplied in optimal quantities only by government. And they do a good job summarizing the libertarian viewpoint against government provision of alleged public goods: Now there are plenty of problems — theoretical and, especially, practical — with the classic theory of public goods. For example, it assumes too blithely that collective-decision-making procedures accurately discover the publics’ true demand for public goods; it overlooks the perverse incentives in the political arena that prompt government officials to act in ways that are inconsistent with the ‘public good’; and it turns a blind eye to the many creative ways that private persons have through the years organized themselves voluntarily to supply ‘public goods’ that, allegedly, would never be supplied privately. Was the interstate highway system demanded by the public? It is said that the interstate highway system had less to do with becoming a general public good for transportation and more to do with Cold-War-era defense because “freeways would help people leave the city in the event of a nuclear attack.” Did government officials act in ways consistent with the “public good”? It is said that the highway system is a subsidization of the trucking industry that distorts resources away from more efficient railways. And as to the final argument, I certainly don’t want to fall prey to the lack of imagination that can befall proponents of government intervention. History is indeed full of “the many creative ways” that private persons have supplied things that one might theorize could never be provided without a government.

### Nonstate Solves Highways --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---Free market roads would create newer and better roads.

BRIAN MICKLETHWAIT ’93 (Editor in chief of the libertarian , 1993, “THE PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC SPACE: THE NEW AGE OF RATIONALLY PRICED ROAD USE”,http://www.libertarian.co.uk/lapubs/econn/econn049.pdf)

The selling of roads and the pricing of their use, in other words, are ideas that many governments, including our British government, is eager to think about. Another reason for selling roads is that this might result in more “infrastructure” without what is now regarded as the inevitable price of new “infrastructure”, namely ... higher public spending! Voters want more “infrastructure”, which they associate with jobs. But, the voters do not want to pay for this infrastructure. So, thinks the government, get the capitalists to pay for it. Which they will only do if roads can be turned into a way for capitalists to make money. If the politicians decide to keep the roads but charge for their use, they will make the same pig’s dinner of them that they have already made of the railways. But even that would be an improvement over the transport mess we have now, if only because publicly owned but less irrationally priced roads would be easier for people to imagine in private hands in the future.

### Walk Away --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---We must walk away from the state --- Only then will there be space to discover new non-destructive alternatives.

Shaffer, 11( Butler, s professor of law at Southwestern University School of Law and author of Calculated Chaos:, “When Will They Figure It Out?”, 1/11/11, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer227.html)

The men and women who not only profit from the political racket, but whose identities are so entwined with the state as to be unable to imagine a life without an attachment to coercive power, are unlikely to make any intelligent changes in their lives. A few might begin to figure out that the "public" – for whom they like to pretend they serve – has a growing resentment of them. For the politically minded, the expression of such anger is seen not as a warning that the state has reached too far, but as another "problem" to be dealt with by a further extension of state power. A few members of the class of "ordinaries" may become so frustrated by all of this that they will see violent reaction as their only option. But for the rest of us – weary of the burdens of obedience, the costs of our being looted, and the deadly violence to which our lives are increasingly exposed – peaceful, non-destructive alternatives must be found. We would be better served not by physically attacking the state or its sociopathic operatives, but in walking away from them. Our survival as free men and women requires a secession of our minds from the chains of violence.

### A2 Free Market Fails --- 2nc Ans 2 Ans

#### ---Your free market empirically fails at transportation infrastructure cards don’t apply --- Every example is an instance of mixed market capitalism dominated by the state. Only the alternative can solve and preserve human liberty.

Mutualist.org, No Date Given (“Transportation Subsidies”, http://www.mutualist.org/id76.html)

One form of contemporary government intervention that Tucker almost entirely ignored was transportation subsidies. This seems odd at first glance, since "internal improvements" had been a controversial issue throughout the nineteenth century, and were a central part of the mercantilist agenda of the Whigs and the Gilded Age GOP. Indeed, Lincoln has announced the beginning of his career with a "short but sweet" embrace of Henry Clay's program: a national bank, a high tariff, and internal improvements. This neglect, however, was in keeping with Tucker's inclination. He was concerned with privilege primarily as it promoted monopoly profits through unfair exchange at the individual level, and not as it affected the overall structure of production. The kind of government intervention that James O'Connor was later to write about, that promoted accumulation and concentration by directly subsidizing the operating costs of big business, largely escaped his notice. At the end of the previous section, we noted that the failure of the trust movement reflected the insufficiency of railroad subsidies, tariffs and patents alone to maintain stable monopoly power. But without the government-subsidized "internal improvements" of the nineteenth century, it is doubtful that most national-scale industrial firms would even have existed, let alone been able to make attempts at collusion. Adam Smith argued over two hundred years ago for the fairness of internalizing the costs of transportation infrastructure through user fees. It does not seem necessary that the expense of those public works should be defrayed from that public revenue, as it is commonly called, of which the collection and application is in most countries assigned to the executive power. The greater part of such public works may easily be so managed as to afford a particular revenue sufficient for defraying their own expense, without bringing any burden upon the general revenue of society.... When the carriages which pass over a highway or a bridge, and the lighters which sail upon a navigable canal, pay toll in proportion to their weight or their tonnage, they pay for the maintenance of those public works exactly in proportion to the wear and tear which they occasion of them. It seems scarce possible to invent a more equitable way of maintaining such works. This tax or toll too, though it is advanced by the carrier, is finally paid by the consumer, to whom it must always be charged in the price of the goods.... It seems not unreasonable that the extraordinary expense which the protection of any particular branch of commerce may occasion should be defrayed by a moderate tax upon that particular branch; by a moderate fine, for example, to be paid by the traders when they first enter into it, or, what is more equal, by a particular duty of so much percent upon the goods which they either import into, or export out of, the particular countries with which it is carried on.90 But that's not the way things work under what the neoliberals like to call "free market capitalism." Spending on transportation and communications networks from general revenues, rather than from taxes and user fees, allows big business to "externalize its costs" on the public, and conceal its true operating expenses. Chomsky described this state capitalist underwriting of shipping costs quite accurately: One well-known fact about trade is that it's highly subsidized with huge market-distorting factors.... The most obvious is that every form of transport is highly subsidized.... Since trade naturally requires transport, the costs of transport enter into the calculation of the efficiency of trade. But there are huge subsidies to reduce the costs of transport, through manipulation of energy costs and all sorts of market-distorting functions.91 Every wave of concentration of capital in the United States has followed a publicly subsidized infrastructure system of some sort. The national railroad system, built largely on free or below-cost land donated by the government, was followed by concentration in heavy industry, petrochemicals, and finance. Albert Nock ridiculed the corporate liberals of his time, who held up the corruption of the railroad companies as examples of the failure of "rugged individualism" and "laissez-faire." It is nowadays the fashion, even among those who ought to know better, to hold "rugged individualism" and laissez-faire responsible for the riot of stock-waterings, rebates, rate-cutting, fraudulent bankruptcies, and the like, which prevailed in our railway-practice after the Civil War, but they had no more to do with it than they have with the precession of the equinoxes. The fact is that our railways, with few exceptions, did not grow up in response to any actual economic demand. They were speculative enterprises enabled by State intervention, by allotment of the political means in the form of land-grants and subsidies; and of all the evils alleged against our railway-practice, there is not one but what is directly traceable to this primary intervention.92 The modern telecommunications system goes back to the Bell Patent association, organized in 1875; the various Bell systems were consolidated as AT&T in 1900. Without the government's enforcement of its huge arsenal of patents on virtually every aspect of telephony, a centralized communications infrastructure would have been impossible on anything like the present scale.93 And that is leaving out entirely the role of government franchises and right-of-way grants in the rise of the AT&T monopoly. The next major transportation projects were the national highway system, starting with the system of designated national highways in the 1920s and culminating with Eisenhower's interstate system; and the civil aviation system, built almost entirely with federal money. The result was massive concentration in retail, agriculture, and food processing. The most recent such project was the infrastructure of the worldwide web, originally built by the Pentagon. It permits, for the first time, direction of global operations in real time from a single corporate headquarters, and is accelerating the concentration of capital on a global scale. To quote Chomsky again, "The telecommunications revolution... is... another state component of the international economy that didn't develop through private capital, but through the public paying to destroy themselves...."94 The centralized corporate economy depends for its existence on a shipping price system which is artificially distorted by government intervention. To fully grasp how dependent the corporate economy is on socializing transportation and communications costs, imagine what would happen if truck and aircraft fuel were taxed enough to pay the full cost of maintenance and new building costs on highways and airports; and if fossil fuels depletion allowances were removed. The result would be a massive increase in shipping costs. Does anyone seriously believe that Wal-Mart could continue to undersell local retailers, or corporate agribusiness could destroy the family farm? It is fallacious to say that state-subsidized infrastructure "creates efficiencies" by making possible large-scale production for a national market. The fact that a large, centralized infrastructure system can only come about when the state subsidizes or organizes it from above, or that such state action causes it to exist on a larger scale than it otherwise would, indicates that the transaction costs are so high that the benefits are not worth it to people spending their own money. There is no demand for it by consumers willingly spending their own money, at the actual costs of providing the services, risks and all, without state intervention. If production on the scale promoted by infrastructure subsidies were actually efficient enough to compensate for real distribution costs, the manufacturers would have presented enough effective demand for such long-distance shipping at actual costs to pay for it without government intervention. On the other hand, an apparent "efficiency" that presents a positive ledger balance only by shifting and concealing real costs, is no "efficiency" at all. Costs cannot be destroyed. Shifting them does not make them any less of a cost--it only means that, since they aren't being paid by the beneficiary of the service, he profits at someone else's expense. There Ain't No Such Thing As A Free Lunch. Intellectually honest right-libertarians freely admit as much. For example, Tibor Machan wrote in The Freeman that Some people will say that stringent protection of rights [against eminent domain] would lead to small airports, at best, and many constraints on construction. Of course--but what's so wrong with that? Perhaps the worst thing about modern industrial life has been the power of political authorities to grant special privileges to some enterprises to violate the rights of third parties whose permission would be too expensive to obtain. The need to obtain that permission would indeed seriously impede what most environmentalists see as rampant--indeed reckless--industrialization. The system of private property rights--in which... all... kinds of... human activity must be conducted within one's own realm except where cooperation from others has been gained voluntarily--is the greatest moderator of human aspirations.... In short, people may reach goals they aren't able to reach with their own resources only by convincing others, through arguments and fair exchanges, to cooperate.95

### A2 Non-State Movements Fail --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---Empirically non-state movements to resist sovereignty work --- We must revolt against the state-then and only then can we be liberated and truly be free.

Worden, 11 (Darian, News analyst and left libertarian writer and activist, “the system needs us we dofreen’t need the system, 2/20/11, http://c4ss.org/content/6226)

Uprisings against notably authoritarian regimes, and resistance to attacks on labor power in Wisconsin, show that the general public has power when they choose to use it. How powerful they can become and how beneficial their power will be rests on how much they continue to believe in authority. A conscious populace can discard a system that does not work for them. The current political system solidly maintains the power of politicians and their supporters over the general populace. Office-holders and their corporate partners make deals with each other to keep their faction in charge — and the maintenance of a stable power structure is essential to enabling them to rule. Fortunately the system is composed of people, and those people are bound by the political necessities of good appearances, by rivalries among rulers, and by the consciences of the enforcers. All the weapons money can buy are only as effective as the individuals operating them. Of course, any challenge to the system holds the dangers of wasting effort to perpetuate the system or adopting one that is no better. A brutal reaction might be unleashed, new elites could become rulers, or rebels might maintain or expand the privileges of the old system instead of leveling the system for mutual benefit. To prevent the rise of new tyranny, the mobilized public must respect individual liberty and know how to safeguard it. It is of prime importance to consistently and effectively call out the lie that elites and rulers are necessary. The power-hungry will always claim they will exploit less than the other guy, and make the unstated assumption that exploitation is a necessity. But exploitation and rulership are not needed to maintain a peaceful and prosperous society of freedom. Instead, power can be dispersed among equals. Elites provide nothing that cannot be better provided without them. Security? Elites undermine it, and the foundations of true security are social bonds and solidarity that thugs are keen to disrupt. Transportation infrastructure? The system builds according to the demands of power, sometimes demolishing neighborhoods in the process, and skims off into the pockets of numerous cronies before it delivers anything. Education? People are eager to learn and teach, and only authoritarian structures, administrative excess, and the nonsense used to prop up the system obstructs them. Environmental protection? Elites market green and pass laws, but encourage waste and destruction. And so on. Power structures are made to support the powerful, and people do best by getting rid of them. A populace that liberates itself has the chance to explore new options: ad-hoc neighborhood councils with common membership, the division of state organizations among mutual ownership shares, and whatever other arrangements satisfied the needs of safeguarding the equal liberty of all individuals to live as they want without infringing on others’ liberty. The groundwork for liberation can be laid by building networks and spreading ideas online and in person. But one must act when action is happening. Events have shown that people do not need to defer to authority or wait for permission to take power from tyrants. If the masses retain power and show a widespread respect for individual autonomy instead of ceding power and liberty to ambitious politicians, an era of unprecedented human freedom will be safeguarded.

## Answers to Answers

### A2 Framework --- 2nc Ans 2 Ans

#### ---Our argument is an impact turn to framework --- If we win a link then we’ve proven their Epistemology is has been infiltrated by the state and intellectually bankrupt.

Shaffer, 10 (Butler, professor of law and author, “How do we know what we know”, 10/13/10, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer223.html)

The most damaging falsehood associated with governmental action is the belief — common to the entire institutional order — that social order is dependent upon pyramidal, vertical power structures. Contrary to its avowed purpose, this premise generates societal disorder, brought on by two factors: [1] the refusal of the system to respect the inviolability of property interests which, in turn, is destructive of individual liberty — about which I have written extensively elsewhere — and [2] the point upon which I am focusing today: the epistemological problems associated with presuming the capacity to predict the outcomes of complex relationships. If we understood the lesson from the study of chaos, namely that complex behavior always produces unpredictable consequences, we might be less arrogant in efforts to mandate the behavior of people. More than that, if we understood just how inherently and unavoidably limited is our knowledge of the world, we might be less hubristic in our insistence upon managing the lives of others. For example, as the federal government was finalizing its plans for the construction of a nuclear-waste storage facility in Yucca Mountain, Nevada, a federal court directed the Department of Energy to predict the consequences that would be generated for a period of time ranging from 300,000 to 1,000,000 years. To most of us who have a sense of responsibility for our actions, I suspect the court's order was premised on the importance of considering long-term costs. The troublesome implications of this judicial response have to do with the court's sense that governments are capable of accurately predicting the course of events for the next one million years. My study of geology, as well as of human existence on Earth, convince me otherwise. Bearing in mind that human beings have likely been on this planet for anywhere from 200,000 to one million years — depending upon whether various skeletal remains are to be defined as "human" or of an earlier species — the court is directing the outcome of human action for a time period equal to mankind's entire history. Furthermore, the court is presuming the kind of geologic and climatological stability that would fail to consider such factors as plate tectonics, earthquakes, and volcanoes; of continental drift and the magnetic reversals of the poles; periodic ice ages and massive flooding; periods of solar flares; the comets and asteroids that have occasionally hit the earth; the cutting-and-filling nature of rivers which, along with the continuing processes of wind and water erosion, continually refigure the face of the planet. To put such inconstancies into the context of the court's order, you should know that, during the last one million years, there have likely been ten major ice ages; the meteor that hit in Arizona and created the giant crater, probably did so about 200,000 years ago; the volcanic eruption that destroyed the island of Krakatoa and produced long-term and worldwide climatological effects, including tsunamis as distant as South Africa, occurred but 127 years ago. Yucca Mountain, itself, was created by a number of volcanic eruptions.

#### ---No impact --- Democracy is merely an illusion designed to normalize coercion and denial of liberty.

Shaffer, 10 (Butler, professor of law at Southwestern Univeristy, “Can Liberty Be Advanced Through Violence?”, 11/11/10, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer224.html)

My opposition to votingarises from the same sense as my opposition to other forms of violence*.* Implicit in efforts to persuade the state to act according to your preferences — whether through voting, lobbying, or threats of force — is the idea that, should you prevail, others will be compelled to abide by what you have chosen for them. Voting is anything but the peaceful alternative to violence: it is premised on the coercive machinery of the state being employed on your behalf should you prevail in amassing a greater number of people on your side than do others.

### A2 Permutation Do Both --- 2nc Ans 2 Ans

#### ---The Perm is not effective- it is impossible to have free will yet subject yourself to the nature of the state.

Shaffer, 11 (Butler, professor of law and author, “The Silence of Institutions”, 4/4/11, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer223.html)

That psychologically healthy men and women incorporate both left- and right-brained influences in their lives is not to be denied. The importance of living centered lives – i.e., living with the integrity that harmonizes (i.e., integrates) our values and actions without conflict or contradiction – is what makes civil society possible. But institutionalized thinking does not allow for such symmetry. An entity that is regarded as an end in itself – its own raison d’etre – is immediately in conflict with the idea of individuals as self-owning beings. From a property perspective, one cannot enjoy decision-making autonomy over his or her life and, at the same time, respect an institution as its own reason for being. This is why a system grounded in liberty and private ownership of property cannot be reconciled with the state. For such reasons, the interests of individuals and institutions are incompatible, a fact that is reflected in the tendency of members of the institutional order to converge on issues central to the maintenance of centralized authority over people. Whether we are considering the war on drugs; police surveillance; government regulation of the economy; state-funded welfare; the so-called "national defense" industry; support for government schools, wars and the expansion of empire; or numerous other state systems premised on the vertical structuring of human action, one rarely finds major institutions dissenting from established policy. Institutional entities have developed a symbiotic relationship that brings them together, as one, when the order, itself, is challenged. What business corporation, university, major religion, member of the mainstream media, corporate-sponsored "think-tank," international labor union, or other member of the "establishment," has offered a frontal criticism of war, defense contracting, the police system, or government schools?

#### ---The Permutation fails- state politics once involved will never leave, its one or the other.

Shaffer, 11( Butler, s professor of law at Southwestern University School of Law and author of Calculated Chaos:, “When Will They Figure It Out?”, 1/11/11, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer227.html)

The reality to increasing numbers of people are becoming aware, is that politics is a violent and corrupt racket that functions on generating fears among those to be ruled. Politicians and other government officials are attracted to political careers not because they want to serve others, but because they have their own visions of what would be "good" for such others, and desire the power to enforce by violence – which is the essence of every government – their expectations. Such people easily find – usually within business organizations and labor unions – people who, unable to prosper in a free market grounded in voluntary transactions, are eager to resort to state violence. "Invisible hands" must be replaced by the "iron fist." Every piece of legislation enacted by congress, every order issued by a court, every action undertaken by government officials – whether at a state, local, or national level – has behind it the power to enforce such edicts or acts by the most violent methods to which such officials deem it necessary to resort. From the cop on the corner, to SWAT teams, to men and women who torture others, to assassins, to those who conduct capital punishment, to military personnel armed with the deadliest of weapons, the state – supported by the special interests who have no qualms about employing such methods to further their interests – is nothing if not the institutionalization of violence. Those who choose to repress an awareness of the vicious, violent, and dehumanized nature of the state will doubtless succumb to the self-serving claims of politicians who fashion themselves noble "public servants" who are victimized by the very violence they have made the central theme for their careers. Political systems – from the local Weed Control Commission to the Pentagon – are defined by their monopoly on the use of violence. Those who use lawful coercion to enforce their wills on others, should be the last heard to lament the "environment of violence" afoot in the land. They have been active participants in the continuing expansion of such life-destroying powers; they insist upon others respecting such authority for their own sense of identity and well-being

### A2 Transition Wars --- 2nc Ans 2 Ans

#### ---Transition wars are the status quo --- The State is the bearer of war- it creates conflicts to subdue its population and regain support for itself.

Shaffer, 11 (Butler, Butler Shaffer is professor of law at Southwestern University School of Law and author of Calculated Chaos:, june 9 2011, http://lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer247.html)

Look at the title of this article: do you find any governmental program or practice therein that is not grounded in state-generated fear? Each one – and the numerous others not mentioned – presumes a threat to your well-being against which the state must take restrictive and intrusive action. Terrorists might threaten the flight you are about to take; terrorist nations might have "weapons of mass destruction" and the intention to use them against you; your children might be at risk from drug dealers or from sex perverts using the Internet; driving without a seat-belt, or eating "junk" foods might endanger you: the list goes on and on, changing as the fear-peddlers dream up another dreaded condition in life. It is not sufficient to the interests of the state that you fear other groups; it is becoming increasingly evident that you must also fear the state itself! Governments are defined as entities that enjoy a monopoly on the use of violence within a given territory. Implicit in such a monopoly is the recognition that there be no limitations on its exercise, other than what serve the power interests of the state. In relatively quiet and stable periods (e.g., 1950s) the state can afford to give respect to notions of individual privacy, free speech, and limitations on the powers of the police. In such ways, the state gives the appearance of reasonableness and respect for people. But when times become more tumultuous – as they are now – the very survival of the state depends upon a continuing assertion of the coercive powers that define its very being. For a number of reasons – some of it technological – our social world is rapidly becoming decentralized. The highly-structured, centrally-directed institutions through which so much of our lives has been organized (e.g., schools, health-care, government, communications, etc.) no longer meet the expectations of many – perhaps most – men and women. Alternative systems, the control of which has become decentralized into individual hands, challenge the traditional institutional order. Private schools and home-schooling; alternative health practices; the Internet, cell-phones, and what is now known as the "social media," are in the ascendancy. With the state becoming increasingly expensive, destructive, economically disruptive, oppressive, and blatantly anti-life, secession and nullification movements have become quite popular. Of course, such transformations are contrary to the established institutional interests that have, for many decades, controlled the state – and, with it, the monopoly on violence that is its principal asset. Having long enjoyed the power to advance their interests not through the peaceful, voluntary methods of the marketplace, but through such coercive means as governmental regulation, taxation, wars, and other violent means, the established order is not about to allow the changing preferences of hundreds of millions of individuals to disrupt its traditional cozy racket. Because the institutional order has become inseparable from the coercive nature of the state, any popular movement toward non-political systems is, in effect, a movement away from the violent structuring of society. The corporate interests that control the machinery of the state may try to convince people that government does protect their interests vis-à-vis the various fear-objects. Failing in this, the statists must resort to the tactic that sustains the playground bully: to reinforce fear of the bully, who controls his victims through a mixture of violence and degradation. Neither the TSA nor the alleged "war on terror" have anything to do with terrorism. The idea that the TSA came about as a consequence of 9/11 ignores the fact that the state’s practice of prowling through the personal belongings of airline passengers goes back many decades. I recall how upset a friend of mine was – in the early 1970s – when government officials went through his hand-luggage, and ordered him to unwrap a birthday gift he was carrying home to a relative. The purpose of such a search then, as now, was to remind passengers of the bully’s basic premise: "I can do anything I want to you whenever I choose to do so." It is for the purpose of keeping us docile – an objective furthered by degrading and dehumanizing us – that underlies such state practices. The groping of people’s genitals and breasts is but an escalation of this premise, and should the TSA later decide that all passengers must strip naked for inspection, such a practice will go unquestioned not only by the courts, but by the mainstream media who will ask " . . . but if you don’t have anything to hide . . . " Those who cannot imagine state power going to such extremes to humiliate people into submission, are invited to revisit the many photographs of German army officers at such places as Auschwitz, who watched – as "full body scanners" – as naked women were forced to run by them. The extension of wars – against any enemy that any president chooses as a target – serves the same purpose. It is not necessary that there be any plausible rationale for the bombing and invading of other countries: it is sufficient that Americans and foreigners alike be reminded of the violence principle upon which government rests. "I will go to war against you if it serves my interests to do so, and any resistance on your part will only confirm what a threat you are to America!" The state directs its wars not so much against foreign populations, as against its own. War rallies people into the mindset of unquestioning obedience because, by engaging in such deadly conduct, the state reminds us of its capacities to destroy us at its will. I elaborated on this topic in an earlier article. You can apply this logic to any of the aforementioned government programs. The state – and the corporate order that depends upon the exercise of state power – is fighting for its survival. Rather than treating this as a "war against terrorism," it is more accurate to consider it as a "war to preserve the hierarchically-structured institutional order." There are too many trillions of dollars and too much arbitrary power at stake for those who benefit from controlling the state’s instruments of violence to await the outcome of ordinary people’s thinking. If the survival of the corporate-state power structure required the extermination of two billion people, such a program would be undertaken with little hesitation. Destructive violence becomes an end-in-itself to an organization that is defined in terms of its monopoly on such means. On the other hand, I continue to remain optimistic that these institutional wars against life will come to an end. I believe that the United States of America is in a terminal condition; its fate already determined. But America – whose existence predates the United States – may very well survive in a fundamentally changed form. What is helping this transformation process are innovative technological tools for the decentralized exchange of information; mankind is rapidly becoming capable of communicating with one another in the most direct ways, methods that make traditional top-down forms less and less relevant. The Internet is one system that is the tip of an iceberg whose deeper challenges have thus far not captured the attention of crew members of the ship-of-state. Wikileaks is another step in the evolution of decentralized information systems that will bring greater transparency to the activities of the ruling classes. In the process, men and women will discover just how liberating the free flow of information can be. When the rest of the world has access to the same information that political systems try to keep secret, the games played at the expense of people begin to fall apart.

# Affirmative Answers

### Permutation Do Both --- Aff Ans

#### ---Permutation Do Both --- Have the United States Federal Government <Do The Plan> and develop challenges and alternatives to state power through non-state movements.

#### ---Only the combination of nonstate action and state coordination can provide functioning transportation infrastructure, mobility and liberty.

Litman 2011

Todd, Contrasting Visions of Urban Transport; Critique of “Fixing Transit: The Case For Privatization”, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.187.8076

Private transport providers sometimes offer cheaper or higher quality service than public transit, but these are exceptions, available only under high demand conditions. Private companies cannot provide an integrated network of transit services needed to achieve strategic planning objectives, such as basic mobility for non-drivers and significant reductions in urban traffic problems. This is an important issue. To be efficient and equitable a transport system must provide diverse options so people can choose the best one for each trip. This requires high quality public transit that is convenient, comfortable, reliable and relatively affordable. The quality and efficiency of public transit service affects overall transport system performance, and therefore a community’s economic productivity and quality of life. Even people who do not currently use public transit can benefit significantly from high quality service. This is not to suggest that public transit cannot be improved or that privatization is never appropriate. Many reforms may be justified. However, it is important to apply comprehensive analysis when evaluating such options, including consideration of impacts on service quality and overall transport system performance.

### Non-State Infrastructure Doesn’t Solve the Aff --- Aff Ans

#### ---World Bank Study concludes non-state transportation infrastructure fails for three reasons [uncoordinated service ignores large sections of the population, less effective organizational structure and excessive passenger competition].

Litman 2011

Todd, Contrasting Visions of Urban Transport; Critique of “Fixing Transit: The Case For Privatization”, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.187.8076

A World Bank study by Estache and Gómez-Lobo (2003) concludes that both economic theory and experience indicate that unregulated and unsubsidized public transit systems cannot provide optional service for the following reasons: • Service is only provided on the most profitable routes, and is not coordinated between routes, so the system cannot achieve scale economies. • Companies that provide transit services tend to be either large and monopolistic, or small and inefficient, depending on market conditions. Either way, they are unlikely to provide optimal service without appropriate regulation. • Operators race for passengers, which increases congestion and accidents. • Because automobile travel imposes external congestion, accident and pollution costs, and public transit helps achieve social equity objectives, unregulated and unsubsidized transit will provide less than optimal service levels. For these reasons, the study recommends the Bus Rapid Transit model of contracting service, in which governments own and operate bus lanes and stations, and allow private companies to bid on the right to use those facilities, based on low operating costs and high service quality. Overall, most experts conclude that regulation and subsidies are required to maintain efficient and high quality transit service. Many support contracting out and public-private partnerships where appropriate, but within a regulatory structure that insures system integration and quality.

#### ---Err affirmative --- All their evidence sites theoretical studies from the ‘90s that have since been empirically disproven.

Litman 2011

Todd, Contrasting Visions of Urban Transport; Critique of “Fixing Transit: The Case For Privatization”, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.187.8076

Fixing Transit is outdated. During the 1990s many experts advocated transport infrastructure privatization (roads, rail and urban transit), but subsequent experience found that these experts had understated problems and costs, and exaggerated benefits. As a result, many transport privatization efforts have since been scaled back, restructured or abandoned.

#### ---Only the state can provide comprehensive transportation infrastructure --- The alternative cannot solve the aff and no evidence supports their ‘non-state actors will fill in’ arguments.

Litman 2011

Todd, Contrasting Visions of Urban Transport; Critique of “Fixing Transit: The Case For Privatization”, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.187.8076

Fixing Transit claims (p. 22) that “Privatization will make transit responsive to users, not politicians, and will actually lead to better services for many transit users,” but provides no evidence. In fact, the type of privatization recommended in Fixing Transit generally leads to a spiral of declining service and ridership, and increasing fares. Fixing Transit ignores the harm this would impose on transit dependent people (and their families, friends and employers). Although some transit users have alternatives (walking, bicycling, being chauffeured by family members or friends, driving, or hiring a taxi), others face severe difficulties, including inability to access essential services and activities, or excessive financial burdens to pay for higher fares or alternatives such as taxis.

#### ---Even Adam Smith concludes transportation Infrastructure cannot be corrected or formed by the invisible hand --- Only a profitable investment for states.

Lind 2011

William, Adam Smith Versus the Libertarians, Center for Public Transportation, <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/cpt/2011/05/16/adam-smith-versus-the-libertarians/>

Many libertarians think their founder was Adam Smith. In reality, it was Dr. Pangloss. So long as something is a free market outcome, it is for the best in this best of all possible worlds. That is true, according to libertarian ideology, even if it kills us. Those libertarians who see Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” as an automatic mechanism, one that functions regardless of any other circumstances (so long as government stays out of it), misread Smith. He knew that all aspects of society, including the economy, are dependent on sound morals. In his own view, his most important book was not The Wealth of Nations but A Theory of Moral Sentiments. The amoralism of many libertarians not only separates them from conservatives, it separates them from Adam Smith as well. Libertarian ideology also departs from Adam Smith when it comes to infrastructure, including transportation and government’s role in providing it. Libertarians demand that everything be left to the free market. Smith, in The Wealth of Nations, wrote: According to the system of natural liberty, the sovereign has only three duties to attend to . . . First, the duty of protecting the society from violence and invasion . . . secondly, the duty of protecting, as far as possible, every member of society from the injustice or oppression of every other member of it . . . and, thirdly, the duty of erecting and maintaining certain public works and certain public institutions, which it can never be for the interest of any individual, or small number of individuals, to erect and maintain; because the profit would never repay the expense to any individual or small number of individuals, though it may frequently do much more than repay it to a great society. That is a pretty good definition of infrastructure, including transportation infrastructure. In fact, Adam Smith goes on to discuss transportation infrastructure at some length. In his day, that meant roads, canals, and bridges. In America, canals in particular, represented Smith’s view. Most were built with at least partial government funding. Other than the Erie Canal, few made a profit. But most of them repaid their state investors many times over. I often ride my bike on the towpath of the Ohio and Erie Canal. When it opened, the price a farmer received for a barrel of flour in the area the canal served went from 50¢ to five dollars. The cost of transport fell so much that his flour could now be shipped cheaply to New York or Europe, where it commanded a far higher price than it did locally. Cleveland grew from a village into a city. The loss the state absorbed for building and operating the canal was more than repaid. Adam Smith departed this world before the first train arrived. But it is not unreasonable to think that he might have seen passenger trains and public transportation as part of the public works the government should undertake. Smith did want those public works to pay for their own upkeep as much as possible. Again, in The Wealth of Nations, he wrote: The greater part of such public works may easily be so managed as to afford a particular revenue for defraying their own expenses, without bringing any burden upon the general revenue of the society. Conservatives agree with that, so long as the demand is made equally of all competitors. The libertarian transit critics like to apply it to trains and transit but not highways, which “particular revenues” at present cover just under 52% of their expenses. And while many libertarians demand that all infrastructure be privatized, Smith wrote: The tolls for the maintenance of a high road cannot with any safety be made the property of private persons. In short, Adam Smith’s views accord more closely with those of conservatives than of libertarians. He saw society’s morals and culture as more important than a free market. He believed government had a role to play in providing infrastructure, without which commerce cannot flourish. And he thought some of that infrastructure would have to be owned by government. Conservatives views all, not ideological cant.

#### ---View all alternative solvency claims as suspect --- No empirical examples of Libertarian transportation infrastructure.

Hedlund 11 (Joshua, Senior Fellow of the Post Liberetarian, “Thank Government for something: Interstate highway system”,11/4/11, http://www.postlibertarian.com/2011/11/thank-government-for-something-interstate-highway-system/)

But fortunately or unfortunately, all we can do is speculate about what the United States would look like today if the federal government had never created the Interstate Highway System. It seems hard to imagine that a similar system would have sprung up from private parties since it spans so much land and jurisdiction and requires so many resources, yet my belief in the power of markets leads me to suspect that something unpredictable and wonderful would have somehow arisen in its stead. At the same time, libertarians can always point out the imperfections of the status quo and theorize how things would be better off without the government. My theory can always beat your reality. I agree with commenter Kevin on the Cafe Hayek post: As with so many government provided utilities, the answer to the question about the effects of policy can only be speculative. We never had a chance to see the success or failure of private roads carrying thousands of cars every day from the suburbs to the city centers, and if I can speculate for a second, we never will. So people with an axe to grind may as well ascribe blame or credit for suburbanization to road subsidies. It’s as verifiable as every other political assertion about how the world would look in a parallel universe. So I look at the interstate highway system and conclude that, for all of its flaws and inefficiencies and distortions of investment and infringements on liberty, I still think it’s pretty fantastic that I can travel from here to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, in a few hours, for only the cost of a few gallons of gas, with the majority of my journey simplified by three major highways that have plenty of rest stops and gas stations available at my slightest need. Maybe the private world would have produced something better; maybe not. The interstate wiki referenced above claims that “About one-third of all miles driven in the country use the Interstate system.” I know a great majority of mine are. So it can’t be that bad, and that’s why I say, thank you, federal government, for the interstate highway system.

### State Inevitable --- Aff Ans

#### ---State systems are inevitable --- The critique is ethnocentric and fails to analyze the history of government.

Solomon 1996

Hussein, Senior Researcher, Human Security Project, Institute for Defence Policy, “In Defence of Realism,” African Security Review, Vol 5, No 2, http://www.iss.co.za/pubs/ASR/5No2/5No2/InDefence.html

One aspect of this criticism relates to the fact that realists see the State as an ‘a-historical given in the global system’.83 Post-modernists posit the notion that the State is a relatively recent historical figure (that the birth of the State is to be found in the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 which ended the Thirty Years War). It is argued that the State historically evolved from set circumstances, and that in the present era of massive global change it shows every indication to be on the wane.84 However, such a view is extremely problematic. Does this mean that Julius Caesar did not rule over a State? Does this mean that the rulers of ancient Han China did not rule over a state? Does this mean that Montezuma’s sophisticated Aztec polity was not a state? And what of King Solomon’s Israel, rulers of the mighty kingdoms of Mali and Ghana, Atahualapa’s vast Inca empire, and the sophisticated Indus Valley polity which existed millennia before the birth of Christ? These questions necessitate a more fundamental question: what exactly is a state? The classic political science definition of a state is a people occupying a specific territory, having rulers (government) who pass laws which are binding on those people.85 By this definition, all the above historical examples are indeed states. More importantly, it illustrates a deep Eurocentric bias among those scholars who claim that the State is a relatively recent historical phenomenon which began with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Those who argue that the State is withering away lack an understanding of human history which proves that states are complex social structures and have always been changing in response to new historical conditions. As such, the State as defined above will always be with us in one form or another. After all, somebody has to see to the need of citizens, ranging from protection from the mugger in the dark alley to the army of a foreign government.

### A2 Liberty First --- Aff Ans

#### ---Case outweighs --- Extinction ends all liberty for all time.

Rothbard 1973

Murray, Dean of Austrian School, Head of Mises Institute, FOR A NEW LIBERTY: THE LIBERTARIAN MANIFESTO, p. http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newlibertywhole.asp#p263

Many libertarians are uncomfortable with foreign policy matters and prefer to spend their energies either on fundamental questions of libertarian theory or on such "domestic" concerns as the free market or privatizing postal service or garbage disposal. Yet an attack on war or a warlike foreign policy is of crucial importance to libertarians. There are two important reasons. One has become a cliche, but is all too true nevertheless: the overriding importance of preventing a nuclear holocaust. To all the long-standing reasons, moral and economic, against an interventionist foreign policy has now been added the imminent, ever-present threat of world destruction. If the world should be destroyed, all the other problems and all the other isms—socialism, capitalism, liberalism, or libertarianism—would be of no importance whatsoever.

#### ---Right tradeoffs are inevitable --- We should prioritize the ones that minimize death and suffering to maximize future liberty.

Sunstein 1999

Stephen, Professor of political science @ Princeton, The cost of rights: why liberty depends on taxes, pg 130

Rights remain rights even though they will not always be enforced to the hilt, or even as thoroughly as would be possible were resources more plentiful or taxpayers more open-handed. Trade-offs in rights enforcement must and will be made. Scarce resources will be allocated between monitoring the police and (for example) paying and training the police, between monitoring the police and monitoring electoral officers, between monitoring the police and providing legal aid to the poor, providing food stamps to the poor, educating the young, nursing the elderly, financing national defense, or protecting the environment. Morally speaking, incomplete protection of property rights is far easier to swallow than half-hearted protection of the helpless from beatings and killings. We accord property rights special, but not the greatest possible, protection. But are the interests of some Americans not being brutalized or murdered given the same level of regard as the interests of other Americans in protection of their property rights? Was the palpable benefit to Joshua DeShaney of retaining his normal brain functions given the highest imaginable level of administrative protections? Was it accorded a level of protection greater or less than that received by the homeowners of Westhampton? There seems to be something obscene about the very comparison, not to mention the distressing answers such questions may elicit. But they do suggest that, in reality, no right can be uncompromisable, for rights enforcement, like everything costly, is inevitably incomplete.

### A2 State Kills Innovation --- Aff Ans

#### ---State transportation infrastructure can innovate and responds to consumer demand --- Recent reforms prove you shouldn’t throw the baby out with the bathwater.

Litman 2011

Todd, Contrasting Visions of Urban Transport; Critique of “Fixing Transit: The Case For Privatization”, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.187.8076

Fixing Transit argues (p. 13) that public transit agencies never innovate, demand response is always better than fixed-route service, buses are always better than rail, everybody prefers automobile travel and sprawl, and newer technologies are always better. These claims are wrong. Transit agencies do innovate. North American transit agencies are implementing all the innovations mentioned in Fixing Transit, including telephone dispatching, vehicle tracking, electronic payment systems, and improved user information, plus many more. The Transit Cooperative Research Program sponsors extensive research on transit innovations. Demand response is already provided by most North American transit agencies. It is appropriate for some applications, particularly serving people with disabilities, but is inherently inefficient. It typically cost several times more than conventional transit (the SuperShuttle airporter service O’Toole cites as an example typically charges $15-30 per trip) and is generally slower and less predictable than fixed-route transit due to flexible routing and stops. Because of its low load factors, it provides little or no congestion reduction or energy savings compared with driving.

#### ---No impact to discouraging transportation innovation --- Segways, flying cars and rocket packs prove the free market only makes stupid transportation technology that is inaccessible and impractical for most.

Litman 2011

Todd, Contrasting Visions of Urban Transport; Critique of “Fixing Transit: The Case For Privatization”, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.187.8076

It is silly to assume, as Fixing Transit, does, that newer transportation technologies are always better than those that are well established and tested. History of rife with proposals for transport system innovations that are technically feasible but not worthwhile, including flying cars and rocket belts. Although Segways can replace non-motorized travel, they have few practical uses. Walking and cycling are generally better overall. Similarly, buses and trains are efficient and reliable transport modes, which can be improved, but not replaced, by technological innovation.

### A2 State = Extinction --- Aff Ans

#### ---Democratic checks and balances preclude excessive use of state power and the alternative empirically lacks democratic accountability to check corporate tyranny which is worse.

Partridge 1999

Ernest, Philosophy @ UC Riverside, “With Liberty for Some,” <http://gadfly.igc.org/papers/liberty.htm>

No one can doubt that many governments have proven to be "dangerous" and tyrannical. But libertarians would have us believe that all governments, per se, are not to be trusted - that "the best government is no government." That claim requires an argument. American history teaches us that because the founders of our government were very suspicious of the powers and abuses of the state, they first attempted, under the Articles of Confederation, the sort of minimalist government that the libertarians might endorse – a government that failed. Following that they tried again, this time with a system of "checks and balances" that separated the powers of government, and then they completed their task with a "Bill of Rights" that explicitly stated limits on the powers of the government over its citizens. Ultimately, the sovereignty over that government resides in the voting public (or at least did so until Bush v. Gore on December 12, 2000).. If we don't like the way we are being governed, we can replace our leaders at the ballot box. Unfortunately, if we don't like the way the telephone company or the public utilities treat us, we can not vote their management out of office - unless, of course, we are wealthy enough to own significant amounts of stock in these companies. Yet these private interests control our lives, without restraint - unless, of course, in accord with liberal policy and contrary to the advice of the libertarians, we have been wise and fortunate enough to enable our collective surrogate, the government, to regulate these private interests in our behalf. Clearly, all governments, being institutions designed by imperfect human beings, are imperfect to some degree. But no one has effectively demonstrated that anarchy is to be preferred. Every civilized human being lives under some system of government, for better or worse. Perhaps there is some compelling reason for this.