# Individualism K

#### Rejecting every instance of state infringement on economic freedoms should be paramount -- the alternative is genocide and totalitarian control.

James, Dorn, Vice president for academic affairs at the Cato Institute and author of "The Rise of Government and the Decline of Morality.", March 14, 2004, “The Road to Serfdom after 60 Years”, CATO Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/road-serfdom-after-60-years, Callahan)

Although Soviet-style central planning is no longer in vogue, **governments** around the world **continue to envision and implement programs designed to suppress markets and enlarge the state.** The forces of collectivism are softer today, but they have not gone away. Take **the U.S.**, for example. **Instead of being a beacon for free markets**, the U.S. **is too often seen protecting special interests and denying freedom of choice.** **Democracy, if not limited by** what Hayek called **a "constitution of liberty,"** **will lead to the use of government to redistribute rather than to protect private property and wealth**. Politicians on both sides of the aisle appear to be more interested in equality of outcome than in protecting taxpayer's property rights and freedom. **The lapse of the U.S. from the liberal principles** that Hayek advocated **appears minor compared to most countries.** Corruption is endemic **in many Third World countries today** because economic **life has not been insulated from politics -- the force of law is used to plunder property rather than to protect it.** As such, economic decisions are politicized. This is especially evident in the former Soviet Union**. Attempts to plan economic life and achieve "social justice" wrought havoc in the 20th century.** The Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, East Germany, and other **totalitarian states learned the hard way that Marx was wrong** and Hayek was right. What still needs to be emphasized, however, is Hayek's message that **"political freedom is meaningless without economic freedom."** When private property rights are violated and economic freedom is attenuated by various forms of government intervention, our other freedoms are threatened**. The Jews in Nazi Germany first had their economic liberties violated. The rest of the horrors followed. The U.S., as the leader of the free world, needs to reinvigorate market liberalism and be a bulwark for private property, freedom of contract, and limited government.**

#### Government provision of infrastructure forces citizen to pay and violates basic morality -- only embracing free enterprise solves.

 Zachary, Slayback, - Fellow at the Harlan Institute, 8/3/2011, “Privatize the Highways — and All Roads for That Matter”, Ludvig von Mises Institute, , http://mises.org/daily/5498/Privatize-the-Highways-and-All-Roads-for-That-Matter)

The failure of the current state-sponsored system of highways is nowhere more evident than in Somerset County, Pennsylvania. Here, the expressway of US Route 219 (also known as the John P. Murtha highway and the Flight 93 Memorial Highway) goes under an overpass and then ends abruptly in a forest. If we truly wish to have 219 — or any other highway or road for that matter — finished, then we ought to be advocating for complete privatization of the highways. Privatization would ensure that the project would be finished in a timely manner, would remove the moral hazard of building a possibly unnecessary highway with public funds, and would not force every individual to fund the project, whether they wish to use it or not. Should a company decide that any highway is a viable venture for their ownership and stockholders, then it would be on that company to build a product that consumers would wish to use. If several companies wished to build a highway, then whichever company offered the best product (i.e., the best-maintained, cheapest, fastest highway) would be chosen by consumers to deliver that product via the price system. When government has a monopoly on any market, competition is stifled, and the ultimate losers are not only the companies who could have invested in a designated area, such as the Somerset County area, but also the consumers, who are forced to settle for a noncompetitive, usually subpar product.

#### **Federal planning undermines freedom and destroys choice -- ending transit subsidies is necessary.**

Gabriel, Roth, civil engineer and transportation economist. He is currently a research fellow at the Independent Institute, 10- June-2012, “Federal Highway Funding”, <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding>

Today, **the interstate highway system is long complete** and **federal financing has become an increasingly inefficient way to modernize America's highways.** Federal spending is often misallocated to low-value activities, and the regulations that go hand-in-hand with federal aid stifle innovation and boost highway costs. Congress implements highway policy through multi-year authorization bills. The last of these was passed in 2005 as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Congress will likely be reauthorizing highway programs in 2011, and it is currently pursuing many misguided policy directions in designing that legislation. **One damaging policy direction involves efforts to reduce individual automobile travel, which will harm the economy and undermine mobility choice.** Another damaging policy direction is the imposition of federal "livability" standards in transportation planning. Such standards would federalize land-use planning and pose a serious threat to civil liberties and the autonomy of local communities. Finally, ongoing federal mandates to reduce fuel consumption have the serious side effect of making road travel more dangerous. The federal government pursues these misguided goals by use of its fiscal powers and regulatory controls, and by diverting dedicated vehicle fuel taxes into less efficient forms of transportation. The main diversion is to rail transit, which can be a very inefficient mode of transportation, as discussed in a related essay. Most Americans do not use rail transit and should not have to subsidize expensive subways and rail systems in a small number of major cities that prohibit the use of more modern and effective transit methods, such as shared taxis. Because car travel is generally faster (door-to-door) than transit (which is not even available to most American travelers), it is not possible to reduce car travel without reducing total travel. The amount of time available for travel is limited, so the use of slower door-to-door travel modes is invariably associated with loss of trips. While requiring road users to cover the costs arising from their trips is a legitimate government objective, a blanket requirement to reduce "per capita" travel constitutes an unacceptable attack on freedom.

## Answers

### A2: Depotism

#### Free elections and localized politics solve despotism – this model of individualism is good

Hahm Chaibong, associate professor of political science at Yonsei University and director of the Comparative Cultural Studies Center at Yonsei University's Institute for East & West Studies, 2000, “The Cultural Challenge to Individualism,” Journal of Democracy, Volume 11, Number 1

To be sure, Tocqueville's genius lay in discovering how America had succeeded in mitigating at least some of the negative consequences of individualism. The reason that America had not disintegrated or fallen into despotism is that it possessed something that no other nation on earth had at the time--namely, "free institutions." Free elections and the localization of politics are the two pillars of American democracy that shield it from individualism's worst effects. Free elections counter the tendency of a democratic society to fragment by teaching those whose ambitions cannot be satisfied in private life that they "cannot do without the people who surround them. Men learn at such times to think of their fellow men from ambitious motives; and they frequently find it, in a manner, their interest to forget themselves" (II, 103). The localization of politics also counters the disintegrative tendency of democracy; it "leads a great number of citizens to value the affection of their neighbors and of their kindred, perpetually brings men together, and forces them to help one another in spite of the propensities that sever them" (II, 104). Thus Tocqueville can state categorically that "the Americans have combated by free institutions the tendency of equality to keep men asunder, and they have subdued it" (II, 103).