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1nc regular shell (1/5)

Taxpayers have a moral right to their income which the aff plan violates – the state can’t identify social goods that could reimburse income, any social goods identified are delivered inefficiently, taxation destroys social goods anyways, and their evidence is biased towards expanded government.

Kuznicki 9 (Jason, facilitator of multiple Cato Institute international publishing projects, Research Fellow and Managing Editor at *Cato Unbound* [an intellectual think tank publication], prior Production Manager at the Congressional Research Service, Ph.D. in history from Johns Hopkins University, Cato Journal, Book review of *The Libertarian Illusion: Ideology, Public Policy, and the Assault on the Common Good*, Spring/Summer 2009, Volume 29 Issue 2, <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=0de93721-30a4-4513-87f1-57bf16a8aa5e%40sessionmgr13&vid=2&hid=12>, SP)

A taxpayer has a moral claim to all of his honestly acquired income. This claim is stronger than that of any other individual or group. Adding the words "state" or "society" to the claims of others does not change this situation in any relevant sense. This is the heart of libertarian thought on taxation. If lowering taxes changes the state's revenue, a libertarian may find this a fortunate or unfortunate side effect, at his discretion. Hudson, however, disagrees not only with Norquist and Laffer, but also with the libertarian moral claim. He writes. The ability that any of us have to earn income and acquire wealth depends only partly on our own individual efforts. It relies as well on the operation of political, economic, and social institutions that make it possible for any of us to "earn a living." . . . Viewed in this light, those deductions from my paycheck can be seen as reimbursement to society for that portion of my earnings derived from social goods [p. 43]. Although social goods clearly are part of everyone's capacity to earn income, it's a precipitous move to say that the state may therefore tax us. It is by no means clear that the state, among all institutions in society, is best equipped to receive that which we offer in gratitude for social goods. It is doubtful that the state could identify the relevant goods, and that it has supplied, or could supply, any but a few of them effectively. It's even doubtful whether the state could know when taxation itself has become destructive of social goods. Indeed, the state's own incentives run toward overassessing its importance, delivering social "goods" that no one wants, and supplying them in comically inefficient ways. Communitarianism appears unfazed by these concerns, and it proposes adding many new government programs that seem equally likely to fall into these same old traps. It seems that our debt to society is never fully paid, but that society, in the form of the state, is always eager to supply us with more. At what point, if any, is my debt to society—or my debt to a certain very earnest intellectual of highminded ideals—repaid? And why do I find myself having to describe productive work in terms that verge on those of criminal justice?

1nc regular shell (2/5)

Taxation is theft – the state is a system of violence using coercion to gather taxation for the aff plan.

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

We are now in a position to analyze government and its relationship to the market. Economists have generally depicted the government as a voluntary social institution providing important services to the public. The modern "public choice" theorists have perhaps gone furthest with this approach. Government is considered akin to a business firm, supplying its services to the consumer-voters, while the voters in turn pay voluntarily for these services. All in all, government is treated by conventional economists as a part of the market, and therefore, as in the case of a business firm or a membership organization, either totally or in part neutral to the market. It is true that if taxation were voluntary and the government akin to a business firm, the government would be neutral to the market. We contend here, however, that the model of government is akin, not to the business firm, but to the criminal organization, and indeed that the State is the organization of robbery systematized and writ large. The State is the only legal institution in society that acquires its revenue by the use of coercion, by using enough violence and threat of violence on its victims to ensure their paying the desired tribute. The State benefits itself at the expense of its robbed victims. The State is, therefore, a centralized, regularized organization of theft. Its payments extracted by coercion are called "taxation" instead of tribute, but their nature is the same.

1nc regular shell (3/5)

Coercive societies cause violence – they polarize social forces, reduce multi-dimensional fields, de-emphasize peaceful exchange, and make citizens pay in blood and taxes.

Rummel 85 (R. J., Professor Emeritus in the Political Science Department at the University of Hawaii, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Libertarian Propositions on Violence within and between Nations: A Test against Published Research Results, September 1985, Volume 29 Number 3 - <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/173944.pdf>, SP)

The basic principle is that socioeconomic and political freedom, the hallmark of a libertarian society, minimizes violence. As the theoretical understanding of this has been developed elsewhere (Rummel, 1975- 1981, 1983a, 1984),' I need only point out that such a society is a multi- dimensional field of diverse social forces-some intersecting, some opposing, some overlapping. The net effect is to cross-pressure interests, to cross-cut status and classes, and thus inhibit the growth of societywide violence. As a society becomes more authoritarian or coercive, however, the spontaneity of a social field declines, social forces become polarized, the multidimensionality of interests is reduced. Interests and issues begin to revolve around a single dimension: one's political power. The dividing line between the "ins" and "outs" becomes a conflict front across society along which extreme violence can occur. At this theoretical level, then, the key ideas are that of a social field, cross-pressures, and polarization. At a less abstract level, there are the explanations common to liberal scholars: the aggregating and compromising, and therefore conflict- reducing, effects of competitive party systems; the institutionalization of societywide conflict resolution through competitive politics and the ballot ("the ballot replaces the bullet"); the formalization and regulation of conflict and violence (e.g., labor-management collective bargaining laws); the democratic emphasis on exchange instead of authority and coercion; the unwillingness of democratic majorities to pay in blood and taxes for the foreign adventures of a political elite.

1nc regular shell (4/5)

Infringements on liberty must be rejected at all costs or we forfeit to totalitarianism.

Petro, Toledo Law Review, 1974 (Sylvester, Spring, page 480)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway - "I believe in only one thing: liberty." And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume's observation: "It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once." Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Dijas. In sum, if one believed in freedom as a supreme value and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

1nc regular shell (5/5)

We must take every chance to battle for libertarian freedom.

Bicksler 9 (James L., Professor in Finance and Economic at Rutgers University at the Rutgers Business School, International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, *Classical libertarianism: The economic perspectives of Milton Friedman including his likely views on the ‘proper’ role of government in the subprime mortgage debacle*, 2009, Volume 6 Issue 1 - <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5252cd7e-08a6-444c-a768-64b61efc7de3%40sessionmgr15&vid=4&hid=18>, SP)

The quest and battle for economic, political and civic freedoms is never won in a finality sense. It is a day-to-day, meaning an ongoing battle, where new challenges and variations of old arguments and fallacies for collectivism and its policies arise. The particular issue on the battleground for freedom and its implications for freedom changes over time.

1nc story shell (1/6)

We begin with a thief who presents a victim with a choice – pay now or wait until the thief injures them. This coercive manipulation allows the thief to drain off of society.

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

Having dealt with this idyll of harmonious and mutually beneficial exchanges, let us now introduce a discordant note. A thief now appears, making his living by robbing and coercively preying on others: The robber obtains his income by presenting the victim with a choice: your money or your life (or, at least, your health)—and the victim then yields his assets. Or, to be more precise, the robber presents the victim with a choice between paying immediately or waiting until the robber injures him.12 In this situation both parties do not benefit; instead, the robber benefits precisely at the expense of the victim. Instead of the consumer's paying, guiding, and being benefited by the producer's activity, the robber is benefiting from the victim's payment. The robber benefits to the extent that the victim pays and loses. Instead of helping expand the amount and degree of production in society, the robber is parasitically draining off that production. Whereas an expanded market encourages increases in production and supply, theft discourages production and contracts the market. It should be clear that the robber is not producing any goods and services at all. In contrast to consumers who purchase goods and services, or who contribute voluntarily to a nonprofit organization, no one is voluntarily purchasing from or contributing to our criminals at all. If they were, the criminals would not be criminal. In fact, what distinguishes a criminal group is that its income, in contrast to that of all other organizations, is extracted by the use of violence, against the wishes or consent of the victims. The criminals, then, are "producing" nothing, except their own income at the expense of others. It has been maintained that the payments by the victims are "really" voluntary because the victim decides to transfer his funds under penalty of violence by the robber. This kind of sophistry, however, destroys the original, as well as the common-sense, meaning of the term "coercion" and renders all actions whatever "voluntary. " But if there is no such thing as coercion and all conceivable actions are voluntary, then the distinctive meaning of both terms is destroyed. In this paper, we are defining "voluntary" and "coercion" in a common-sense way: that is, "voluntary" are all actions not taken under the threat of coercion; and "coercion" is the use of violence or threat of violence to compel actions of others. Robbery at gunpoint, then, is "coercion"; the universal need to work and produce is not.

1nc story shell (2/6)

The thief tells the victim that the payment will be used to defend them from other thieves, but these coercive tactics just allow the thief to manipulate the market in his own interest.

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

In a trivial sense, the victim agrees to be victimized rather than lose his life; but surely, to call such a choice or decision "voluntary" is a corruption of ordinary language. In contrast to truly voluntary decisions, where each person is better off than he was before the prospect of exchange came into view, the robbery victim is simply struggling to cut his losses, for, in any case, he is worse off because of the entry of the robber onto the scene than he was before. Just as the claim that the victim's payment to the thief is "voluntary" is patently sophistical, so it is absurd to claim that the robber is "producing" some service to the victim or anyone else. The fact that the victim paid him revenue proves no demonstrated preference or value; it proves only that the victim prefers the imposition to being shot. The robber may well spin elaborate arguments for his productivity and for his alleged benefit to the victim. He may claim that by extracting money he is providing the victim a defense from other robbers. In attempting to achieve and maintain his monopoly of loot, he may very well act against other robbers trying to muscle in on his territory. But this "service" scarcely demonstrates his productivity to the victims. Only if the victims pay the robber voluntarily can any case be made for a nexus of payment and benefit. Since payments are now coercive instead of voluntary, since the consumer has now become the victim, all arguments offered by the criminal and his apologists about why the victim should have been eager to pay the criminal voluntarily are in vain, for the stark and overriding fact is that these payments are compulsory. The robber takes the funds extracted from the victims and spends them for his own consumption purposes. The total revenue collected by theft we may call tribute; the expenditures of the robbers, apart from the small sums spent on burglars' tools, weapons, planning, and so on, are consumption expenses by the robbers. In this way, just as income and assets are diverted from the productive sector to the robbers, so the robbers are able to use that money (in their purchasing) to extract productive resources from the market. We conclude, then, that the activities of thieves are most emphatically not neutral to the market. In fact, the robbers divert income and resources from the market by the use of coercive violence, and thereby skew and distort production, income, and resources from what they would have been in the absence of coercion. If, on the contrary, we adhere to the view that theft is voluntary and criminals productive, then criminal activities, too, would be neutral to the market, in which case the entire problem of neutrality would disappear by semantic legerdemain, and everything by definition would be neutral to the market because the rubric of the market would encompass all conceivable activities of man. In that case, nothing could be called "intervention" into the market. By labeling aggressive violence as "coercion" and as an interference into the market, we avoid this kind of absurd trap, and we cleave closely to the commonsense view of such concepts as "coercion, " "voluntary, " "market," and "intervention. "

1nc story shell (3/6)

This thief is the state – it’s a system of violence using coercion to gather taxation for the affirmative plan.

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

We are now in a position to analyze government and its relationship to the market. Economists have generally depicted the government as a voluntary social institution providing important services to the public. The modern "public choice" theorists have perhaps gone furthest with this approach. Government is considered akin to a business firm, supplying its services to the consumer-voters, while the voters in turn pay voluntarily for these services. All in all, government is treated by conventional economists as a part of the market, and therefore, as in the case of a business firm or a membership organization, either totally or in part neutral to the market. It is true that if taxation were voluntary and the government akin to a business firm, the government would be neutral to the market. We contend here, however, that the model of government is akin, not to the business firm, but to the criminal organization, and indeed that the State is the organization of robbery systematized and writ large. The State is the only legal institution in society that acquires its revenue by the use of coercion, by using enough violence and threat of violence on its victims to ensure their paying the desired tribute. The State benefits itself at the expense of its robbed victims. The State is, therefore, a centralized, regularized organization of theft. Its payments extracted by coercion are called "taxation" instead of tribute, but their nature is the same.

1nc story shell (4/6)

Taxpayers have a moral right to their income – the state can’t identify social goods that could reimburse income, any social goods identified are delivered inefficiently, taxation destroys social goods anyways, and their evidence is biased towards expanded government.

Kuznicki 9 (Jason, facilitator of multiple Cato Institute international publishing projects, Research Fellow and Managing Editor at *Cato Unbound* [an intellectual think tank publication], prior Production Manager at the Congressional Research Service, Ph.D. in history from Johns Hopkins University, Cato Journal, Book review of *The Libertarian Illusion: Ideology, Public Policy, and the Assault on the Common Good*, Spring/Summer 2009, Volume 29 Issue 2, <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=0de93721-30a4-4513-87f1-57bf16a8aa5e%40sessionmgr13&vid=2&hid=12>, SP)

A taxpayer has a moral claim to all of his honestly acquired income. This claim is stronger than that of any other individual or group. Adding the words "state" or "society" to the claims of others does not change this situation in any relevant sense. This is the heart of libertarian thought on taxation. If lowering taxes changes the state's revenue, a libertarian may find this a fortunate or unfortunate side effect, at his discretion. Hudson, however, disagrees not only with Norquist and Laffer, but also with the libertarian moral claim. He writes. The ability that any of us have to earn income and acquire wealth depends only partly on our own individual efforts. It relies as well on the operation of political, economic, and social institutions that make it possible for any of us to "earn a living." . . . Viewed in this light, those deductions from my paycheck can be seen as reimbursement to society for that portion of my earnings derived from social goods [p. 43]. Although social goods clearly are part of everyone's capacity to earn income, it's a precipitous move to say that the state may therefore tax us. It is by no means clear that the state, among all institutions in society, is best equipped to receive that which we offer in gratitude for social goods. It is doubtful that the state could identify the relevant goods, and that it has supplied, or could supply, any but a few of them effectively. It's even doubtful whether the state could know when taxation itself has become destructive of social goods. Indeed, the state's own incentives run toward overassessing its importance, delivering social "goods" that no one wants, and supplying them in comically inefficient ways. Communitarianism appears unfazed by these concerns, and it proposes adding many new government programs that seem equally likely to fall into these same old traps. It seems that our debt to society is never fully paid, but that society, in the form of the state, is always eager to supply us with more. At what point, if any, is my debt to society—or my debt to a certain very earnest intellectual of highminded ideals—repaid? And why do I find myself having to describe productive work in terms that verge on those of criminal justice?

1nc story shell (5/6)

Infringements on liberty must be rejected at all costs or we forfeit to totalitarianism.

Petro, Toledo Law Review, 1974 (Sylvester, Spring, page 480)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway - "I believe in only one thing: liberty." And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume's observation: "It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once." Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Dijas. In sum, if one believed in freedom as a supreme value and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

1nc story shell (6/6)

We must take every chance to battle for libertarian freedom.

Bicksler 9 (James L., Professor in Finance and Economic at Rutgers University at the Rutgers Business School, International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, *Classical libertarianism: The economic perspectives of Milton Friedman including his likely views on the ‘proper’ role of government in the subprime mortgage debacle*, 2009, Volume 6 Issue 1 - <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5252cd7e-08a6-444c-a768-64b61efc7de3%40sessionmgr15&vid=4&hid=18>, SP)

The quest and battle for economic, political and civic freedoms is never won in a finality sense. It is a day-to-day, meaning an ongoing battle, where new challenges and variations of old arguments and fallacies for collectivism and its policies arise. The particular issue on the battleground for freedom and its implications for freedom changes over time.

1nc – link - “voluntary” payment = coercion

There’s no difference between “voluntary” contribution and coercion

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

Having dealt with this idyll of harmonious and mutually beneficial exchanges, let us now introduce a discordant note. A thief now appears, making his living by robbing and coercively preying on others: The robber obtains his income by presenting the victim with a choice: your money or your life (or, at least, your health)—and the victim then yields his assets. Or, to be more precise, the robber presents the victim with a choice between paying immediately or waiting until the robber injures him.12 In this situation both parties do not benefit; instead, the robber benefits precisely at the expense of the victim. Instead of the consumer's paying, guiding, and being benefited by the producer's activity, the robber is benefiting from the victim's payment. The robber benefits to the extent that the victim pays and loses. Instead of helping expand the amount and degree of production in society, the robber is parasitically draining off that production. Whereas an expanded market encourages increases in production and supply, theft discourages production and contracts the market. It should be clear that the robber is not producing any goods and services at all. In contrast to consumers who purchase goods and services, or who contribute voluntarily to a nonprofit organization, no one is voluntarily purchasing from or contributing to our criminals at all. If they were, the criminals would not be criminal. In fact, what distinguishes a criminal group is that its income, in contrast to that of all other organizations, is extracted by the use of violence, against the wishes or consent of the victims. The criminals, then, are "producing" nothing, except their own income at the expense of others. It has been maintained that the payments by the victims are "really" voluntary because the victim decides to transfer his funds under penalty of violence by the robber. This kind of sophistry, however, destroys the original, as well as the common-sense, meaning of the term "coercion" and renders all actions whatever "voluntary. " But if there is no such thing as coercion and all conceivable actions are voluntary, then the distinctive meaning of both terms is destroyed. In this paper, we are defining "voluntary" and "coercion" in a common-sense way: that is, "voluntary" are all actions not taken under the threat of coercion; and "coercion" is the use of violence or threat of violence to compel actions of others. Robbery at gunpoint, then, is "coercion"; the universal need to work and produce is not.

1nc – link - coercion disrupts the market

Don’t let the aff justify taxation with their advantages: at the end of the day, it’s still coercion that disrupts the free market

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

In a trivial sense, the victim agrees to be victimized rather than lose his life; but surely, to call such a choice or decision "voluntary" is a corruption of ordinary language. In contrast to truly voluntary decisions, where each person is better off than he was before the prospect of exchange came into view, the robbery victim is simply struggling to cut his losses, for, in any case, he is worse off because of the entry of the robber onto the scene than he was before. Just as the claim that the victim's payment to the thief is "voluntary" is patently sophistical, so it is absurd to claim that the robber is "producing" some service to the victim or anyone else. The fact that the victim paid him revenue proves no demonstrated preference or value; it proves only that the victim prefers the imposition to being shot. The robber may well spin elaborate arguments for his productivity and for his alleged benefit to the victim. He may claim that by extracting money he is providing the victim a defense from other robbers. In attempting to achieve and maintain his monopoly of loot, he may very well act against other robbers trying to muscle in on his territory. But this "service" scarcely demonstrates his productivity to the victims. Only if the victims pay the robber voluntarily can any case be made for a nexus of payment and benefit. Since payments are now coercive instead of voluntary, since the consumer has now become the victim, all arguments offered by the criminal and his apologists about why the victim should have been eager to pay the criminal voluntarily are in vain, for the stark and overriding fact is that these payments are compulsory. The robber takes the funds extracted from the victims and spends them for his own consumption purposes. The total revenue collected by theft we may call tribute; the expenditures of the robbers, apart from the small sums spent on burglars' tools, weapons, planning, and so on, are consumption expenses by the robbers. In this way, just as income and assets are diverted from the productive sector to the robbers, so the robbers are able to use that money (in their purchasing) to extract productive resources from the market. We conclude, then, that the activities of thieves are most emphatically not neutral to the market. In fact, the robbers divert income and resources from the market by the use of coercive violence, and thereby skew and distort production, income, and resources from what they would have been in the absence of coercion. If, on the contrary, we adhere to the view that theft is voluntary and criminals productive, then criminal activities, too, would be neutral to the market, in which case the entire problem of neutrality would disappear by semantic legerdemain, and everything by definition would be neutral to the market because the rubric of the market would encompass all conceivable activities of man. In that case, nothing could be called "intervention" into the market. By labeling aggressive violence as "coercion" and as an interference into the market, we avoid this kind of absurd trap, and we cleave closely to the commonsense view of such concepts as "coercion, " "voluntary, " "market," and "intervention. "

1nc – internal link - state = coercive

The state is a coercive criminal organization.

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

We are now in a position to analyze government and its relationship to the market. Economists have generally depicted the government as a voluntary social institution providing important services to the public. The modern "public choice" theorists have perhaps gone furthest with this approach. Government is considered akin to a business firm, supplying its services to the consumer-voters, while the voters in turn pay voluntarily for these services. All in all, government is treated by conventional economists as a part of the market, and therefore, as in the case of a business firm or a membership organization, either totally or in part neutral to the market. It is true that if taxation were voluntary and the government akin to a business firm, the government would be neutral to the market. We contend here, however, that the model of government is akin, not to the business firm, but to the criminal organization, and indeed that the State is the organization of robbery systematized and writ large. The State is the only legal institution in society that acquires its revenue by the use of coercion, by using enough violence and threat of violence on its victims to ensure their paying the desired tribute. The State benefits itself at the expense of its robbed victims. The State is, therefore, a centralized, regularized organization of theft. Its payments extracted by coercion are called "taxation" instead of tribute, but their nature is the same.

1nc – link/impact - taxation = immoral and fails

Taxpayers have a moral right to their income – the state can’t identify social goods that could reimburse income, any social goods identified are delivered inefficiently, taxation destroys social goods anyways, and their evidence is biased towards expanded government.

Kuznicki 9 (Jason, facilitator of multiple Cato Institute international publishing projects, Research Fellow and Managing Editor at *Cato Unbound* [an intellectual think tank publication], prior Production Manager at the Congressional Research Service, Ph.D. in history from Johns Hopkins University, Cato Journal, Book review of *The Libertarian Illusion: Ideology, Public Policy, and the Assault on the Common Good*, Spring/Summer 2009, Volume 29 Issue 2, <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=0de93721-30a4-4513-87f1-57bf16a8aa5e%40sessionmgr13&vid=2&hid=12>, SP)

A taxpayer has a moral claim to all of his honestly acquired income. This claim is stronger than that of any other individual or group. Adding the words "state" or "society" to the claims of others does not change this situation in any relevant sense. This is the heart of libertarian thought on taxation. If lowering taxes changes the state's revenue, a libertarian may find this a fortunate or unfortunate side effect, at his discretion. Hudson, however, disagrees not only with Norquist and Laffer, but also with the libertarian moral claim. He writes. The ability that any of us have to earn income and acquire wealth depends only partly on our own individual efforts. It relies as well on the operation of political, economic, and social institutions that make it possible for any of us to "earn a living." . . . Viewed in this light, those deductions from my paycheck can be seen as reimbursement to society for that portion of my earnings derived from social goods [p. 43]. Although social goods clearly are part of everyone's capacity to earn income, it's a precipitous move to say that the state may therefore tax us. It is by no means clear that the state, among all institutions in society, is best equipped to receive that which we offer in gratitude for social goods. It is doubtful that the state could identify the relevant goods, and that it has supplied, or could supply, any but a few of them effectively. It's even doubtful whether the state could know when taxation itself has become destructive of social goods. Indeed, the state's own incentives run toward overassessing its importance, delivering social "goods" that no one wants, and supplying them in comically inefficient ways. Communitarianism appears unfazed by these concerns, and it proposes adding many new government programs that seem equally likely to fall into these same old traps. It seems that our debt to society is never fully paid, but that society, in the form of the state, is always eager to supply us with more. At what point, if any, is my debt to society—or my debt to a certain very earnest intellectual of highminded ideals—repaid? And why do I find myself having to describe productive work in terms that verge on those of criminal justice?

1nc – impact – coercion causes violence/libertarian peace theory

Coercive societies cause violence – they polarize social forces, reduce multi-dimensional fields, de-emphasize peaceful exchange, and make citizens pay in blood and taxes.

Rummel 85 (R. J., Professor Emeritus in the Political Science Department at the University of Hawaii, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Libertarian Propositions on Violence within and between Nations: A Test against Published Research Results, September 1985, Volume 29 Number 3 - <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/173944.pdf>, SP)

The basic principle is that socioeconomic and political freedom, the hallmark of a libertarian society, minimizes violence. As the theoretical understanding of this has been developed elsewhere (Rummel, 1975- 1981, 1983a, 1984),' I need only point out that such a society is a multi- dimensional field of diverse social forces-some intersecting, some opposing, some overlapping. The net effect is to cross-pressure interests, to cross-cut status and classes, and thus inhibit the growth of societywide violence. As a society becomes more authoritarian or coercive, however, the spontaneity of a social field declines, social forces become polarized, the multidimensionality of interests is reduced. Interests and issues begin to revolve around a single dimension: one's political power. The dividing line between the "ins" and "outs" becomes a conflict front across society along which extreme violence can occur. At this theoretical level, then, the key ideas are that of a social field, cross-pressures, and polarization. At a less abstract level, there are the explanations common to liberal scholars: the aggregating and compromising, and therefore conflict- reducing, effects of competitive party systems; the institutionalization of societywide conflict resolution through competitive politics and the ballot ("the ballot replaces the bullet"); the formalization and regulation of conflict and violence (e.g., labor-management collective bargaining laws); the democratic emphasis on exchange instead of authority and coercion; the unwillingness of democratic majorities to pay in blood and taxes for the foreign adventures of a political elite.

1nc – impact – freedom decision rule

Infringements on liberty must be rejected at all costs or we forfeit to totalitarianism.

Petro, Toledo Law Review, 1974 (Sylvester, Spring, page 480)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway - "I believe in only one thing: liberty." And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume's observation: "It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once." Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Dijas. In sum, if one believed in freedom as a supreme value and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

1nc – alternative - day-to-day resistance

We must take every chance to battle for libertarian freedom.

Bicksler 9 (James L., Professor in Finance and Economic at Rutgers University at the Rutgers Business School, International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, *Classical libertarianism: The economic perspectives of Milton Friedman including his likely views on the ‘proper’ role of government in the subprime mortgage debacle*, 2009, Volume 6 Issue 1 - <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5252cd7e-08a6-444c-a768-64b61efc7de3%40sessionmgr15&vid=4&hid=18>, SP)

The quest and battle for economic, political and civic freedoms is never won in a finality sense. It is a day-to-day, meaning an ongoing battle, where new challenges and variations of old arguments and fallacies for collectivism and its policies arise. The particular issue on the battleground for freedom and its implications for freedom changes over time.

2nc – link - state = coercive

Government programs depends on a coercion-based taxation system which simulates a criminal organization

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

But if taxation is coercive and a system of organized theft, then any "services" that the government may supply to its subjects are beside the point, for they do not establish the government as voluntary or as part of the market any more than a criminal band's providing the "service" of defending its victims from competing bands establishes that its services are voluntarily paid for. These services are not voluntarily paid for by the taxpayers, and we therefore cannot say that the taxes measure or reflect any sort of benefit. In the case of voluntary purchase on the market, as we have seen, the consumer demonstrates by his purchase that he values the good or service he buys more than the price he pays; but in paying taxes he demonstrates no such thing—only the desire not to be the recipient of further violence by the State. We have no idea how much the taxpayers would value these services, if indeed they valued them at all. For example, suppose that the government levies a tax of X dollars on A, B, C, and so on, for police protection—for protection, that is, against irregular, competing looters and not against itself. The fact that A is forced to pay $1,000 is no indication that $1,000 in any sense gauges the value to A of police protection. It is possible that he values it very little, and would value it less if he could turn to competing defense agencies. Moreover, A may be a pacifist; so he may consider the State's police protection a net harm rather than a benefit. But one thing we do know: If these payments to government were voluntary, we can be sure that they would be substantially less than present total tax revenue. Why? Because if people were willing to pay voluntarily, then there would be no need for the apparatus of coercion so intimately wrapped up in taxation.

2nc – link - ALL taxation = coercive

All taxation is coercion. The State, like the robber, attempts to trick taxpayers into paying for the government.

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

A second important point is that, in contrast to the market, where consumers pay for received benefits (or, in nonprofit organizations, where members pay for psychic benefits), the State, like the robber, creates a total disjunction between benefit and payment. The taxpayer pays; the benefits are received, first and foremost, by the government itself, and secondarily, by those who receive the largess of government expenditures. But if, under coercive taxation, tax payments far exceed benefits to the victim, and if benefits accrue to the government itself and to the recipients of its expenditures at the expense of taxpayers, then it should be quite clear that it is impossible for taxes ever to be neutral to the market. Taxation, whatever its size or incidence, must distort market processes, must alter the allocation and distribution of assets, incomes, and resources.

2nc – link – taxation = ownership

Succumbing into taxation is the equivalent of government ownership

Nozick 77 (Robert Professor of Philosophy @ Harvard University Anarchy, State, and Utopia Basic Books November 11, 1977)

Whether it is done through taxation on wages or on wages over a certain amount, or through seizure of profits, or through there being a big racial pot so that it's not clear what's coming from where and what's going where, patterned principles of distributive justice involve appropriating the actions of other persons. Seizing the results of someone's labor is equivalent to seizing hours from him and directing him to carry on various activities. If people force you to do certain work, or unrewarded work, for a certain period of time, they decide what you are to do and what purposes your work is to serve apart from your decisions. This process whereby they take this decision from you makes them a part-owner of you; it gives them a property right in you. just as having such partial control and power of decision, by right, over an animal or inanimate object would be to have a property right in it. End-state and most patterned principles to distributive justice institute (partial) ownership by others of people and their actions and labor. These principles involve a shift from the classical liberals notion of self-ownership to a notion of (partial) property rights in other people. Considerations such as these confront end-state and other patterned conceptions of justice with the question of whether the actions necessary to achieve the selected pattern don't themselves violate moral side constraints. Any view holding that there are moral side constraints on actions, that not all moral considerations can be built into end states that are to be achieved (see Chapter 3, pp. 28-30), must face the possibility that some of its goals are not achievable by any morally permissible available means. An entitlement theorist will face such conflicts in a society that deviates from the principles of justice for the generation of holdings.

2nc – link – linear coercion

Government funding relies on coercive taxation

Bovard 11 (James, author and policy advisor to The Future of Freedom Foundation, “Defining Coercion Down” 3/18/2011 <http://www.fff.org/freedom/fd1012c.asp>)

Coercion is the essence of government in the same way that profit is the essence of private businesses. The state can impose new prohibitions and restrictions, create new penalties, or impose taxes in order to finance benefits. It is misleading to conceive of politicians as offering both carrots and sticks: Government must first use a stick to commandeer the money to pay for the carrot. Every increase in the size of government means an increase in coercion — either an increase in the amount of a person’s paycheck that government seizes or an increase in the number of types of behavior for which a government can jail, imprison, or fine a citizen. Every increase in government spending means an increase in political power — and a new pretext to seize private paychecks.In order to understand the contemporary concept of the state, it is important to recognize the radical changes in the concept of coercion that have occurred over the past century in federal courts. The common use of the word “slavery” in the disputes of the Revolutionary period captured colonists’ hatred of the arbitrary coercive power vested in British government officials and Parliament members. Even if that power was not used by every British colonial official on a daily basis, the mere fact that power existed in the statute books fatally compromised the colonists’ freedom. In the mid 1800s, Southerners’ habit of referring to slavery as “the peculiar institution” indicated their squeamishness about admitting the degree of coercive power that that institution required. In modern times, we have a new “peculiar institution”: government coercion. Many political thinkers’ fixation on government benevolence obscures the reality of the growing subjugation of American citizens to government employees. Federal agencies have been able to seize far more power over citizens in part because judges and others have redefined many forms of government coercion out of existence.

2nc – link – aff doesn’t use competition

The government only exists to protect from foreign invasion, establish laws, and implement functions that individuals can’t justify economically through a lens of market competition – the aff plan is a clear-cut link and collectivist ideologies fail.

Bicksler 9 (James L., Professor in Finance and Economic at Rutgers University at the Rutgers Business School, International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, *Classical libertarianism: The economic perspectives of Milton Friedman including his likely views on the ‘proper’ role of government in the subprime mortgage debacle*, 2009, Volume 6 Issue 1 - <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5252cd7e-08a6-444c-a768-64b61efc7de3%40sessionmgr15&vid=4&hid=18>, SP)

Collectivist advocates (that is, communists and socialists) have foundations that are inherently inconsistent and contradictory with their own recommended economic allocation mechanism. Specifically, their advocated ideas of freedom and organisational market structure and which translate into (1) freedom of individual economic choice and (2) central planning of resource allocation are inherently inconsistent and contradictory. This is because economic freedom requires competitive markets and property rights whereas central planning is premised on the absence of both competitive markets and individual property rights. More specifically, socialism promised a new economic order, which, in essence, was an economic utopia wherein people lived without want. Given socialism’s fundamental flaws and limitations in achieving firm economic resource efficiency, it is not surprising that in due course, there was the demise of socialism. Similarly, the demise of communism was also due to its resource allocation failure and negative impact on both the income of the citizenry and the Gross Domestic Product (that is, the value of all the goods and services produced by the economy). Adam Smith felt that there was a definite but limited role for government. Indeed, Smith felt that there were only three appropriate / legitimate functions of government. They were (1) having a military to protect the country against foreign invasion, (2) the establishment of institutions of law and justice and (3) the implementation and establishment of selected public service functions that individuals cannot justify on an economic basis. However, it is important to note that the government functions (2) and (3) of Adam Smith should be implemented with a focus on individual self-interest and in an environment of market competition. 32 – 34

2nc – AT: permutation

Perm fails. Using the state destroys the consistency which is key to begin solvency.

Konkin in 80. (prominent libertarian activist, Koman Publishing, The new Libertarian Manifesto, October -1980, http://agorism.info/NewLibertarianManifesto.pdf, DT)

The basic principle which leads a libertarian from statism to his free society is the same which the founders of libertarianism used to discover the theory itself. That principle is consistency. Thus, the consistent application of the theory of libertarianism to every action the individual libertarian takes creates the libertarian society. Many thinkers have expressed the need for consistency between means and ends and not all were libertarians. Ironically, many statists have claimed inconsistency between laudable ends and contemptible means; yet when their true ends of greater power and oppression were understood, their means are found to be quite consistent. It is part of the statist mystique to confuse the necessity of ends-means consistency; it is thus the most crucial activity of the libertarian theorist to expose inconsistencies. Many theorists have done to admirably; but we have attempted and most failed to describe the consistent means and ends combination of libertarianism

2nc – AT: permutation

Using the state causes vulnerability to counter attacks that cause failure of the movement. Only the Alt alone can solve.

Konkin in 80. (prominent libertarian activist, Koman Publishing, The new Libertarian Manifesto, October -1980, http://agorism.info/NewLibertarianManifesto.pdf, DT)

 The State's Higher Circles were not about to yield their plunder and restore property to their victims at the first sign of opposition. The first counter- attack came from anti-principles already planted by the corrupt Intellectual Caste: Defeatism, Retreatism, Minarchy, Collaborationism, Gradualism, Monocentris and Reformism including accepting State office to "improve" Statism! All of these anti-principles (deviations, heresies, self-destructive contradictory tenets, etc.) will be dealt with later. Worst of all is Partyarchy, the anti-concept of pursuing libertarian ends through statist means, especially political parties. A "Libertarian" Party was the second counter-attack of the State unleased on the fledgling Libertarians, first as a ludicrous oxymoron [10], then as an invading army. [11] The third counter-attack was an attempt by one of the ten richest capitalists in the United States to buy the major Libertarian institutions - not just the Party - and run the movement as other plutocrats run all the other political parties in capitalist states. [12] The degree of success those statist counter-attacks had in corrupting libertarianism led to a splintering of the Movement's "Left" and the despairing paralyzation of others. As disillusionment grew with "Libertarianism," the disillusioned sought answers to this new problem: the State within as well as the State without. How do we avoid being used by the State and its power elite? That is, they asked, how can we avoid deviations from the path of liberty when we know there are more than one? The market has many paths to production and consumption of a product, and none are perfectly predictable. So even if one tells us how to get from here (statism) to there (liberty), how do we know that's the best way?Already some are dredging up the old strategies of movements long dead with other goals. New paths are indeed being offered - back to the State. [13] Betrayal, inadvertent or planned, continues. It need not

2nc – impact - libertarianism causes peace

Libertarian societies are less likely to engage in violence – unwilling taxation, strong property expectations, dislike of foreign adventurism, true freedom of individuals, and the tendency to self-regulate conflicts.

Rummel 83 (R. J., Professor Emeritus in the Political Science Department at the University of Hawaii, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, *Libertarianism and International Violence*, March 1983, Volume 27 Number 1 - <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/173842.pdf?acceptTC=true>, SP)

Put simply, the theory is that in libertarian states (those emphasizing individual freedom and civil liberties and the rights associated with a competitive and open election of leaders) exist multiple, often conflicting, elites, whose interests are divergent and segmented, checked and balanced. Although perhaps formally centralized, as in Great Britain and France, in practice political power is relatively decentralized and diffuse. Moreover, political elites are dependent on the support of a public unwilling to bear the cost in taxes, property, and blood of foreign adventures and intervention unless they are aroused by an emotionally unifying issue. Even then the public cannot be trusted to pay the price of foreign violence for long and may turn on those responsible even in the midst of war. Of course, an emotional and patriotically aroused people can itself be a force for war. But this is to underline that the essential diversity of interests and values of free people must be overcome, a sufficiently unifying national stake or value must be at issue, before elites can risk foreign violence. This is not true for states whose political elites are unrestrained by a free press and contending centers of power and which are unaccountable through free elections. For these reasons, the freer the people of a state, the more nonviolent its elite's expectations and perceptions, and the less likely they are to commit official violence against other states. This is not to deny such violence does occur (witness the Vietnam War and the Falkland Islands conflict, among others), but only that free states are least prone to international violence and war. At a more basic theoretical level, libertarian states comprise social fields in which the actions of groups and individuals respond to many divergent and opposing social and psychological forces. These forces spontaneously resolve into interlocking and nested balances of powers and associated structures of expectations. These define the social order. Such systems (like the free market) tend to be self-regulating and to isolate and inhibit conflicts and violence when they occur. They tend to encourage exchange, rather than coercive and violent solutions, in conflict between groups and individuals. Libertarian states are by theory not only less violence prone, but when foreign relations includes the perception of other libertarian states, this inhibition becomes a mutual barrier to violence. Their mutual domestic diversity and pluralism, their free and competitive press, their people-to-people and elite-to-elite bonds and relationships, and their mutual identification and sympathy will foreclose on any expectation or occurrence of war between them; violence may occur only in the most extraordinary and unusual circumstances.

2nc - AT: libertarian peace theory flawed – [data]

Data support the theoretical warrants behind the libertarian peace theory and contiguous borders don’t affect it.

Rummel 83 (R. J., Professor Emeritus in the Political Science Department at the University of Hawaii, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, *Libertarianism and International Violence,* March 1983, Volume 27 Number 1 - <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/173842.pdf?acceptTC=true>, SP)

The direct and indirect tests given here provide strong, positive support for the three hypotheses and thereby for the Joint Freedom and Freedom Propositions, and thus reinforce the conclusion of my Understanding Conflict and War. A necessary condition of violence between two states is that at least one of them be partially or completely nonlibertarian. Or, to turn this around, violence does not occur between libertarian states. Moreover, whether states are considered individually or dyadically, the less free -libertarian- a state, the more violence it engages in. Contiguity is not an intervening variable: Contiguous or not, libertarian states do not exert violence on each other; and whether having common borders or not, the less freedom in states, the more violence between them. Whether libertarian is defined by political freedom or freedom, the data are highly supportive of the propositions. However, while economic freedom does not significantly detract from the Joint Freedom Proposition, it is clearly important for the Freedom one. To add economic freedom to civil liberties and political rights is to reduce significantly the level of violence for a state overall, or between particular states. For the Freedom Proposition, the libertarian's (or classical liberal's) faith in the peaceful effects of economic freedom appears, according to these data, well justified.

2nc – impact – value to life

Only an autonomous life free from coercion is worth living.

Moraro 8 (Piero, Master’s Degree from the London School of Economics in Philosophy and Public Policy, and a BA from the University of Bologna, Italy. “Autonomy and Autonomy-based Duties: an argument for disobedience?”)

Raz identifies three ‘conditions of autonomy’ that must be fulfilled for the agent to be able to lead an autonomous life: (a) appropriate mental abilities, (b) adequate range of options, and (c) independence. By (a) Raz means that the autonomous agent must be in possession of a minimum of rationality, i.e. the mental faculties to set one’s own goals, the ability to comprehend the means required to realize them, etc. More interesting in (Raz’s account is b): the idea that ‘autonomy’ requires the availability of an adequate range of options to choose from. In order to understand this point, we should have a glimpse at Raz’s notion of well-being: a person’s well-being depends on her being the maker or the author of her own life, and on the availability to her of a multiplicity of valuable options There is a direct connection, therefore, between having a valuable life and being autonomous. A life in which an agent is not in the condition to choose would be much less valuable than one in which s/he is. To be autonomous a person must not only be given a choice, but s/he must be given an adequate range of choices. Someone whose decisions are extracted from him/her through coercion is not acting autonomously: equally, someone who is paralysed and cannot take advantage of the options available to him/her lacks autonomy. If the autonomous life is about choosing, then, guaranteeing someone’s autonomy entails providing the individual with an adequate range of options from which to choose. By ‘adequate’ Raz emphasizes not the ‘number’, but rather the ‘variety’: “[a] choice between hundreds of identical and identically situated houses is no choice, compared with a choice between a town flat and a suburban house”. Furthermore, ‘variety’ in the strict sense is not enough either: choosing between a variety of morally repugnant actions does not qualify as ‘autonomous choice’. If I am faced with a choice between applying for a PhD at the university, or killing someone, then I am not autonomously choosing what to do: for Raz, the choice between good and evil is no choice at all.

2nc – impact - war

A philosophy of individual rights prevents war.

Rand 66 (Ayn, author and lecturer on Objectivist philosophy, Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal p. 38, 42)

Laissez-faire capitalism is the only social system based on the recognition of individual rights and, therefore, the only system that bans force from social relationships. By the nature of its basic principles and interests, it is the only system fundamentally opposed to war. Men who are free to produce, have no incentive to loot; they have nothing to gain from war and a great deal to lose. Ideologically, the principle of individual rights does not permit a man to seek his own livelihood at the point of a gun, inside or outside his country. Economically, wars cost money; in a free economy, where wealth is privately owned, the costs of war come out of the income of private citizens—there is no overblown public treasury to hide that fact—and a citizen cannot hope to recoup his own financial losses (such as taxes or business dislocations or property destruction) by winning the war. Thus his own economic interests are on the side of peace. If men want to oppose war, it is statism that they must oppose. So long as they hold the tribal notion that the individual is sacrificial fodder for the collective, that some men have the right to rule others by force, and that some (any) alleged “good” can justify it—there can be no peace within a nation and no peace among nations.

2nc – impact – value to life/decision rule

Coercion kills value to life – we must leave the moral relations between people undisturbed.

Machan, Professor of philosophy, Auburn University, 95 <Tibor, PRIVATE RIGHTS AND PUBLIC ILLUSIONS, p. 68-9>

All governmental action that does not serve to repel or retaliate against coercion is antithetical to any respect for human dignity. While it is true that some people should give to others to assist them in reaching their goals, forcing individuals to do so plainly robs them of their dignity. There is nothing morally worthwhile in forced giving. Generally, for a society to respect human dignity, the special moral relations between people should be left undisturbed. Government should confine itself to making sure that this voluntarism is not abridged, no matter how tempting it might be to use its coercive powers to attain some worthy goal.

2nc –impact – decision rule

Taxation is always bad – we must abandon it.

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

Much the same thing has happened to the noble concept of neutral taxation. The idea that taxation, and therefore government's fiscal operation, should be neutral to the market—should not disturb the operations of the market nor divert it from its free course—is a noble but impossible one. As we have seen here, taxation can never be neutral to the market, and the impossibility of this dream is rooted in the very nature of taxation and government. Neutral taxation is merely a chimera. It is perhaps because of this impossibility that this concept, in the hands of the modern public-choice theorists and others, has so quickly become yet another device for ratifying the status quo of State power. We are forced, then, to the realization of crucial points from which free-market economists seem to have been fleeing as from the very plague. That neutral taxation is an oxymoron; that the free market and taxation are inherently incompatible; and therefore either the goal of neutrality must be forsaken, or else we must abandon the institution of taxation itself.

2nc – impact – moral obligation (1/2)

A market free from government intervention is morally superior because it is based in individual choice rather than coercion.

Williams 95 (Walter, Prof of Economics @ George Mason U, “The Argument For Free Markets: Morality VS. Efficiency” Cato Journal, Vol. 15, Nos. 2-3)

Freedom's first principle is: Each person owns himself. The transition from socialism to capitalism and the preservation of capitalism require what philosopher David Kelley calls the entrepreneurial outlook on life, which he describes, in part, as "a sense of self-ownership, a conviction that one's life is one's own, not something for which one must answer to some higher power'' (Kelley 1994: 4). Once we accept self-ownership as a first principle, we readily discover what constitutes just and unjust conduct. Unjust conduct is simply any conduct that violates an individual's property rights in himself when he himself has not infringed upon the property rights of others. Therefore, acts like murder, rape, and theft, whether done privately or collectively, are unjust because they violate private property. There is broad consensus that government-sponsored murder and rape are unjust; however, not as much consensus is reached regarding theft. Theft being defined as forcibly taking the rightful property of one person for the benefit of another. For individual freedom to be viable, it must be a part of the shared values of a society, and there must be an institutional framework to preserve it against encroachments by majoritarian or government will. Constitutions and laws alone cannot guarantee the survival of personal freedom as is apparent where Western-style constitutions and laws have been exported to countries not having a tradition of individual freedom. U.S. articulation of the right to individual autonomy is enunciated in our Declaration of Independence: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That statement, which played such an important role in the rebellion against England and in the establishment of the U.S. Constitution, was the outgrowth of libertarian ideas of such thinkers as John Locke, Montesquieu, and Sir William Blackstone.

[Williams 95 continued on next page]

2nc – impact – moral obligation (2/2)

[Williams 95 continued]

Even in societies with a tradition of freedom, such as the United States, the values supporting that freedom have suffered erosion and have proven an insufficient safeguard against encroachment by the state. As is so often the case, political liberty (democracy) has been used to redistribute income and wealth. The redistributive state, in turn, has had a stifling effect on economic liberty and has reduced individual freedom. All too often defenders of free-market capitalism base their defense on the demonstration that capitalism is more efficient in terms of resource allocation and, hence, leads to a larger bundle of goods than socialism and other forms of statism. However, as Milton Friedman frequently points out, economic efficiency and greater wealth should be promoted as simply a side-benefit of free markets. The intellectual defense of free-market capitalism should focus on its moral superiority. In other words, even if free enterprise were not more efficient than other forms of human organization, it is morally superior because it is rooted in voluntary relationships rather than force and coercion, and it respects the sanctity of the individual. The struggle to extend and preserve free markets must have as its primary focus the moral argument. State interventionists stand naked before well-thought-out moral arguments for private ownership of property, voluntary exchange, and the parity of markets. People readily understand moral arguments on a private basis--for example, one person does not have the right to use force against another to serve his own purposes. However, people often see government redistribution as an acceptable use of force. In a democratic welfare state that coercion is given an aura of legitimacy. The challenge is to convince people that a majority vote does not establish morality and that free markets are morally superior to other forms of human organization.

2nc – no aff impact - taxation/the state fails

The State is never productive with taxes: don’t trust their traditional economics authors

Rothbard 81 (Murray N. Dean of the Austrian School of economics. The Cato Journal *The Myth of Neutral Taxation* Fall, 1981, pp. 519-564) TS

Despite the fact that government and taxation are patently coercive, economists have devoted considerable energy, in numerous ways, to maintaining the contrary. If government and taxation were truly voluntary, then taxation would be akin to a market payment, and government could be deemed a part of, and therefore neutral to, the market. By lumping government along with private expenditures as a gauge of the output of the economy, the conventional national income statisticians are implicitly assuming that government is neutral to the market because government provides those "services" that "society" desires it to supply. Government "output " is equated to the salaries paid to the bureaucracy. By employing the seemingly precise method of segregating some government expenses as mere "transfer payments"—the taxing of Peter to pay Paul—rather than productive purchases of goods and services, the national income statisticians are in reality making an unsupportable ideological judgment. For in what sense does the hiring of bureaucrats, or the purchasing of paper clips, add to the production of the economy and therefore become somehow voluntary, while transfer payments are frankly taxing one group to subsidize another? As we shall see further below, all taxation necessarily involves taking from one group to subsidize another; therefore all government expenditures, taken together, constitute one giant transfer payment.

2nc – impact - turns the case (1/2)

Libertarianism is the only way to solve the plan – efficiency and effectiveness due to enhanced caution, more innovative activity through competition, and better allocation of resources due to deregulation.

Bicksler 9 (James L., Professor in Finance and Economic at Rutgers University at the Rutgers Business School, International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, *Classical libertarianism: The economic perspectives of Milton Friedman including his likely views on the ‘proper’ role of government in the subprime mortgage debacle*, 2009, Volume 6 Issue 1 - <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5252cd7e-08a6-444c-a768-64b61efc7de3%40sessionmgr15&vid=4&hid=18>, SP)

Friedman describes the essence of libertarianism as ‘ free private property capitalism ’ . With regard to private property, Friedrich A. Hayek is of the opinion that ‘ private property ’ is the most important guarantee of freedom. Further, Milton Friedman has stated, ‘ you can ’ t have a free society without private property ’ . Translated, Friedman ’ s libertarian framework is that economic and political freedoms are best and, perhaps, can only be achieved via institutions and markets that maximise the welfare of each individual party to the transaction, as judged by each individual party to the transaction and the transaction taking place in competitive markets where there is individual ownership of property rights. Note that much of the rationale for emphasising individual decision making in a private property economy is captured in Milton Friedman ’ s view that ‘ Nobody spends somebody else ’ s resources as carefully as he uses his own. So if you want efficiency and effectiveness, if you want knowledge to be properly utilised, you have to do it through the means of private property ’ . This means, as Friedman states, that ‘ the organization of the bulk of economic activity through private enterprise operating in a free market promotes economic welfare and political freedom ’ . The primary end results of competitive markets dominated by self-interested individuals are enhanced efficient resource allocation at the level of both the firm and the household, and the enhancement of the real growth of the economy. 16,17 This reasoning goes back to Adam Smith ’ s seminal Wealth of Nations (1776), where Smith argued that the invisible hand of self-interested individuals promoted what was best for society. 18,19 Specifically, Adam Smith stated that ‘ he intends only his own gain, and he is in this as in many other cases led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was not part of his intention ’ .

[Bicksler 9 continued on next page]

2nc – impact – turns the case (1/2)

[Bicksler 9 continued]

That is, ‘ It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest ’ . Alternatively stated, the essence of all of Milton Friedman ’ s public policy prescriptions was the demonstration via arguments of price theory that if there is an efficient allocation of resources at the firm level, it results in lower market clearing prices in competitive markets and these gains accrue to the benefit of individuals. Further, competitive markets encourage entrepreneurial and innovative activity which results in an expanded opportunity set of choices for consumers which again is a gain for society. This means that, in general, private markets are to be preferred to governmental regulated markets because they have superiority in allocating scarce resources. Certainly, private markets, if they are competitive markets, are to be preferred, without exception, to governmental regulated markets because they have superiority in allocating scarce resources. 22 – 26 Adam Smith ’ s viewpoint of self-interested individuals operating in competitive markets, leading to enhanced resources allocation and societal economic gains differs markedly from the then prevailing mercantilistic structure of the economy. 27 In mercantilism, there is a government / monarchy that focuses on a nation ’ s economic goals, particularly on export-balance of payment goals, and where there is zero focus and emphasis on enhancing opportunities for individuals and on individual self-interest.

2nc – alternative – agorism (1/2)

Agorism solves. Once a movement towards algorism is complete, people see the benefits of freedom. Even if there are a few remaining Statists, they will be mainly overrun by the agorists.

Konkin in 80. (prominent libertarian activist, Koman Publishing, The new Libertarian Manifesto, October -1980, http://agorism.info/NewLibertarianManifesto.pdf, DT)

 With a State tainting every act and befouling our minds with unearned guilt, it becomes extremely important to understand the social consequences of our acts. For example, if we fail to pay at tax and get away with it, who is hurt: us? The State? Innocents? Libertarian analysis shows us that the State is responsible for any damage to innocents it alleges the "selfish tax-evader" has incurred; and the "services" the State "provides" us are illusory. But even so, there must be more than lonely resistance cleverly concealed or "dropping out?" If a political party or revolutionary army is inappropriate and self-defeating for libertarian goals, what collective action works? The answer is agorism. It is possible, practical, and even profitable to entrepreneur large collections of humanity from statist society to the agora. This is, in the deepest sense, true revolutionary activity and will be covered in the next chapter. But to understand this macro answer, we must first outline the micro answer. [1] The function of the pseudo-science of Establishment economics, even more than making predictions (like the Imperial Roman augurers) for the ruling class, is to mystify and confuse the ruled class as to where their wealth is going and how it is taken. An explanation of how people keep their wealth and property from the State is then Counter-Establishment economics, or Counter- Economics [2] for short. The actual practice of human actions that evade, avoid and defy the State is countereconomic activity, but in the same sloppy way "economics" refers to both the science and what it studies, Counter- Economics will undoubtedly be used. Since this writing is Counter-Economic theory itself, what will be referred to as Counter-Economics is the practice. Mapping and describing all or even a significantly useful part of Counter- Economics will require at least a full volume itself. [3] Just enough will be sketched here to provide understanding for the rest of the manifesto. Going from an agorist society to a statist one should be uphill work, equivalent to a path of high negative entropy in physics. After all, once one is living in and understanding a well-run free society, why would one wish to return to systematic coercion, plunder, and anxiety? Spreading ignorance and irrationality among the knowledgeable and rational is difficult; mystifying that which is already clearly understood is nearly impossible. The agorist society should be fairly stable relative to decadence, though highly open to improvement. Let us run backwards in time, like running a film backward, from the agorist society to the present statist society. What would we expect to see? Pockets of statism, mostly contiguous in territory, since the State requires regional monopolies, would first appear.

[Konkin 80 continued on next page]

2nc – alternative – agorism (2/2)

[Konkin 80 continued]

The remaining victims are becoming more and more aware of the wonderful free world around them and "evaporating" from these pockets. Large syndicates of market protection agencies are containing the State by defending those who have signed up for protection- insurance. Most importantly, those outside the statist pockets or sub- societies are enjoying an agorist society save for a higher cost of insurance premiums and some care as to where they travel. The agorists could co-exist with statists at this point, maintaining an isolationist "foreign policy" since the costs of invasion of statist sub-societies and liberation would be higher than immediate returns (unless the State launches an all-out last aggression), but there is no real reason to imagine the remaining victims will choose to remain oppressed when the libertarian alternative is so visible and accessible. The State's areas are like a super-saturated solution ready to precipitate anarchy. Run backward another step and we find the situation reversed. We find larger sectors of society under Statism and smaller ones living as agorically as possible. However, there is one visible difference: the agorists need not be territorially contiguous. They can live anywhere, though they will tend to associate with their fellow agorists not only for social reinforcement but for ease and profitability of trade. It's always safer and more profitable to deal with more trustworthy customers and suppliers. The tendency is for greater association among more agorist individuals and for dissociation with more statist elements. (This tendency is not only theoretically strong; it already exists in embryonic practice today.) Some easily defendable territories, perhaps in space or islands in the ocean (or under the ocean) or big-city "ghettos" may be almost entirely agorist, where the State is impotent to crush them. But most agorists will live within statist-claimed areas. There will be a spectrum of the degree of agorism in most individuals, as there is today, with a few benefiting from the State being highly statist, a few fully conscious of the agorist alternative and competent as living free to the hilt, and the rest in the middle with varying degrees of confusion. Finally, we step back to where only a handful understand agorism, the vast majority perceiving illusory gains from the existence of the State or unable to perceive an alternative, and the statists themselves: the government apparatus and the class defined by receiving a new gain from the State's intervention in the Market. [

2nc – alternative – agorism – this round is key

We must recruit and educate agorists within the debate round.

Konkin in 80. (prominent libertarian activist, Koman Publishing, The new Libertarian Manifesto, October -1980, http://agorism.info/NewLibertarianManifesto.pdf, DT)

The New Libertarian activist must keep in mind that actual defense against the State is impossible until the counter-economy has generated the syndicates of protection agencies sufficiently large to defend against the remnant of the State. This will occur only at the "phase transition" between the third and fourth steps leading back from our statism to agorism (Chapter 3). Each step from statism to agorism requires a different strategy; tactics will differ even within each step. There are some rules which will apply in all stages. Under all circumstances, one recruits and educates. Given typically confused individual acquaintances who consider a counter-economic act, encourage them to do it. If they are intelligent enough and not likely to turn on you, explain risks involved and return expected. Most of all, educate them by your example to the extent you can let them know. All "Library Libertarians" you know, those who profess some theoretical variant of libertarianism but eschew practice, should be encouraged to practice what they preach. Scorn their inaction, praise their first halting steps towards countereconomics. Interact with them more and more as trust grows with their competence and experience. Those already in counter-economics whom you meet can be "let in on" the libertarian philosophy that you hold, that mysterious belief you hold which keeps you so happyand free of guilt. Drop it nonchalantly if they feign lack of interest: wax enthusiastic as they grow more curious and eager to learn. Self agorism by example and argument. Control and program your emotional reactions to exhibit hostility at statism and deviationism, and to exhibit enthusiasm and joy at agorist acts and the State's setbacks. Most of these tactics will come with routine but you can check yourself to polish a few things. Finally, co-ordinate your activities with other New Libertarian activists. At this point, we arrive at the need for group tactics and organization.

2nc – alternative – abandoning taxation solves

The state mystifies itself by controlling education and knowledge. If we were to cut off its’ supply of money it would fall.

Konkin in 80. (prominent libertarian activist, Koman Publishing, The new Libertarian Manifesto, October -1980, http://agorism.info/NewLibertarianManifesto.pdf, DT)

What exists everywhere on Earth allowing the State to continue is the sanction of the victim. [7] Every victim of statism has internalized the State to some degree. The IRS's annual proclamation that the income tax depends on "voluntary compliance" is ironically true. Should the taxpayers completely cut off the blood supply, the vampire State would helplessly perish, its unpaid police and army deserting almost immediately, defanging the Monster. If everyone abandoned "legal tender" for gold and goods in contracts and other exchanges, it is doubtful that even taxation could sustain the modern State. [8] This is where the State's control of education and the information media, either directly or through ruling-class ownership, becomes crucial. In earlier days, the established priesthood served the function to sanctify the king and aristocracy, mystify the relations of oppression, and induce guilt in evaders and resisters. The disestablishment of religion has put this burden on the new intellectual class (what the Russians called the intelligentsia). Some intellectuals, holding truth as their highest value (as did earlier dissenting theologians and clerics), do work at clarifying rather than mystifying, but they are dismissed or reviled and kept away from State and foundation-controlled income. Thus is the phenomenon of dissidence and revisionism created; and thus is the attitude of anti-intellectualism generated among the populace who suspect or incompletely understand the function of the Court Intellectual.

2nc - AT: collectivism good/individualism bad

Collectivism is illogical. Individualism comes first because collectives consist of individuals.

Reisman 6 (George, Prof Emeritus of Econ @ Pepperdine U, “Collectivism, Climate Change, and Economic Freedom” 3/26/6 <http://blog.mises.org/4842/collectivism-climate-change-and-economic-freedom/>)

Clearly, there is something very wrong here. What is wrong is the influence of the philosophy of collectivism. Collectivism considers the group â€” the collective â€” to be the primary unit of social reality. It views the collective as having real existence, separate from and superior to that of its members, and as thinking and acting, and as the source of value. At the same time, it regards the individual as an essentially inconsequential cell in the superior, living collective organism. It is on this basis that the loss of an individual’s life is considered to be of no great consequence, with the result that whatever the killer of an individual might be guilty of, it is viewed as not all that serious in the first place. And then, the killer’s actions, it is held, do not emanate from within himself but from the collectively determined circumstances in which he lives. By the same token, if the collective, consisting of billions of individuals consuming fossil fuels over two centuries or more, is responsible for releasing enough carbon dioxide and other gases into the atmosphere to raise the average surface temperature of the Earth, then each and every individual now alive and who consumes fossil fuels is held to be responsible for the phenomenon, because no distinction is made between the individual and the collective. This is the basis on which the owner of the appliances and vehicle is held to be “guilty.” His individual emissions of carbon dioxide are seen as part and parcel of the emissions of carbon dioxide by all the members of the carbon-dioxide emitting collective taken together and as responsible for their effect. There is a different, diametrically opposed philosophy, which has all but been forgotten. It is rarely, if ever, taught in our “culturally diverse” educational system, whose diversity consists in the teaching of numerous varieties of collectivism and the employment of many varieties of collectivists, all the while almost totally excluding this fundamentally different point of view. The name of this different philosophy is individualism. Its most important advocates are Ludwig von Mises and Ayn Rand. According to individualism, only individuals exist; collectives consist of nothing but individuals. Only the individual thinks; only the individual acts; only the life of the individual has value and is important. All rights are rights of individuals.

2nc - AT : libertarianism bad/libertarianism flawed - [ignorance]

Critics don’t even know what libertarianism is – they conflate everything they dislike into one static concept.

Kuznicki 9 (Jason, facilitator of multiple Cato Institute international publishing projects, Research Fellow and Managing Editor at *Cato Unbound* [an intellectual think tank publication], prior Production Manager at the Congressional Research Service, Ph.D. in history from Johns Hopkins University, Cato Journal, Book review of *The Libertarian Illusion: Ideology, Public Policy, and the Assault on the Common Good*, Spring/Summer 2009, Volume 29 Issue 2, <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=0de93721-30a4-4513-87f1-57bf16a8aa5e%40sessionmgr13&vid=2&hid=12>, SP)

It is daunting to review a book claiming that everything you believe is wrong. Fortunately, William Hudson's The Libertarian Illusion also attacks many things that neither I nor very many other libertarians believe. This gives courage for the rest. Hudson, a professor in the political science department at Providence College, is a communitarian. Were I to judge by his book alone, communitarianism appears to mean support for everything that government planners would like to do, provided only that a democratic majority believes such policies constitute the common good. In his first substantive chapter, Hudson also defends higher taxes to pay for these state-supplied goods and services. This stance is unlikely to endear him to the majority, but it’s refreshingly honest. Hudson also appears to have found a word for anything he disagrees with: "libertarian." He bends it to suit his needs. Thus Grover Norquist, who proposes tax cuts because they will lower government revenue, is a Libertarian. But so too is Art Laffer, who proposes tax cuts because they will raise government revenue. Clearly, for any change in tax rates, at least one of them must be wrong. Yet neither view, if taken in isolation, offers a particularly strong example of Libertarianism. A libertarian would lower taxes not to reach some desired level of government revenue, but because respect for the taxpayer demands it.

2nc – AT: libertarianism flawed – [human nature] (1/2)

Libertarianism is grounded in human nature and justified – individual autonomy is a value that simultaneously promotes cooperation and condemns aggressive coercion.

Epstein et. al 4 (Richard, James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor of Law, University of Chicago, Randy Barnett, Austin B. Fletcher Professor, Boston University School of Law, David Friedman, Professor, law school and the economics department of Santa Clara University, and James P. Pinkerton, Fellow, New America Foundation, Washington, D.C., Reason, *Coercion vs. Consent*, March 2004, Volume 35 Issue 10 - <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=8&hid=111&sid=994d9154-b986-4c4c-a871-eb0dae016fe7%40sessionmgr114&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=a9h&AN=12218807>, SP)

PERHAPS THE MOST fundamental question we face is how to think about liberty. Some libertarians stress the formal power of logic to resolve hard questions. They insist that all rights and duties flow from a necessary conception of individual autonomy or self-rule that allows all individuals to do whatever they wish with their own lives so long as they do not interfere with the like liberties of other individuals. No person may use force or deception against other people, either for his own advantage or for the advantage of third persons. This moral imperative holds seemingly without regard for its social and economic consequences. Political organizations should adapt to this strong conception of rights and duties, the argument goes, and not yield to whim or fashion. Given this simple premise, individuals may use their own labor to acquire property, to exchange their labor or property with others, or to form complex business, social, and charitable organizations. This strong intuitive conception of rights and duties tightly corresponds to our ordinary concept of right and wrong behavior. Most people do not seek to order their daily lives by discerning the origins of property in the mists of history; nor do they typically ponder the larger questions of public finance and political organization. But they are taught from birth to be neither bullies nor cheats. In dealing with life-size events, they adhere unswervingly to these simple basic principles. Why then resist their universal application? The content of the rules is clear, and any effort to switch to some calculus that weighs consequences case by case would at best yield indeterminate results, which would in mm heighten overall social insecurity. Better not to scratch beneath the surface. Even if these rules are not necessary truths, we should still treat them as such. Deductive principles order practical affairs well. Unfortunately, this principle of personal guidance does not supply us with a comprehensive theory of social organization. First, there is the question of philosophical foundations. Can we really support any kind of political order that pays no conscious attention to the consequences it generates? On this point, the ostensibly deductive view is right to shun judging individual actions one case at a time. But this detached form of analysis really should be regarded as a form of closet consequentialism. Setting up public institutions to pass on all individual actions becomes so costly and intrusive that it flunks the standard of good government in just those consequentalist terms.

[Epstein et. al 4 continued on next page]

2nc – AT: libertarianism flawed – [human nature] (2/2)

[Epstein et. al 4 continued]

But it is possible to moor this judgment of political structure in a keen appreciation of the mainsprings of human nature, which yields a decidedly mixed picture of the best and worst in human behavior. We start with the biological observation that no individual could survive in a world of scarce resources without a strong measure of self-interest, one that includes at the very least his own family and close associates. That self-interest can manifest itself in one of two ways when dealing with strangers; through either aggression or cooperation. The overall social consequences of these two approaches are massively different. With force, one person wins while the other person loses. With cooperation, both persons win. This simple observation underlies the consequentialist explanation for the libertarian preference for agreement over coercion: Take that arrangement that leaves both parties better off than they are under the alternative legal order. Contracts result in joint improvements, such that the greater the ease of contracting, the greater the gains from cooperation. Coercion creates at least one loser for every winner, where the losses (e.g., death, rape, or theft) can be huge relative to the gains on any intuitive interpersonal comparison of utility. When the odds are right, any individual may find it in his interest to use force or deception, but from a social point of view this conduct merits strong condemnation. The basic libertarian imperatives are well-grounded in human nature.

2nc – AT: libertarianism/privatization causes coercion

The state is coercive but corporations aren’t.

Wolf 2 (Martin, chief economics commentator @ The Financial Times, “Countries still rule the world: The notion that corporations wield more power than governments rests on flawed calculations and conceptual confusion” Financial Times; Feb 6, 2002)

Of the largest economies in the world, 51 are corporations; only 49 are countries. Critics of "corporate globalisation", some of whom protested against the annual meeting of the World Economic Forum in New York, rely on this supposed fact to justify their view that governments lie prostrate before unbridled corporate power. Theirs is a paranoid delusion. The calculations on the relative size of corporations on which so many critics of globalisation depend come from the left-of-centre Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, DC.\* But they rest on an elementary howler. The authors, Sarah Anderson and John Cavanagh, compute the size of corporations by sales but that of national economies by gross domestic product. Yet GDP is a measure of value added, not sales. If one were to compute total sales in a country one would end up with a number far bigger than GDP. One would also be double-, triple- or quadruple-counting. But the flaw in such claims is not just factual but also conceptual, since countries and companies are radically different. A country has coercive control over its people and its territory. Even the weakest state can force millions of people to do things most of them would far rather not do: pay taxes, for example, or do military service. Companies are quite another matter. They are civilian organisations that must win the resources they need in free markets. They rely not on coercion but on competitiveness. Does anybody doubt that the US legal system could break up Microsoft if it wanted to do so? Or that Microsoft would itself disappear if it ceased making products its customers wanted? Even the property rights of companies depend on the coercive power of states. In the 1970s, for example, the strongest oil companies were unable to resist nationalisation of their assets by some weak developing countries. Wrong numbers, incorrect understanding of trends and, above all, a misleading analytical framework - the critics are guilty of all these. But the worst of these is the last. By comparing the ability of companies to grow by satisfying customers, paying employees and rewarding investors with the ability of governments to exert coercive power, they are guilty of, at best, confusion and, at worst, deliberate misrepresentation. Companies are not comparable with states. Even if they were far bigger, they would still not be. Does this mean there is nothing to the critique of corporate power? Not quite. Two points are correct. First, open borders increase the choices open to citizens, particularly to owners of mobile factors of production. This limits the coercive power of states. To critics, this represents an erosion of democracy. To supporters, it represents an increase in individual freedom. Both are correct, in their own terms, though the impact is not of corporations but of markets.

2nc – framework impact turn – state coercion bad

We’ll impact turn your framework – political propaganda has produced false education and an institution of immoral coercion has rigged the game of fairness. The state has murdered more people than ever and taxes have stolen more than ever.

Konkin in 80. (prominent libertarian activist, Koman Publishing, The new Libertarian Manifesto, October -1980, http://agorism.info/NewLibertarianManifesto.pdf, DT)

Such an institution of coercion, centralizing immorality, directing theft and murder, and co-ordinating oppression on a scale inconceivable by random criminality exists. It is the Mob of mobs, Gang of gangs, Conspiracy of conspiracies. It has murdered more people in a few recent years than all the deaths in history before that time; it has stolen in a few recent years more than all the wealth produced in history to that time; it has deluded - for its survival - more minds in a few recent years than all the irrationality of history to that time. Our Enemy, The State. [2] In the 20th Century alone, war has murdered more than all previous deaths; taxes and inflation have stolen more than all wealth previously produced; and the political lies, propaganda, and above all, "Education" have twisted more minds than all the superstition prior; yet through all the deliberate confusion and obfuscation, the thread of reason has developed fibers of resistance to be woven into the rope of execution for the State: Libertarianism.

Libertarianism Aff Answers

No link – government services = consumer desires

Despite coercion, government services are for actual public desires

Hicks 70 (John R. Hicks, Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences. *Three Sacred Cows of Economics* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970), p. 54. ) TS

I can see no alternative but to assume that the public services are worth to society in general at least what they cost.... One may feel considerable qualms about such an assumption—it is obvious that the government spends far too much on this, far too little on that: but if we accept the actual choices of the individual consumer as reflecting his preferences... then I do not see that we have any choice but to accept the actual choices of the government, even if they are expressed through a Nero or a Robespierre, as representing the actual wants of society.

Perm: do both – libertarian communism (1/2)

Perm: do both solves – France proves that libertarian communism becomes a diverse movement that works together to spark revolutions and engage in sociopolitical activism.

Berry 8 (David, Senior Lecturer in European Studies in the Department of Politics, History, and International Relations at Loughborough University, interdisciplinary masters in French studies at Sussex, Ph.D. in Philosophy in French Labour Studies at Sussex, Journal of Contemporary European Studies, *Change the World Without Taking Power? The Libertarian Communist Tradition in France Today*, April 2008, Volume 16 Issue 1 - <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=2ff4b976-3960-4d61-894e-32a0ab25b687%40sessionmgr4&vid=2&hid=18>, SP)

In 2002 the left-wing journal Contretemps organized a conference in Paris on the theme: ‘Change the world without taking power? New libertarians, new communists’ (Corcuff & Lowy, 2003a).1 The starting point was not just the cohabitation of Marxists and anarchists in the present-day ‘alterglobalisation’ or anti-capitalist movement, but also the fact that they seem to some extent to be exerting a mutual influence over each other and that numerous thematic cross-overs are discernible. The most prominent examples cited (Corcuff & Lowy, 2003b) are associated with different forms of autonomist Marxism (the variant of Marxism most often regarded as being closest to anarchism): the Zapatistas, Holloway’s (2005a) ideas on ‘changing the world without taking power’ and the notion of ‘counter-power’ or ‘anti-power’ discussed in different ways by Holloway, Hardt & Negri (2000) and Bensayag & Sztulwark (2000).2 The editors of Contretemps share the Cohn-Bendit brothers’ impatience with those who dwell on the ‘false and uninteresting conflict’ between Marx and Bakunin (and their heirs) (Cohn-Bendit & Cohn-Bendit, 1968, p. 18) and express the wish to go beyond it, looking back on the First International not, as most historians have done, as an example of conflict between the two dominant currents in West European labour movements but as a positive example of fruitful cooperation: A democratic, multiple, diverse, internationalist movement, where distinct if not opposed political options came together in a process of reflection and action over a period of several years, playing a dynamic role in the first great modern proletarian revolution. An International where libertarians and marxists were able—despite conflicts—to work together and to take part in joint actions. (Corcuff & Lowy, 2003b, p. 9).

[Berry 8 continued on next page]

Perm: do both – libertarian communism (2/2)

[Berry 8 continued]

The focus of this article is thus what has come to be known as the ‘libertarian communist’ tradition in France, and in particular the organization ‘Alternative Libertaire’ (AL). An introductory section traces the historical development of this ideological current and argues that in France it has two roots: firstly, a tendency within the historic anarchist movement which attempted to shake off the negative stereotypes associated with anarchism; secondly, various post-war, critical or non-Leninist Marxist groups and individuals (notably Daniel Guerin) who were trying to grapple with the perceived ideological and political shortcomings of classical Marxism. The paper looks at the confluence of these two traditions during the 1970s and 1980s and the creation in 1991 of AL. Having established the ideological nature and strategic aims of AL and determined what distinguishes it from other anarchisms and socialisms, the paper examines the group’s involvement since its creation in ‘the social movement’ (i.e. the plethora of new social movements and single issue campaigns of various kinds as well as trade union organizations, especially Solidaire, Unitaire, Democratique (SUD). In attempting to answer the three questions raised above the paper analyses AL’s conception of ‘revolution’ in the 21st century (one which rejects both the insurrectionary myths of the past and the slide into social democratic reformism) and AL’s claims that ‘libertarian communism’ offers an original ideological framework and a distinctive approach to sociopolitical activism.

No link/impact – libertarian intellectuals disagree

The negative’s representation of Libertarianism is not all-encompassing – libertarian intellectuals disagree.

Feser 2000 (EDWARD Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College. The Independent Review, v.V, n.2 *Taxation, Forced Labor, and Theft*, pp. 219–235 Fall 2000) TS

The injustice of taxation—of taxation per se, not merely of this or that particular tax policy or of especially high levels of taxation—is a familiar theme of popular libertarian rhetoric. Curiously, it is less evident in the more sophisticated statements of libertarianism emanating from libertarian political philosophers and economists, who tend to base their arguments on appeals to more abstruse considerations of utility maximization, rights theory, and the like. To be sure, a critique of current tax policies, perhaps even of most taxation as such, may often follow from some of those more fundamental considerations; but even so, the connection often has the appearance of an afterthought, something to be passed over quickly on the way to treating more pressing matters. One simply does not find many libertarian intellectuals—certainly not many libertarian academics—insisting that the institution of taxation that sustains the Leviathan state they oppose is clearly and fundamentally illegitimate: illegitimate not merely as currently administered, nor only for reasons that are inconclusive and in any case highly derivative from other considerations only slightly less inconclusive; but illegitimate for reasons that do not require a great deal of argumentation and are difficult in good faith to avoid recognizing—illegitimate for the same sorts of reasons that slavery is illegitimate.

Impact turn – libertarianism bad – awesome card (1/4)

Libertarianism reproduces its own errors in the guise of political revolution – it kills the economy, it doesn’t create “freedom of choice”, it stops social goods, it homogenizes people rather than embracing difference, it doesn’t stop taxation, and it dehumanizes the subjects of the nation. The only way to solve is to move away from the apolitical system it produces – New Zealand proves.

Kelsey 99 (Jane, Associate Professor of Law, The University of Auckland, New Zealand, *New Zealand "experiment" a colossal failure*, July 9 1999, <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/apfail.htm>, SP)

New Zealand used to claim credit for being the birthplace of the welfare state, for being the first country to give women the vote, and for building a harmonious multi-racial society. Today, however, it is becoming infamous for what is known as the "New Zealand experiment." Economic theories which had never been tried, let alone proved, anywhere else in the world became New Zealand government policy--first at the hands of a Labour government from 1984 to 1990, and then continued with equal, if not greater, fervor by its National government successor. The "fundamentals"--market liberalization and free trade, limited government, a narrow monetarist policy, a deregulated labour market, and fiscal restraint--were taken as "given," based on common sense and beyond challenge. These radical policies were systematically embedded against change. This was a classic structural adjustment program of the kind traditionally imposed on poorer countries of the Third World by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. New Zealand did it voluntarily. The result is being promoted in New Zealand and overseas as a model for the developed countries of the OECD. But those governments and their peoples need to look beyond the "good news machine" and learn the real lessons of our last ten years.

The economic deficit

This was no success story. For most of the decade New Zealand's economy has faced stagnation or recession. Between 1985 and 1992, OECD economies grew by an average 20%, while New Zealand's economy shrank by 1% over the same period. Other objective indicators show that, between 1984 and 1993, productivity growth averaged around 0.9% a year, due mainly to labour cutbacks. Inflation averaged around 9% a year. Real interest rates remained excessively high. Unemployment rose to unprecedented levels. Net migration flows were negative. Foreign debt quadrupled. New Zealand's credit rating was downgraded twice. Investment as a percentage of GDP halved, and spending on research and development fell to half the OECD average. When New Zealand finally showed some signs of economic growth in 1993, its "turnaround economy" became the toast of the global economic community. Yet three years into this much-heralded recovery, some of the key indicators, such as public debt, are just returning to their pre-1984 levels.

[Kelsey 99 continued on next page]

Impact turn – libertarianism bad – awesome card (2/4)

[Kelsey 99 continued]

Others, such as unemployment, are nowhere near that. Control of the country's vital financial, energy, transport and communications infrastructure, and much of its natural resource base, is now in foreign or transnational hands. While indicators like inflation and budget balance have improved, many commentators believe the country is significantly worse off than it would have been under a different economic approach. Moreover, a sustainable economy is far from guaranteed. In late 1995, there were signs that the economy was weakening once more. Job growth has slowed, real wages continue to fall, the balance of payments deficit has grown, and economic growth has been forced back down to bring "underlying" inflation within the Rserve Bank's goal.

The social deficit

Whatever the economic outcomes, the country and many of its people are a great deal worse off. Unemployment and poverty have become structural features of New Zealand life. The Labour government was responsible for the early decline, with rising unemployment, failure to keep benefit and family assistance in line with inflation, and favourable tax treatment for the rich at the expense of the poor. Its National successor fuelled unemployment and deregulated the labour market to force wage rates down. It slashed benefit levels and tightened eligibility criteria, imposed new user charges, and suspended inflation-indexing for family assistance and income support. There is no doubt that poverty and inequality have increased. The number of New Zealanders estimated to be living in poverty grew by at least 35% between 1989 and 1992, so that, by 1993, one in six New Zealanders was considered to be living in poverty. Even if unemployment returns to the level of the mid-1980s--still very high by New Zealand's historical standards--poverty and hardship are expected to remain about the same. This doesn't seem to concern the government. Cabinet Minister Bill Birch admitted that income disparities "are widening, and they will widen much more. That doesn't worry me." New Zealand is now a deeply divided society. Hundreds of thousands of individuals, their families and communities have endured a decade of unrelenting hardship. The burden fell most heavily on those who already had the least: the Maori, the poor, the sick, women with children, and the unemployed. Their "freedom of choice" was whether to use their scarce resources to buy housing, health and education, or other essentials such as food--and which of these essentials to go without. The government and its affluent supporters talked constantly of the need for stability--but always in terms of the economy, never of people's lives. The strain of constant change fostered uncertainty and insecurity, and made it impossible for people to plan ahead. "Labour market flexibility" meant going to bed not knowing if you would have a job the next day. "Price stability" meant sudden hikes in your interest on mortgages and loans, and suppression of growth by the Reserve Bank (the country's central bank).

[Kelsey 99 continued on next page]
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[Kelsey 99 continued]

"Fiscal responsibility" meant continual cuts in income support, benefits and social services. Privatized state services meant having to choose which essential service to keep, with no one being held to account. Constant policy failure meant revisions and reversals as new versions of the experiment tried to remedy the disasters of the old. In this decade of greed, talk of "short-term pain for long-term gain" meant pain for the poor to achieve gain for the rich. Social policy no longer promoted the right of people to participate in and belong to their community. It promised instead to "maintain individuals in the daily essentials of food, clothing and housing at a decent level." By the mid-1990s, however, the government was no longer providing even these minimum benefits for many citizens. The victims of the market were forced to depend on a shrinking welfare safety net or on private charity. What were once basic priorities--collective responsibility, redistribution of resources and power, social stability, democratic participation, and the belief that human beings were entitled to live and work in security and dignity--seemed to have been left far behind. Poverty, division and alienation had become permanent features of New Zealand's social landscape.

The political deficit

The political verdict was equally damning. Most voters felt paralyzed by the pace of change, confused by the Labour government's role after 1984, and trapped in nostalgia for an interventionist welfare state which was disappearing before their eyes. While they felt uneasy, most remained isolated, insecure, unorganized, and politically inert. Critics of the right-wing "experiment" were dismissed as dinosaurs or vested interest lobby groups trying to protect their own interests. Too often the media abandoned their investigative role and became seduced by the market hype. Meanwhile, the "change agents" stacked the deck with fellow-travellers who would defend the new regime against all challenges and critiques. Political choice thus became increasingly sterile. Aside from labour market deregulation and more overt attacks on the welfare state, structural adjustment followed the same neo-liberal course whichever party was in power. The fortunes of both the Labour and National parties see-sawed throughout the decade. Deprived of real political choice, a majority voted the electoral system down and opted for MMP (a form of proportional representation). Many assumed it would make the political system more accountable and representative, and would serve to moderate, if not reverse, the pace of change. But their expectations were inflated. By 1995, it appeared that they could expect more of the same. The cultural deficit Within a decade, the country and the lives of its people were turned upside down. This right-wing revolution--bloodless, but devastating for those who became its victims--had been prosecuted in the name of "the nation as a whole." Constant references to national wealth, national well-being, and national self-interest sought to submerge deep inequalities into an amorphous whole.

[Kelsey 99 continued on next page]
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Along the way, the nation in whose name the experiment was carried out was irreversibly changed, raising vital concerns about identity, sovereignty, and foreign control. The ethos of the market pervaded everyday life. Even the language was captured, dehumanizing the people and communities it affected. It became acceptable to talk of "shedding workers," as if they were so much dead skin. "Incentives" meant cutting benefits to force people into low-paying jobs.

"Broadening the tax base" meant shifting the tax burden from the rich to the poor. "Freeing up the market" meant removing all impediments to profit-making. "Deinstitutionalization" meant closing state institutions and shifting responsibility for their occupants to poor families and communities. "An open economy" meant welcoming foreign purchasers of the country's assets and resources. "International competitiveness" meant competing with countries whose economies are based on prison and child labour, grinding poverty, and environmental degradation. There are alternatives The message is very clear: Even if the New Zealand economy has shown signs of recovering, many of the people have not. Yet the New Zealand experiment is now being hailed by the World Bank, the OECD, and other like-minded guardians of the global economy as a "success story" and a model for the rest of the world. What they are really applauding, however, is the unimpeded imposition of an ideological model to which they adhere--regardless of its social and economic consequences. Few would disagree that New Zealand's economy in 1984 needed attention. The claim that "there was no alternative" to the right-wing revolution has, by sheer repetition, become accepted truth. But in fact this was not the only option available to the New Zealand government. It was simply the only option that had been conceived and promoted at the time--the option that enjoyed the patronage of the political, bureaucratic and business elites. Those responsible were determined to initiate and entrench the "right" policies, not to secure socially acceptable outcomes. According to their theories, the two would ultimately coincide. In the process, they rationalized the costs to individuals, families and communities as inevitable and short-term. They justified anti-democratic practices and the privatization of power as being "in the national good." They ignored the gap between prevailing social values and those which they dogmatically pursued. They abandoned the commitment to sustaining a community that cares and shares. They are now beginning to reap the consequences as increasing numbers of victims, especially Maori, fight back. A decade into this experiment, it is a fruitless exercise to speculate on "what might have been." It is an historical and irreversible fact that the structural adjustment program was imposed by default. New Zealanders feel they are losing control of their identity, their economy, their country, even their lives. They now face the question of where realistically to move from here. They still have channels for innovation and struggle. They still have a choice. They can fall into line and remain victims of the global market within a divided and polarized society; or they can seek out new identities, new economic strategies, and new forms of politics that will respond creatively to a rapidly changing world. Ultimately, the people of New Zealand have to decide what kind of society they wish to live in, and work together to create it. In the meantime, other countries, governments and peoples who are being told that they too have no alternative to the corporate agenda should learn from New Zealand's tragic mistake.

Impact turn – taxation is good (1/2)

Taxing isn’t evil, doesn’t affect people massively and is actually pretty freaking awesome.

Harriss in 74. (C. Lowell, Prof. economics @ Columbia, The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Property taxation: What’s Good and What’s Bad about it*, Jan 1974, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3485546.pdf, DT)

1. Viability of Local Government. The tax now helps to finance local activity, enough to make local government as meaningful and as viable as it remains. Cities, towns, counties, and school districts do at times fail to meet our aspirations for good government. And state and national government are also less than perfect; so is the world of business and of non-profit organizations. Be reality as it may, the use of localities, as distinguished from state and nation, to get some of the things we expect from collective (governmental, political) action has merit. Property taxation offers people in different localities an instrument by which they can make truly local choices significant. People in one locality are not forestalled, inexorably, by the decisions of voters elsewhere. Who among us would want to limit his children to a level of education which might satisfy, say, a majority of voters in a state? This tax helps to provide freedom and opportunity to do things differently-not to be held down to a level set by others who may live in areas which are quite different. 2. Voter Influence on His Taxes-and Government Spending. Either an increase in assessed valuation or a boost in the tax rate requires a positive act. Such tax-raising action can lead to more voter resistance than will an automatic rise in income tax from established rates which apply to growing income. Voters have an opportunity to relate a) budget proposals which will require higher taxes, b) to the desirability of more government spending. Is not the ability to reject more spending and taxes a desirable element of "the good society?" 3. Benefit and Justice. The equity which we seek in public finance consists of various forms. One feature associates costs with benefits (in the making of decisions and in the results). Fairness of this type is evident as property taxation does adjust the payments for different quantities of services from one community to another to local burdens. Generally, the localities in which burdens are highest are those providing residents the most services. Here is an element of justice in a basic sense, a quid pro quo. Within communities the relation of benefits received per family to tax paid will be crude. Families with relatively large property holdings pay more tax than others who get equal services. Yet the intercommunity aspect commands respect.

[Harriss 74 continued on next page]
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4. Fairness-Capturing Some of Socially Created Values: "Unearned Increments." Socially created increments in property values are sometimes substantial. The property tax can capture a portion for financing government. Considerable property value increases (above general inflation) have appeared in the last two decades. Nationwide, land prices have probably risen by at least half a trillion dollars in 20 years or so. In my view, more of the increment would better have gone to local government treasuries. Property taxation could capture more of values due (a) to social growth and (b) local government spending for financing local services. Is this not almost the epitome of fairness in taxation? I shall say more about this potential-one which makes property taxation the very opposite of the customary assertion that it is the most unfair tax. To some extent, I submit, it can be a "most fair" tax. 5. Equity-New Measures ("Circuit Breakers") to Relieve (Some of) the Poor. With rapidity unusual in tax policy, states have enacted provisions for granting property tax relief for the aged poor and some other groups. Experience indicates that this one defect can be largely eliminated without undue loss of revenue. I say more lately about this widely acclaimed de- vice for improving the equity of property taxation. 6. Good Results of Age. "An old tax is a good tax"; this is an ancient proverb, and it is not completely true, of course. Nevertheless, property taxation has worked its way through the economy, especially the portion represented by rates other than the most recent increases. Some elements have been capitalized, and other adjustments have been made as owners and users have taken the tax into account. Inequalities and crudities lose some of their sting as men adjust over the years. 91 92 the American Journal of Economics and Sociology 7. Some of the Tax is No Real Burden. Part of the tax is no current burden on the present owner or user. In many communities probably 15 to 20 per cent of the property tax represents (a) tax on land values (b) at rates which have existed for such a long time that most present owners allowed for it in the price they paid. The annual payment of this portion constitutes no true burden on the user. Part of what the owner pays over to the local treasury each year does not really leave him worse off, compared with what would have been his situation if the tax had not applied when he bought the property

Impact turn – only government can provide social goods

The Libertarian obsession with privatization justifies ridiculous ownership, only government control solves

Partridge 04 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

The libertarian's error resides in their proposal that privatization, which is clearly the correct solution for some commons problems, is to be prescribed for all commons problems. Like Maslow's carpenter, libertarians believe that all commons problems can be fixed with the "hammer" of privatization. Accordingly, they propose the abolition of all national parks, and the privatization of all public lands and utilities, including roads and airports -- everything, that is, except the military, the police and the courts. Presumably, this means that such universal "commonses" as the atmosphere and the oceans are to be carved up and sold to the highest bidder. Not even wildlife is to be allowed to remain free and unowned. Is this an unfair caricature of the libertarian position? Consider the argument of Robert J. Smith who suggests that the absence of privatization explains "why the buffalo nearly vanished, but not the Hereford; ... why the common salmon fisheries of the United States are overfished, but not the private salmon streams of Europe." (32) His solution? "We should explore the possibilities of extending ownership of native game animals and wildlife to property owners." (47). Critics of libertarianism find no end of amusement pointing out the inadequacies of the libertarians' "hammer." How, for example, are we to "privatize" the whaling industry? Are we to "brand" the whales, to validate the ownership of each? And what if "my whale" feeds on "your krill,” which you purchased (from whom?) to feed "your whales”? What courts must we set up to assess damages? What agency will be set up to collect the facts germane to the case, and how is it to be financed? Furthermore, the privatization of oceanic resources suggests that "territories" of ocean will have to be established, which means the end of the centuries-old convention of non-sovereignty of the seas. What country will be the first to claim the North Atlantic, along with the Gulf Stream? If the United States, will Great Britain and Scandinavia then have to pay the US for the use of the Gulf Stream's climatic services? Will the nations of the world accede to this "sea grab" without protest? The military implications are awesome. If we privatize wildlife, then will the owner of the wild insects that pollinate my orchard be entitled to charge me for this service? If someone's flock of migrating birds soils my clothing or pollutes my swimming pool, how am I to locate the responsible owner? The mind boggles. There is worse to come: can we conceivably "privatize" the atmosphere, and with it the hydrological cycle? If so, then who is liable for El Nino or Hurricane Katrina? If I own a "piece" of the atmosphere, is this a defined space, or is it the migrating clouds and molecules within. How is the "owner" to make his claim? Total privatization of the earth is a fantasy -- a reductio ad absurdum, charitably supplied to the critics by the libertarians themselves. The atmosphere, the seas, wildlife, and innumerable ecological services both known and undiscovered, are now and will forever be the "common property" of mankind, not to mention the other species of the earth. And since "privatization" of land and resources can never be the total and final solution to the commons problem, there remains the libertarians' alternative proposal: legal compensation for invasion of property. If that is found to fail, then governmental regulation, endorsed by the liberals and detested by the libertarians, may be the only remaining solution to "the tragedy of the commons."

Impact turn – libertarianism bad/government good (1/2)

Libertarianism reproduces the errors that it seeks to solve – it increases crime, disrupts the economy, gives the wealthy more money, and creates unemployment – only the government can solve the social goods deprived through the alternative’s blind ideological commitment – New Zealand economy proves.

Dobbin 00 (Murray, author and writer based in Vancouver, The National Post, *New Zealand’s Vaunted Privatization Push Devastated Their Country, Rather Than Saving It*, August 15 2000, <http://www.commondreams.org/views/081500-106.htm>, SP)

It has been so long since anyone in the business press has praised the New Zealand "miracle," it's almost as if we imagined the whole thing. But, of course, the current silence is really no mystery. The 15-year free market experiment has been an unmitigated disaster. The suffering caused among ordinary New Zealanders is well known: the highest youth suicide rate in the developed world; the proliferation of food banks; huge increases in violent and other crime; the bankruptcy of half the farms in the country; the economic disruption of hundreds of thousands of lives; health care, education and other social services devastated by the mad marketplace scientists. But, of course, neo-liberal ideologues don't hold much truck with the human consequences of their experiments. So let's examine those things they do care about. The revolutionaries promised to tear down the "debt wall," unleash spectacular economic growth, spur foreign investment and productivity, create enormous new wealth and new and better jobs. They failed on every count. Instead of a brave new economy, they delivered an economic version of Frankenstein's monster. The initial wave of changes -- deregulation, privatization, tariff elimination -- was justified by the infamous debt crisis. This was a ruse all along. Even Sir Roger Douglas admitted this when I interviewed him in 1992. The "crisis" New Zealand faced post-election in 1984 was a currency crisis brought on by Mr. Douglas himself. As for the debt in 1984, it was NZ$22-billion, but after 10 years of experimenting, it had doubled to NZ$45-billion -- in spite of the sell-off of NZ$16-billion in state enterprises. Today, it has finally returned to 1984 levels, but only through more Crown asset sales. And economic growth? In the years 1985-92, average economic growth in the OECD countries totalled 20%, while in New Zealand it was negative, at -1%. The promised creation of enormous new wealth went into reverse: Real GDP in 1992, at 5%, was below the 1985-86 level. A burst of growth from 1993 to 1995 petered out, and the economy steadily declined until it dipped into negative territory in 1998, posting the fourth-worst growth in the OECD. The transformation of the economy was supposed to spur foreign investment, but it mostly meant a feeding frenzy on domestic corporate assets. In 1993, the proportion of GDP in investments was just 70% of what it was in 1984.

[Dobbins 2000 continued on next page]
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The restructuring of the economy failed most dramatically on the unemployment front, and the country has never managed to get back to anywhere near the 1984 level of 4%. The "workless and wanting work" figure peaked at more than 18% in 1993. In 1999, that figure had been reduced only to 11.2%. The radicals also promised increases in productivity, but again, they failed to deliver. After eight years of restructuring and massive labour deregulation, New Zealand's productivity began a steady decline in comparison with its neighbour, Australia. From 1978 to 1990, the rates had been similar. The gap steadily increased between 1990 and 1998, with Australia posting a 21.9% increase and New Zealand just 5.2%. Only the wealthy in New Zealand could see any benefit from this destructive exercise in social engineering. Between 1984 and 1996, the top 10% of income earners measurably increased their share of total income. The lowest 10% lost 21.6% of their 1984 income. More than 50% of the total working population had lower real income in 1996 than in 1984. There are lessons from New Zealand, but they do not involve adopting that tortured country as a model. The first lesson is that the unfettered application of ideology is inevitably destructive -- not just to democracy, social peace and equality but to the economy. Even as the revolution continued to deliver disastrous results, its promoters claimed it was because it had not gone far enough. The second lesson is that parliamentary democracy Anglo-Saxon style has proven extremely vulnerable to the ravages of ideology. A virtual executive dictatorship can implement policies that are never even debated during elections -- as happened in New Zealand in 1984. The only thing that stopped the zealots from going even further was the introduction of proportional representation in the early 1990s and the subsequent election of minority governments. And that leads to the last lesson: Globalization is not inevitable, nor is it irreversible. The current New Zealand government (a coalition of a chastened Labour party and the left-wing Alliance) is unfortunately still committed to signing free trade and investment agreements. But it is reversing many of the most destructive policies. Included in this rethink are a reversal of the privatization of Accident Compensation Insurance; an immediate rise in pensions; a halt to the sale of public housing and a commitment to rebuilding the public housing stock; the appointment of a review committee on electricity pricing; the freezing of tariffs on clothing and footwear; and the re-recognition of unions. The pity is that New Zealanders had to suffer through so much in the first place.

Impact turn – coercion good – key to survival and general rights

Some government coercion can be necessary.

West, 10 (Thomas, Professor of Politics @ University of Dallas,

8/30,http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2010/08/The-Economic-Principles-of-America-s-Founders-Property-Rights-Free-Markets-and-Sound-Money)

<This potential and sometimes actual conflict between natural rights was also acknowledged during the Founding era. The property rights of the individual cannot always be respected when the survival of the community is at stake—for example, in a time of foreign invasion. In an 1810 letter, Jefferson recalls examples of grave but necessary government inroads on property rights during the Revolutionary War: When, in the battle of Germantown, General Washington’s army was annoyed from Chew’s house, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, although the property of a citizen. When he besieged Yorktown, he leveled the suburbs, feeling that the laws of property must be postponed to the safety of the nation.[16]Would the Founders’ principles lead to the conclusion, then, that socialism or some other scheme of government redistribution of income could be the most just economic order? Using government coercion to redistribute property certainly violates the natural right to possess property, but what if this policy is the best way to enable everyone to exercise their right to acquire it? Would that not be in greater conformity with natural right than the starvation or deprivation of the poor?>

Impact turn – libertarianism causes plutocracy

Libertarianism creates a framework of exclusion where only the rich get to rule

Partridge 04 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

The system sounds just fine for those with a super-abundance of wealth and power. But what of all the others in society? Not to worry, say the libertarians. Citing Adam Smith, the libertarian assures us that the enterprising entrepreneur who "intends only his own gain" will, in the course of maximizing his satisfactions, be "led by an invisible hand to promote... the public interest." (A. Smith, 423). "The invisible hand" metaphor has familiar variants, such as "the rising tide that lifts all boats" and "the trickle down effect". (As noted above, those who celebrate the "trickling down" of wealth from the most to the least advantaged, seem disinclined to notice that wealth also "percolates up" from the labor of the less advantaged, and from public adherence to a "well ordered" system of justice). By invoking, through "the invisible hand" and "the rising tide," the advantage to all which accrues from the self-motivated search for private wealth by each, the libertarian conveniently (if temporarily and inconsistently) puts aside his "social atomism" in favor of an ad hoc theory of an integrated system of society. In response to Milton Friedman's celebration of the "freedom to choose," one is immediately led to ask: "freedom of whom to 'choose' -- and at whose expense?" Given the libertarian's uncompromising fidelity to property rights and his faith in the free market, those with property and with the wealth to enter the market have the "freedom to choose," in direct proportion to their wealth. And at whose expense? Presumably, those without the tickets (i.e., cash) to enter the marketplace or to own property. This would include the very young, the very poor, other species, ecosystems, and future generations.. Thus it would appear that the libertarian morality embraces the cynic's version of "the golden rule:" "Those with the gold, get to rule."

Libertarianism only protects the wealthy and powerful

Partridge 04 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

Thus libertarianism does not qualify as a just system for all members of society. On the contrary, as we noted above, it is a Nietzschean "master morality," reflecting the preferences and protecting the interests of the wealthy and powerful. Complaints against "big government" and "over-regulation," though often justified, also issue from the privileged who are frustrated at finding that their quest for still greater privileges at the expense of their community are curtailed by a government which, ideally, represents that community. Pure food and drug laws curtail profits and mandate tests as they protect the general public. And environmental protection regulations "internalize" the costs of pollution, thus properly burdening the corporations and their investors as a direct result of these regulations relieving the unconsenting public of the previously externalized costs. The libertarian trust in "the wisdom of the free market" is likewise attractive to the wealthy and powerful, since one's involvement with markets -- the libertarians' preferred instrument of social adaptation and change -- is proportional to one's access to cash. The Golden Rule - "those with the gold get to rule" - is one of the first principles of both "the master morality" and of libertarianism.

Impact turn – libertarianism causes women oppression

Libertarian ethics ensures women oppression and sexual binaries: inevitable dependence

Kittay 98 (Eva Feder. Professor of Philosophy at State University of New York, Stony Brook Love's Labor: Essays on Women, Equality and Dependency Routledge December 17, 1998)

The dependency critique [of equality] is a feminist critique of equality that asserts: A conception of society viewed as an association of equals masks inevitable dependencies, those of infancy and childhood, old age, illness and disability. While we are dependent, we are not well-positioned to enter a competition for the goods of social cooperation on equal terms. And those who care for dependents, who must put their own interests aside to care for one who is entirely vulnerable to their actions, enter the competition for social goods with a handicap. Viewed from the perspective of the dependency critique we can say: Of course women have not achieved equality on men’s side of the sexual divide [in the public world of paid work and politics] for how could women abandon those they leave behind on that side of the divide? Their children and their elderly parents, their ill spouse or friend? (xi)

Women oppression is inevitable in the world of Libertarianism

Nussbaum 2000 (Martha C. Ernst Freund Distinguished Service Professor of Law and Ethics @ University of Chicago The Future of Feminist Liberalism Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association, Vol. 74, No. 2, pp. 47-79 Nov., 2000)

Life, of course, is not like that. Real people begin their lives as helpless infants, and remain in a state of extreme, asymmetrical dependency, both physical and mental, for anywhere from ten to twenty years. At the other end of life, those who are lucky enough to live on into old age are likely to encounter another period of extreme dependency, either physical or mental or both, which may itself continue in some form for as much as twenty years. During the middle years of life, many of us encounter periods of extreme dependency, some of which involve our mental powers and some our bodily powers only, but all of which may put us in need of daily, even hourly, care by others. Finally and centrally there are many citizens who never have the physical and/or mental powers requisite for independence. These citizens are dependent in different ways. Some have high intellectual capabilities but are unable to give and receive love and friendship; some are capable of love, but unable to learn basic intellectual skills. Some have substantial emotional and intellectual capabilities, but in a form or at a level that requires special care. These lifelong states of asymmetrical dependency are in many respects isomorphic to the states of infants and the elderly. In short, any real society is a caregiving and care-receiving society, and must therefore discover ways of coping with these facts of human neediness and dependency that are compatible with the self-respect of the recipients and do not exploit the caregivers. This is a central issue for feminism since, in every part of the world, women do a large part of this work, usually without pay, and often without recognition that it is work. They are often thereby handicapped in other functions of life.'

Impact turn – libertarianism can’t solve environment

Libertarianism can’t solve environmental issues.

Partridge 4 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

The psychologist, Abraham Maslow, once remarked that "to a carpenter, all problems can be solved with a hammer." To the Libertarian, that "hammer" is "the free market" combined with inviolable "property rights." In particular, the Libertarian is convinced that this is the "hammer" best designed to solve the problems of pollution, of land degradation, and of resource allocation, both within and among generations. Market incentives combined with an uncompromising protection of personal property rights will, the libertarian believes, yield the optimum solutions to our environmental problems. Neither theory, nor practice, nor history will support this claim. Environmental problems must be met with a "kit of tools" - a variety of rules, practices and objectives. Thus, while the free market and property rights are appropriate solutions to some environmental problems, they surely will not suffice for all.

Impact turn – government good

The libertarian ideology is based off of short term frustration. Government actually helps the entirety of the population

Partridge 04 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

When, during a football game, a referee makes a call against the home team, the fans are often heard to shout: "Kill the Ref!" -- forgetting, for that moment, that without referees, the game could not continue. Similarly, "abolish government" is another cry that issues from frustration. Without a doubt, governments can be damned nuisances. They require us to pay taxes, often for services that do not benefit us or for benefits which we take for granted. Governments tell us that we can't build homes and factories on public lands, that we can't throw junk into the air and rivers, that we can't drive at any speed we wish, and that we can't sell medicines without first testing their safety and efficacy. All this curtails the freedom and the wealth of some. But at the same time, such "government interference" promotes the welfare of the others: of consumers, travelers, ordinary citizens and, yes, property owners. Interestingly, among the liberal democracies, the constraints of "big government" tend to burden the wealthy and powerful, while those same constraints protect the poor and the weak, all of whom, in a just polity, are equal citizens before the law.

No impact/alternative - libertarianism flawed – dependency exists

The libertarian project fails: assumes everybody is a rational and independent actors

Daskal 10 (Steve Assistant Professor of Philosophy @ Northern Illinois University. Social Theory & Practice Vol. 36 Issue 1, p21-43, 23p Libertarianism Left and Right, the Lockean Proviso, and the Reformed Welfare State. Jan2010) TS

Critics of libertarianism have raised objections against each of these central features of the libertarian framework. To begin with, the reliance on state-of-nature theorizing renders libertarianism subject to the criticism that it illegitimately treats people as fully independent, or atomistic, agents. In what has come to be called the “dependency critique,” feminist philosophers such as Martha Nussbaum have argued that liberal theorists in general tend to ignore the fact that as a normal part of the course of human life one experiences periods of extreme dependency, most notably as an infant or child. 8 Because libertarian theories are built on the presupposition that we can gain insight into the obligations owed between actual people in the real world by evaluating the actions of fictional agents in a state of nature, libertarianism is a prime target of this dependency critique, particularly given that libertarians uniformly imagine the fictional agents in the state of nature to start out fully independent from one another. As Nussbaum and other feminist critics see it, the libertarian project is essentially a nonstarter, because even if we could determine the obligations owed between agents who are initially construed to be completely independent of one another, that would tell us nothing about the obligations owed between actual people who do not just happen to be born and raised in a fundamentally social environment but by their nature must begin their lives in such an environment

Alternative fails – libertarianism = liberalism – vague definitions

Libertarianism is no different from liberalist theories and liberalism is key to a functioning society

Partridge 4 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

The Libertarian "minimalist state," designed to protect fundamental rights of "life, liberty and property," may not be all that 'minimalist.' To the libertarians, the only legitimate function of government is to protect life, liberty and property -- which is to say, the only legitimate public institutions are the military, the police, and the courts. But the boundaries of even these functions are not clearly defined, nor do the full implications of these "rights" end where the libertarians might expect. Arguably, the maintenance of "civic friendship" and the "well ordered society," promoted by such liberal contractarian theorists as John Rawls, falls under the libertarian criteria. For it may be the case that "life, liberty and property," can be secured only if society is "well-ordered," and "civic friendship" obtains; that is, when the critical mass of citizens recognize their common stake in a "shared fate," when, in a word, they have a well-founded loyalty to their contract-state. But such a society must be a community as described by liberal theory, and not the aggregate of "utility maximizing egoists" envisioned by the free-market libertarians. Again, we ask, how secure are "life, liberty and property" in the failed communities of Bosnia and Ulster?

Alternative fails – coercion inevitable

Restriction of freedom is inevitable, even under libertarian ethics. Freeing of slaves proves.

LaFollette 79 (Hugh, Chair in Ethics @ University of South Florida, http://www.hughlafollette.com/papers/libertar.htm, 194-206)

Consequently, everyone's life is not, given the presence of negative general rights and negative general duties, free from the interference of others. The "mere" presence of others imposes duties on each of us, it limits everyone's freedom. In fact, these restrictions are frequently extensive. For example, in the previously described case I could have all of the goods I wanted; I could take what I wanted, when I wanted. To say that such actions are morally or legally impermissible significantly limits my freedom, and my "happiness," without my consent. Of course I am not saying these restrictions are bad. Obviously they aren't. But it does show that the libertarian fails to achieve his major objective, namely, to insure that an individual's freedom cannot be limited without his consent. The libertarian's own moral constraints limit each person's freedom without consent.7This is even more vividly seen when we look at an actual historical occurrence. In the nineteenth century American slaveholders were finally legally coerced into doing what they were already morally required to do: free their slaves. In many cases this led to the slave owners' financial and social ruin: they lost their farms, their money, and their power. Of course they didn't agree to their personal ruin; they didn't agree to this restriction on their freedom. Morally they didn't have to consent; it was a remedy long overdue. Even the libertarian would agree. The slave holders' freedom was justifiably restricted by the presence of other people; the fact that there were other persons limited their acceptable alter natives. But that is exactly what the libertarian denies. Freedom, he claims, cannot be justifiably restricted without consent. In short, the difficulty in this: the libertarian talks as if there can be no legitimate non-consensual limitations on freedom, yet his very theory involves just such limitations. Not only does this appear to be blatantly inconsistent, but even if he could avoid this inconsistency, there appears to be no principled way in which he can justify only his theory's non-consensual limitations on freedom.

Alternative fails – any residual links revert the revolution

Alt fails: All it takes is a few people who prefer statism to revert back

Konkin in 80. (prominent libertarian activist, Koman Publishing, The new Libertarian Manifesto, October -1980, http://agorism.info/NewLibertarianManifesto.pdf, DT)

Undoubtedly the freest society yet envisioned is that of Robert LeFevre. All relations between people are voluntary exchanges - a free market. No one will injure another or trespass in any way. Of course, a lot more than statism would be to be eliminated from individual consciousness for his society to exist. Most damaging of all to this perfectly free society is its lack of a mechanism of correction. [3] All it takes is a handful of practitioners of coercion who enjoy their ill-gotten plunder in enough company to sustain them - and freedom is dead. Even if all are living free, one "bite of the apple," one throwback, reading old history or rediscovering evil on his own, will "unfree" the perfect society

Alternative fails/plan solves – the aff is a prerequisite

The aff is a prerequisite to libertarianism and the libertarian project is futile: it inevitably reverts back to liberalism.

Partridge 4 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

Wealth can be acquired and maintained only in a system wherein the most and the least advantaged share a communal loyalty in the social system under which that wealth was acquired. Such a system would presumably contain "social safety nets" to ensure a minimal amount of support and care for the least fortunate. In addition, the system might be expected to support education, art and culture, so that all citizens might acquire a shared loyalty to community values. Otherwise, the least advantaged may no longer feel that they have a stake in the system, whereupon the wealth of the advantaged may become vulnerable to revolution. Thus, "through the back door" of enlightened self interest, returns the "welfare state" that the libertarians believed they had evicted through the front door. In short, it is not at all clear that the "minimal state" required to secure the libertarian rights to life, liberty and property is all that "minimal." In fact, the liberal would insist, his activist government agenda must be adopted if these libertarian rights are to be secure.

Alternative fails/plan solves – the aff is better and no clear alternative

Libertarianism inevitably fails but the aff can solve what it attempts to achieve.

Partridge 4 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

In conclusion, we have found that in numerous cases the libertarian doctrines of social atomism, unfettered free markets, and unconfined personal liberty, bear morally atrocious and practically unmanageable implications. In contrast, these implications are avoided by the liberal assumptions: (a) that human beings are essentially social creatures, (b) that morality and justice are independent of, and indeed the foundations of, ideal market mechanisms, (c) that in readily identifiable instances, advantages to each result in ruin for all, (d) that, conversely, advantages to all exact sacrifices (e.g. taxes) upon each, and finally (e) that, accordingly, optimal social policies are assessed from “the moral point of view” – from the perspective of the “ideal disinterested spectator.” (John Rawls’s “Original Position”). Accordingly, the liberal concludes, human excellence, social harmony and, yes, personal liberty for all, can best be accomplished through the agency of a government answerable to the people, and through the rule of law, applied impartially and equally to all. Admittedly, the liberal democracy and regulated capitalism that I would recommend is not perfect -- nor is any human institution under the sun. But an anecdotal inventory of the shortcomings of public regulation does not, by itself, constitute a repudiation of the existing system. What is required is a clear and persuasive presentation of a better alternative. This the libertarians have not offered us. Nor can they, so long as anyone pays more than casual attention to human psychology, ecological necessities, and the lessons of history.

Alternative fails – it’s too simplistic

Libertarianism fails: multiple warrants

Partridge 04 Ernest  Research Associate in Philosophy at the University of California, Riverside, and a lecturer-consultant in Applied Ethics and Environmental Ethics. *With Liberty for Some* Environmental Philosophy Prentice Hall, 2004).

In short, libertarianism fails, not because it is wrong, but because it is insufficiently and over-simplistically right. It correctly celebrates the rights of life, liberty and property, and then fails to examine the conflicts and paradoxes that issue from these rights. Moreover, the libertarian fails to appreciate that a just system of adjudication of these rights and claims of presumably equal citizens would necessarily restore much of the very governmental structure that the libertarians would abolish and that the liberals defend.