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### 1NC Shell

#### **Transportation Investment destroy free market principles and basic property rights- this results in massive inefficiencies**

Carson 10 (Kevin A. Carson, senior fellow and holder of the Karl Hess Chair in Social Theory at the Center for a Stateless Society, this article won the 2011 Beth A. Hoffman Memorial Prize for Economic Writing, November 2010, “The Distorting Effects of Transportation Subsidies”, Foundation for Economic Education, <http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-distorting-effects-of-transportation-subsidies/>]

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

#### Government coercion never results in a better society –rejecting the plan is necessary to prevent tyranny

**Browne 95** (Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work,)

Social reformers and crime-busters try to beg off responsibility for the¶ destruction by saying these invasions are the price we pay to create a better¶ world, a better nation, or a better community. After all, “you can’t make an¶ omelet without breaking a few eggs.”¶ But, somehow it’s always someone else’s eggs that get broken —¶ never theirs.¶ And the omelet never materializes — only cracked shells and¶ broken lives.¶ Their better world never materializes because it depends upon coercion to¶ succeed. And coercion never improves society. So government is always¶ promising to do something that’s impossible — such as coercing people to stop¶ taking drugs or abandon their prejudices.¶ When the coercion doesn’t work, the politicians must impose harsher and¶ harsher measures in order to show they’re “serious” about the problem and,¶ inevitably, we come to the abuses we saw in the preceding chapter — such as¶ property seizures and “no-knock” invasions of your home. Some of these things — such as getting children to snitch on their parents or¶ ordering people into reeducation programs — already are happening in America.¶ The others have been proposed and are being considered seriously. History has¶ shown that each was an important step in the evolution of the world’s worst¶ tyrannies. We move step by step further along the road to oppression because¶ each step seems like such a small one. And because we’re told that¶ each step will give us something alluring in return — less crime,¶ cheaper health care, safety from terrorists, an end to discrimination¶ — even if none of the previous steps delivered on its promise. And¶ because the people who promote these steps are well-meaning¶ reformers who would use force only to build a better world.

#### The alternative is to embrace the free market as the only solution to effective transportation infrastructure

**Browne 95** (Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work,)

But if each person has his own standards, how can the needs and wants of¶ different people all be served?¶ The marketplace takes care of that automatically.¶ Most companies offer products that are a little different from those of their¶ competitors — in order to catch the consumers who prefer those differences.¶ That’s why there are so many different car models to choose from. That’s why¶ there are so many different computers and computer programs. That’s why there¶ are so many different kinds of salad dressing in the supermarket, and so many¶ different dresses in the department store.¶ In the marketplace, you get to weigh safety, quality, service, features, and¶ price by your standards — and pick the product that’s closest to what you want.¶ And your choices don’t keep anyone else from choosing what he wants.¶ Everyone can make his own choice without preventing others from getting what¶ they want.¶ And the opportunity to choose isn’t limited to products. It applies as well to¶ the services you require — to such things as safety information, guaranteed¶ repair service, special help in making a selection, instruction in how to operate a¶ product, a cheaper alternative, shopping without leaving your home, or almost¶ anything else. If a sufficient number of people want it, someone will see that¶ desire as an opportunity to profit, and will make the service available.¶ It isn’t necessary to muster a majority to make something available — as it is¶ in political matters. Many a company prospers by serving only 1% of its market¶ — because it provides the features the 1% want. For example, there are hundreds¶ of magazines, each with a devoted readership. There are thousands of furniture¶ manufacturers, each producing the kinds of chairs that some people want. There¶ are millions of businesses, each offering something a little different that some¶ people want. And even when an industry, such as breakfast cereal, is dominated¶ by a few giant companies, each competes by offering dozens of choices.

## \*\*\*Links\*\*\*

### Link - Generic

#### **Transportation infrastructure is a method for expansion of government control transfer of wealth to the elite and creates massive inefficiencies**

The Plenarchist 12 (The Plenarchist, man of liberty, February 4th 2012, “No government, no transportation, right?”, <http://plenarchist.wordpress.com/2012/02/04/no-government-no-transportation-right/>]

The coup de grace argument cited by government apologists is that without government, there would be no roads. But is that really true? Before the government’s violent takeover of “internal improvements” including transportation, private roads were thriving in the US through much of the 19th century.¶ According to Klein and Majewski, “Private road building came and went in waves throughout the nineteenth century and across the country, with between 2,500 and 3,200 companies successfully financing, building, and operating their toll road.” Private road building was a booming business as people, particularly farmers, realized that with a road their landholdings became more valuable. Private road builders did not steal land through eminent domain takings as the government does. Landowners negotiated with the road owners and roads got built; a voluntary positive sum exchange.¶ But the progressive movement from the early 1800′s, of which Lincoln was part, led to the violent government takeover of private enterprise in transportation. What followed in the words of DiLorenzo at Mises, “Governments at all levels did intervene, however, with subsidies for canals, roads, and railroads, and their record of performance was nothing less than monstrous.”¶ Looking back on this history, we can see that the “progressive movement” was really a blinder perpetrated by Northern industrialists with help from their paid-for politicians like Lincoln to plunder the wealth of one group of people and transfer it to themselves through government largess and subsidies.¶ By all appearances, the modern highway system in the United States is a marvel and yet a more circumspect look reveals a different story. The highway system is in fact a monstrosity and one that is making America poorer and will undoubtedly continue to cost Americans dearly. It now hangs around the neck of the US like an albatross.¶ Under government stewardship, the highway system has been grossly overbuilt, is enormously inefficient, and disastrously wasteful of resources. The highway system in the US is a direct cause of US wars in the Middle East due to its insatiable need for oil. Innovation in transportation has all but ceased over the last century and the maintenance cost of the current infrastructure is unsustainable. The highway system in the US will likely become a major contributor to the inevitable economic decline of the US as long as it remains under government control. This is because the government monopoly of transportation is inherently committed to this dinosaur. There is no incentive for the government to do anything but keep the system patched. If the government does consider alternatives, it only looks at old technologies such as light rail; government has no imagination. The government is anti-innovation and the politicians are beholden to the lobbying interests who milk the system in its current form. Serving the interests of the public is low on the priority list.¶ The government monopoly of transportation infrastructure has led to many problems that undoubtedly would not have arisen or the forcible displacement of millions of land owners through eminent domain takings. Urban sprawl is a direct consequence of the exercise of eminent domain and zoning laws. The combination of these two government policies is to artificially reduce the real cost of land acquisition through theft. That has led to the abundance of single residence suburbs and various commercial districts throughout urban metro areas. People now live in one part of the city, drive many miles to a job (much of the time stuck in congestion), leave their car sitting all day, drive home, drive to the grocery… This transportation paradigm has been what politicians and government planners have foisted on us which has led to a massive waste of land and other resources for infrastructure. And under government control, we get lack of innovation and choice in transport modes, massive consumption of oil, pollution, millions of relocated businesses and residents, and millions of highway deaths over the 20th century. The inevitable conclusion in the absence of competitive free markets and property rights.¶ It’s ironic that anti-sprawl people blame the marketplace and greed of people for loss of farmland and the development of rural areas when in fact it has been their friend, the government, all along who will always serve those who can pay for privilege; not the people. In a free society with no government intervention, urban development would undoubtedly have been much more compact and multi-use. Had the US embraced capitalism and property rights instead of “progressivism” and interventionist government, the urban landscape would actually today look a lot more like what environmentalists have wanted with high density development and public transit of some form.¶ And there are those government defenders who will tell us that the highway system in the United States has been the engine of economic growth, but it is too convenient for them since we don’t know what a free market in transportation would have brought us. We might today really be living in a Jetsons world with PAT (personal air transit) or PRT (personal rapid transit).¶ But now the transportation infrastructure in the US that created all that prosperity will also very likely become an economic noose around the neck of the nation as the cost of maintaining the infrastructure and inability of the system to adapt to population growth overwhelm it’s functional benefit. Even now, people sit idling for hours on congested freeways. So at some point, the system will fail under it’s own weight as the US government crashes the value of the dollar (another brilliant failure of government). And without the competition driven innovation of the marketplace, the government will make many costly missteps to try to fix the problems they created. People will increasingly be told by their overlords to accept lower standards of service such as forced carpooling and cattle cars (light rail transit).

#### **Government control of transportation results in massive inefficiencies- only privatization solves**

Dehaven and Edwards 10 (Tad Dehaven, budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute, Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at Cato, June 17th 2010, “Privatize Transportation Spending”, The Washington Times, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/privatize-transportation-spending>]

If the president ever gets serious about eliminating programs, the $91 billion Department of Transportation would be a good place to start. The DOT should be radically chopped. America's mobile citizens would be better off for it.¶ Rising federal control over transportation has resulted in the political misallocation of funds, bureaucratic mismanagement and costly one-size-fits-all regulations of the states. The solution is to devolve most of DOT's activities back to state governments and the private sector. We should follow the lead of other nations that have turned to the private sector to fund their highways, airports, air traffic control and other infrastructure.¶ The first reform is to abolish federal highway aid to the states and related gasoline taxes. Highway aid is tilted toward states with powerful politicians, not necessarily to the states that are most in need. It also often goes to boondoggle projects like Alaska's "Bridge to Nowhere." Furthermore, federal highway aid comes with costly regulations like the Davis-Bacon labor rules, which raise state highway costs.¶ For their part, the states should seek out private funding for their highways. Virginia is adding toll lanes on the Capitol Beltway that are partly privately financed, and Virginia is also home to the Dulles Greenway, a 14-mile private highway in operation since 1995. Ending federal subsidies would accelerate the trend toward such innovative projects.¶ Another DOT reform is to end subsidies to urban transit systems. Federal aid favors light rail and subways, which are much more expensive than city buses. Rail systems are sexy, but they eat up funds that could be used for more flexible and efficient bus services. Ending federal aid would prompt local governments to make more cost-effective transit decisions. There is no reason why, for example, that cities couldn't reintroduce private-sector transit, which was the norm in U.S. cities before the 1960s.¶ To government planners, intercity high-speed rail is even sexier than urban rail systems. The DOT is currently dishing out $8 billion for high-speed rail projects across the country, as authorized in the 2009 stimulus bill. Most people think that the French and Japanese fast trains are cool, but they don't realize that the price tag is enormous. For us to build a nationwide system of bullet-style trains would cost up to $1 trillion.¶ The truth about high-speed trains is that even in densely-populated Japan and Europe, they are money losers, while carrying few passengers compared to cars, airlines and buses. The fantasy of high-speed rail in America should be killed before it becomes a huge financial drain on our already broke government.¶ Through its ownership of Amtrak, the federal government also subsidizes slow trains. The government has dumped almost $40 billion into the company since it was created in 1971. Amtrak has a poor on-time record, its infrastructure is in bad shape, and it carries only a tiny fraction of intercity passengers. Politicians prevent Amtrak from making cost-effective decisions regarding its routes, workforce polices, capital investment and other aspects of business. Amtrak should be privatized to save taxpayer money and give the firm the flexibility it needs to operate efficiently.¶ A final area in DOT to make budget savings is aviation. Federal aid to airports should be ended and local governments encouraged to privatize their airports and operate without subsidies. In recent decades, dozens of airports have been privatized in major cities such as Amsterdam, Auckland, Frankfurt, London, Melbourne, Sydney and Vienna.¶ Air traffic control (ATC) can also be privatized. The DOT's Federal Aviation Administration has a terrible record in implementing new technologies in a timely and cost-effective manner. Many nations have moved toward a commercialized ATC structure, and the results have been very positive.¶ Canada privatized its ATC system in 1996 in the form of a nonprofit corporation. The company, NavCanada, has a very good record on both safety and innovation. Moving to a Canadian-style ATC system would help solve the FAA's chronic management and funding problems, and allow our aviation infrastructure to meet rising aviation demand.¶ There are few advantages in funding transportation infrastructure from Washington, but many disadvantages. America should study the market-based transportation reforms of other countries and use the best ideas to revitalize our infrastructure while ending taxpayer subsidies.

#### The state is a coercive mechanism- anything besides punishment is outside the bounds of the state’s authority.

Kraut 97, Richard Kraut, [Professor of Philosophy, Northwestern University], “Aristotelianism and libertarianism”, Critical Review 11, no. 3 [Summer 1997], http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/08913819708443466

From these points, RDU infer that the state is highly circumscribed in what it can do to promote the good of citizens. The government cannot make them rational or virtuous; it cannot even contribute to their well-being by handing out money or promoting health. Since many of the elements of happiness differ from one person to another, and all of them require the initiative and planning of the individual, the government's role can only be to secure the basic institutional structure that allows citizens to pursue their conception of happiness as they perceive it. Governments should promote the rule of law, protect property, safeguard the freedom to make contracts, and so on. A larger role—shaping the ends citizens pursue, or providing them with all-purpose means—is beyond its competence, because of the self-directed aspect of human happiness and the diversity of human fulfillment. RDU concede that many individuals who live in a free society will pursue shallow goals, and will do little or nothing to promote their own well-being. But they think the state can do nothing to prevent or remedy this unfortunate situation, because it is by its nature the wrong sort of institution to address itself to these human weaknesses and failures. In essence the state is a coercive power. The state is necessary because we need an institution that threatens and punishes those who use violence, theft, or other illicit methods to invade the moral boundaries of others. The fundamental purpose of the state is to safeguard these moral boundaries, and its coercive nature makes it incompetent to perform any larger role than this. When it tries to do more, it accomplishes nothing worthwhile, wastes resources, and itself becomes an invader of individual moral boundaries.

#### Spending on transportation infrastructure is opposed to the idea of a minimal state.

Solimano 99, Andres Solimano, [Director, Country Management Unit, Colombia, Ecuador and Venezuela, The World Bank], 1999, “Beyond Unequal Development: An Overview”, Distributive Justice and Economic Development. The University of Michigan Press.

Another perspective is provided by Neo-marxism. In particular, marxian economics sees unequal property relations and command of productive wealth in capitalism as the main factors in generating and reproducing existing inequalities over time 4 . Neo-marxism eschew the idea of a social contract negotiated from the veil of ignorance. On the contrary, this view stresses that the owners of productive wealth design or influence, at the end, institutions that are functional to their interests rather than to the interests of the less favored in society; hence, the neo-marxian claim of the unfair nature of capitalist society. In contrast, Libertarians as Robert Nozick for example, see the possession of wealth and the right to enjoy its benefits, as a natural right of the individual, and part of their "self-ownership" that includes the right of private use of productive assets and natural resources 5 . Libertarians propose a “minimal state” devoid of powers of taxation that expropriate the fruits of individual effort and risk-taking.

#### Federal government is too much of a role in transportation infrastructure.

Edwards 10, [Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, a manager with PricewaterhouseCoopers, and an economist with the Tax Foundation], “Department of Transportation Proposed Spending Cuts”, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/spending-cuts/.

Most Department of Transportation activities are properly the responsibility of state and local governments and the private sector. There are few advantages in funding infrastructure such as highways and airports from Washington, but there are many disadvantages. Federal involvement results in political misallocation of resources, bureaucratic mismanagement, and costly one-size-fits-all regulations imposed on the states. The Federal Highway Administration should be eliminated. Taxpayers and highway users would be better off if federal highway spending and gasoline taxes were ended. State governments could more efficiently plan their highway systems without federal intervention. The states should look to the private sector for help in funding and operating highways, and they ought to move forward with innovations such as expressways with electronic tolling. The Federal Transit Administration should be eliminated. Federal transit subsidies have caused local governments to make inefficient transportation choices. Federal aid favors rail systems, which are more expensive and less flexible than bus systems. The removal of federal subsidies and related regulations would spur local governments to discover more cost-effective transportation solutions, such as opening transit markets to private operators. Air traffic control should be removed from the federal budget, and the ATC system should be set up as a stand-alone and self-funded agency or private company. Many nations have moved towards such a commercialized ATC structure, and the results have been very positive with regard to efficiency and safety. Canada's reform in the 1990s to create a private nonprofit ATC corporation is a good model for the United States to follow. U.S. ATC is currently overseen by the Federal Aviation Administration, which has serious funding problems and a poor record on implementing new technologies. Moving to a Canadian-style ATC system would help solve these problems and allow our aviation infrastructure to meet rising aviation demand. Amtrak has provided second-rate rail service for decades, while consuming almost $40 billion in federal subsidies. It has a poor on-time record, and its infrastructure is in bad shape. As a government agency, it is hamstrung in its decisionmaking regarding routes, workforce polices, capital investment, and other aspects of business. Amtrak should be privatized to give it the management flexibility it needs to operate in a more efficient and competitive manner. The table shows that federal taxpayers would save about $85 billion annually by closing down the agencies and programs listed. The department would retain its current activities regarding highway safety, aviation safety, and some other regulatory functions. Those functions could be reformed as well, but the most important thing is to end federal subsidies for transportation activities that would be better handled by the states and private sector. America should take heed of the market-based reforms being implemented abroad, and pursue similar solutions to its transportation challenges.

#### Taxes

Cato Institute 09, “CATO HANDBOOK FOR POLICYMAKERS”, 2009, 7th Edition, http://www.cato.org/pubs/handbook/hb111/hb111-24.pdf.

Nationally, gas taxes, tolls, and other highway user fees cover 85 to 90 percent of the cost of building, maintaining, and operating highways, roads, and streets. In contrast, transit fares cover only 28 percent of the cost of building and operating the nation’s transit systems. On one hand, this means that transit riders have little sense of the real cost of their mode of travel. On the other hand, dependence on taxes encourages many transit agencies to build expensive urban monuments that please politicians, construction companies, and other powerful interests rather than provide high-quality, economical services to actual transit users.

#### **Taking citizens’ resources to pay for roads is a violation of their liberty.**

Vallentyne 12, Peter Vallentyne, [Professor of Philosophy at the University of Missouri], "Libertarianism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2012 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2012/entries/libertarianism/>.

Libertarianism holds that many of the powers of the modern welfare state are morally illegitimate. Agents of the state violate the rights of citizens when they punish, or threaten to punish, a person for riding a motorcycle without a helmet, for taking drugs, for refusing to serve in the military, for engaging in consensual sexual relations in private, or for gambling. Furthermore, agents of the state violate the rights of citizens when they force, or threaten to force, individuals to transfer their legitimately held wealth to the state in order to provide for pensions, to help the needy, or to pay for public goods (e.g., parks or roads). (Left-libertarians object to such transfers to the extent that these are in excess of what is owed for the appropriation of natural resources.) Some libertarian-leaning theorists—such as Hayek (1960)—argue that it is legitimate to force people to pay their fair share of the costs of providing basic police services (i.e., protection of the libertarian rights and prosecution of those who violate them), but it's hard to see how this could be legitimate on right-libertarian grounds. If one does not voluntarily agree to share one's wealth in this way, the mere fact that one reaps a benefit from the services does not, on libertarian grounds, generate an enforceable duty to pay one's fair share.[6] One objection, then, that libertarians raise against the modern welfare state is that it uses force, or the threat thereof, to restrict people's freedom to engage in activities that do not violate anyone's rights. A second objection is that the modern welfare state—and most states generally—uses force, or the threat thereof, to restrict people's freedom to use force to protect and enforce their own rights. Although most states recognize a right to use force in self-defense, few states recognize a legal right to forcibly extract compensation from, or punish, a person who has violated one's rights. States typically punish those who attempt to impose the relevant rectification—even if the private citizens impose the very same rectification that the state would impose. Non-pacifist libertarians, however, deny this. Each individual has the right to enforce his rights in various ways, and these are not lost unless the individual voluntarily gives them up. The objection here, then, is not that agents of the state enforce people's rights (which they are perfectly entitled to do if the protected person so wishes), but rather that the state uses force to prevent citizens from directly enforcing their own rights.

### Link- Roads

#### Government controlled roads cause thousands of deaths every year- only privatization solves

Block 09 (Walter Block, Harold E. Wirth Eminent Scholar Endowed Chair in Economics at Loyola University, senior fellow of the Mises Institute, April 16th 2009, “A Future of Private Roads and Highways”, <http://mises.org/daily/3416>, Ludwig Von Mises Institute]

This is so far off the radar of public-policy analysis and apart from the concerns of politicians, pundits, and commentators that few people will take it seriously. Do not be one of them. Your very life may be at stake. For over 40,000 people die on the nation's roadways every year, and you or a loved one might one day join this horrid list.¶ Do not be misled by the oft-made contention that the actual cause of highway fatalities is speed, drunkenness, vehicle malfunction, driver error, etc. These are only proximate causes. The ultimate cause of our dying like flies in traffic accidents is that those who own and manage these assets supposedly in the name of the public — the various roads bureaucrats — cannot manage their way out of the proverbial paper bag. It is they and they alone who are responsible for this carnage.¶ This does not mean that, were thoroughfares placed in private hands, the death toll would be zero. It would not. But, at least, every time the life of someone was tragically snuffed out, someone in a position to ameliorate these dangerous conditions would lose money, and this tends, wonderfully, to focus the minds of the owners. This is why we do not have similar problems with bananas, baskets, and bicycles, or the myriad other goods and services supplied to us by a (relatively) free-enterprise system.¶ If the highways were now commercial ventures, as once in our history they were, and upward of 40,000 people were killed on them annually, you can bet your bottom dollar that Ted Kennedy and his ilk would be holding Senate hearings on the matter. Blamed would be "capitalism," "markets," "greed," i.e., the usual suspects. But it is the public authorities who are responsible for this slaughter of the innocents.

#### Government control and regulation of roads results in massive inefficencies

Peters 96(Eric Peters, reporter on automotive issues for the Washington Times, February 1996, “Private Roads”, The Free Market, <http://mises.org/freemarket_detail.aspx?control=202>]

But what if people need to get around and government doesn't have the money to build the road? This is the scenario that is appearing more and more often, and private entrepreneurs are begging for a chance to give road enterprise a try.¶ Take Virginia's just-completed "Dulles Greenway" toll road. Privately conceived, funded, and operated, this 14-mile extension of an existing limited access highway connects Northern Virginia suburbs with the Main Washington-D.C. area transportation arteries.¶ It is the first modern highway in America underwritten solely by private venture capital--and the first private toll road built in Virginia since 1816.¶ The impetus behind the construction was an exploding number of people who need to get from here to there. Travel demands and low-price road access have made the public roads a headache. A 15-mile trek in these suburbs can take up to 90 minutes. Ordinarily, the state would built more roads, but the money couldn't be raised, thanks to the political priority of welfare demands.¶ Moreover, three fourths of Virginia's road money already goes toward maintaining the existing ones. Virginia could have raised taxes. But that option is increasingly untenable given the already confiscatory rates faced by the state's fed-up citizenry.¶ Seeing an opportunity, Cigna Corp., Prudential Power Funding, and John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance stepped in, formed a new corporation called TRIP, and made an offer. TRIP would build the road if it could reap the profits. Virginia agreed, and despite enormous bureaucratic obstacles and (still) potentially ruinous government barriers, the road has at last been completed.¶ Allowing the owners to run it like a business is another matter. The chief problem is the price structure. Before the road was finished, Virginia formed the State Corporation Commission to regulate road prices in the same way the government regulates utilities today. To change prices, TRIP has to ask permission, and the Commission can approve or reject any proposal.¶ Right now, tolls on the Greenway are set to remain at $2.10 one way until the year 2010. But that price doesn't account for peak periods, off periods, commuter discounts, or other variables which would be part of a truly free-market system. Thanks to government intervention, TRIP lacks the ability to respond to changing market conditions and reduce shortages and surpluses of drivers on its own road.¶ Imagine a supermarket that couldn't raise or lower the price of ground beef depending on availability and consumer demand. It had to keep beef at one price all the time. The resulting periods of shortages and surpluses would frustrate consumers. Any rigidity or inflexibility in pricing causes inefficiencies and waste.¶ The CEO of TRIP, Michael Crane, is extremely concerned about this problem. Today he says he would never undertake another private highway system--at least not under Greenway conditions. For example, TRIP spent $50 billion over seven years before ground was even broken. Merely obtaining the requisite easements from government was a bureaucratic nightmare.¶ There is another hidden difficulty. Private roads have to compete with public roads, which are either free to drivers (but not taxpayers) or heavily subsidized. The true costs of public roads are hidden and diffuse, while the costs of private roads are concentrated on the people who use them, just as they should be. The unfair competition of public roads has taken a heavy toll, and travel on Greenway has been sparser than expected, for now.¶ The project may yet succeed and turn a profit, especially as demands on the public roads grow and traffic becomes more and more congested. On the other hand, bureaucracy and unfair competition from government could strangle the project. That would be a tragedy.

#### Government roads results in thousands of deaths every year and massive inefficiencies

Block 79 (Walter Block, Harold E. Wirth Eminent Scholar Endowed Chair in Economics at Loyola University, senior fellow of the Mises Institute, Summer 1979, “FREE MARKET TRANSPORTATION: DENATIONALIZING THE ROADS”, The Journal of Libertarian Studies, <http://mises.org/journals/jls/3_2/3_2_7.pdf>]

What reasons are there for advocating the free market approach for the ¶ highway industry? First and foremost is the fact that the present government ¶ ownership and management has failed. The death toll, the suffocation ¶ during urban rush hours, and the poor state of repair of the highway stock, ¶ are all eloquent testimony t o the lack of success which has marked the reign ¶ of government control. Second, and perhaps even more important, is a ¶ reason for this state of affairs. It is by no means an accident that government ¶ operation has proven to be a debacle, and that private enterprise can succeed ¶ where government has failed. ¶ It is not only that government has been staffed with incompetents. The ¶ roads authorities are staffed, sometimes, with able management. Nor can it ¶ be denied that at least some who have achieved high rank in the world of ¶ private business have been incompetent. The advantage enjoyed by the ¶ market is the automatic reward and penalty system imposed by profits and ¶ losses. When customers are pleased, they continue patronizing those mer- ¶ chants who have served them well. These businesses are thus allowed to earn ¶ a profit. They can prosper and expand. Entrepreneurs who fail to satisfy, o n ¶ the other hand, are soon driven to bankruptcy. ¶ This is a continual process repeated day in, day out. There is always a¶ tendency in the market for the reward of the able, and the deterrence of ¶ those who are not efficient. Nothing like perfection is ever reached, but the ¶ continual grinding down of the ineffective, and rewarding of the competent, ¶ brings about a level of managerial skill unmatched by any other system. ¶ Whatever may be said of the political arena, it is one which completely lacks ¶ this market process. Although there are cases where capability rises to the ¶ fore, there is no continual process which promotes this. ¶ Because this is well known, even elementary, we have entrusted the market ¶ to produce the bulk of our consumer goods and capital equipment. What is ¶ difficult to see is that this analysis applies to the provision of roads no less ¶ than to fountain pens, frisbees, or fishsticks.

### Link- HSR

HSR is used as a ploy to force the middle class out of a free market economy only to serve the interests of a small group of elite

D’Amato 11 (David S. D’Amato, news analyst for the Center for a Stateless Society, February 9th 2011, “All Aboard the Money Train”, Center for a Stateless Economy, http://c4ss.org/content/6090]

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

#### Government involvement in HSR makes solvency impossible and creates inefficiency- Only the private sector solves

Anderson 02 (William L. Anderson, associate professor of economics at Frostburg State University, adjunct scholar at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy and the Ludwig von Mises Institute, September 16th 2002, “Socialism and Capital Stock”, Ludwig Von Mises Institute, <http://mises.org/daily/1031/>]

The decision by Amtrak, the nation's socialist passenger rail system, to pull all 18 of its Acela high-speed locomotives out of service highlights once again the truism that socialism and capital do not mix very well. What is being touted in the news media as simply a maintenance issue is actually another example of the fact that, under socialism, it is impossible for individuals to engage in necessary economic calculation. As Ludwig von Mises noted more than eight decades ago, socialism is not only impossible in a practical sense, it is also impossible in theory.¶ Amtrak’s highly-touted Acela, which was supposed to bring European-style high-speed rail to the United States, has been plagued from the start with cost overruns and maintenance problems. Even before the latest revelation that there were serious problems with its shock absorbers, Amtrak riders already were seeing the famed fast locomotives being pulled into repair shops on a regular basis. For all intents and purposes, the Acela has been a colossal failure, one that most likely would not have occurred had a profit-seeking private enterprise owned passenger rail in this country.¶ The real issue in this sorry case is not the Acela itself. Instead, this high-speed fiasco is a small part of the larger quandary brought on with the futile attempts in socialist enterprises to engage in meaningful economic calculation, and the failure of people to recognize the actual problems.¶ In examining the economic difficulties of everyday life in the old communist-bloc nations, free-market economists tended to concentrate on the ubiquitous shortages that meant people would have to stand in line for hours just to obtain basic items. Economists correctly pointed out that the artificial price systems in socialist countries prevented goods from being sold at market-clearing prices. Unfortunately, they tended to stop with that analysis instead of looking at the larger underside of socialist failures, the creation and maintenance of capital stock. Yet, it is here that the greater problems of socialist "calculation" were clearly revealed.¶ Before going into the problem in greater detail, let me say that this important omission was not an accident or just a simple oversight by mainstream economists. Indeed, like socialism itself, the failure to recognize the capital problem in socialism is the result of deficiencies in the mainstream economic theories. Although mainstream economists have chosen to ignore the Austrian theories of capital creation and maintenance, this does not mean Austrian theory is intellectually deficient. Instead, Austrian economics better explains economic problems from shortages in the old Soviet bloc to the failure of Amtrak to keep its Acela on the tracks--or even to have purchased these locomotives in the first place.¶ Mainstream theory, as developed by Frank Knight and his followers, properly declares that capital consists of the tools that enable workers to create goods more abundantly and efficiently. Knight, however, never did clearly specify how and why capital is created, other than to say that it exists. Furthermore, Knight insisted that capital "maintains itself," and that once capital is created, its owners will somehow know how to keep it operating and when to replace it. In Knight’s view, private ownership was not an important factor in the decision-making process.¶ Such a theory clearly meshes with the Keynesian notion that aggregate demand is the key to a successful economy. In the Keynesian view, whenever there is adequate aggregate demand in the system, owners of capital automatically will create and maintain the necessary amounts of capital. The process, they believe, is self-sustaining, so all that is needed is for the government to ensure that the system enjoys enough demand through "appropriate" monetary and fiscal policies.¶ Austrians, on the other hand, see capital as being much more organic to the workings of individuals within a market setting. Capital, as Murray Rothbard correctly notes, comes from the pool of individual savings.[i] While economic thinkers as early as Adam Smith understood the role of savings in the creation of capital, mainstream economists have led the whole analysis off the correct path, while Austrians further developed and perfected the early theories.¶ Furthermore, Austrians point out that, in a modern economy, capital is connected with time preference, which determines the prevailing rates of interest. In fact, Mises and other Austrians, including F.A. Hayek, developed the famed Austrian business cycle theory by tying central monetary authorities' attempts to artificially lower interest rates to malinvestments of capital that must be liquidated when an economic boom turns into a bust.¶ Thus, in the Austrian view, the "correct" amount of capital within an economy is determined by the combination of time preferences of individuals acting within an unhampered market system of free prices and private property. To attempt to do so otherwise results in the case of the blind leading the blind.¶ When I visited the former East Germany 20 years ago, I was struck by how run-down everything appeared to be, from official buildings, to apartment complexes, to the rail lines. The entire place--considered by most to be the "showcase" of the former communist world--seemed to suffer from decay and neglect. Friends who had visited other communist countries reported the same thing to me.¶ The problem was that the capital stock clearly was not maintaining itself, as Knight had claimed it would. The East German government was permitting the capital stock to deteriorate to very low levels before making attempts--however feeble--to repair or replace it. One of the hidden stories of communist failure was the fact that much of the "vaunted" industrial system could not operate because of mechanical breakdowns of farm and factory machinery that could not be repaired quickly or efficiently.¶ This phenomenon was more than just a problem with "incentives," as mainstream economists claim. Granted, the lack of private enterprise did create perverse systems of incentives, but that is only part of the story. The real issue was that, under socialism, capital becomes a liability rather than an asset, and the problem is not limited to the former communist bloc economies. We can see this very problem in any socialistic enterprise, and especially in those sectors for which there are strict monopoly privileges for the state-run operations.¶ Let us take Amtrak, for example. As a government "corporation," Amtrak faces very different issues than does an entity like Delta Airlines. Although fares make up an important portion of Amtrak’s revenues, the firm is assured that taxpayers will always make up the difference between revenues and expenses, no matter how great the deficit, effectively socializing the company’s liabilities.¶ While traveling on Amtrak last year, I noticed that one of the restrooms in a passenger car not only was dirty and smelly but also had a number of implements held together by duct tape. I cannot imagine even a troubled entity like U.S. Airways (which recently filed for bankruptcy) using duct tape in restrooms on its planes.¶ Why would Amtrak permit such inferior capital stock onto the tracks? The reason is that the directors of Amtrak (who have no ownership stake in the company) are faced with scarcity problems of where to spend their revenues. Should they invest in better passenger cars with cleaner bathrooms, they must use funds that otherwise would go to their unionized workforce, which is much more interested in receiving raises than assuring passengers have a bathroom sans duct tape. ¶ In a private, profit-seeking system in which passenger revenues would provide the firm’s income, that would be an easy decision: passenger comfort and hygiene would come first. However, even though nasty bathrooms would ensure that some people would not want to travel on Amtrak, the fact that Congress will vote each year to cover Amtrak’s losses serves as a powerful incentive for the firm’s management to seek to keep its most militant workers happy with pay raises.

### Link- Infrastructure Bank

National infrastructure bank is used as a tool to transfer capital from the middle to upper class

Steelman 08 (Jacob Steelman, President of International Ventures Group, a global investment, finance and development company, August 7th 2008, “Beware of Wolves in Sheep’s Clothing”, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig9/steelman2.html>]

Rohatyn, who is frequently credited with the federal government (American taxpayer) bailing out New York City from its financial crisis in the 1970s, wants passage of the bill sponsored by United States Senators Dodd and Hagel for the creation of a national infrastructure bank to assist state and local governments increase "investment" in infrastructure. But this is just more of what we use to call public works (known as public jobs and waste of taxpayer money) now repackaged as "investment," a term coined during the Clinton administration. This national infrastructure bank would have a capital base of $60 billion. It would provide subsidies for certain projects, issue its own long-term bonds and insure the bonds of local and state governments resulting in an estimated $250 billion of funding and employment of a million or more (jobs is always a key political word used by promoters of such projects). In addition Rohatyn wants an additional $250 billion of revenue sharing by the federal government for state and local governments’ infrastructure projects particularly local schools (education is another key political word used in promoting government projects). Does anyone really think this will stop at $500 billion once the floodgates are opened?¶ It should be obvious where all this is heading – right into the pocketbook of Rohatyn’s client Lehman Brothers who will sell the bonds which are backed by the full faith and credit of the American taxpayers. These are not investments which provide any increase in wealth from the invested capital but rather transfer payments from taxpayers to the beneficiaries of these public make-work projects resulting in more waste of capital and taxpayers’ money. The beneficiaries will be the investment bankers such as Lehman Brothers who will have another financial product to sell (the long-term government bonds backed by the taxpayer), the holders of the bonds (who receive interest on the bonds which is paid by the American taxpayer) the contractors and businesses (and their workers) who are awarded the bids for construction of the infrastructure projects and the politicians and bureaucrats who will be working hard to funnel this new money into the pet projects of their constituents and clients. The losers will be the American taxpayers who will have more of their money taken by force to be transferred to the beneficiaries of these projects through taxation and inflation and who will now have less money for real investment and consumption.

### Link- PPP

PPP are used as a justification to expand government power and destroy efficient market allocation of resources

Brown 08 (Chris Brown, lecturer at the Australian Graduate School of Entrepreneurship at Swinburne University, December 12th 2008, “The Back Door to Socialism”, Ludwig Von Mises Institute, <http://mises.org/daily/3240>]

Barack Obama plans to initiate public-private partnerships (PPPs) on a grand scale. While the media focuses on Obama's First Dog or his left-handed jump shot, behind the scenes he is planning how to become president of the world. Therefore, it is worth enumerating many of his proposed partnerships so as to expose his actual policies, and then offer an Austro-libertarian analysis of these partnerships. As we will see, a mix of public and private ownership is a socialist arrangement, and a sly tactic employed by those looking for increased power, albeit under a different name: the public-private partnership.¶ PPPs are essentially contracts between a public agency and a private company where assets, risks, and rewards are shared in providing a good or service to the public. The rationale is typically that private enterprise provides greater efficiency and quality of service, while the government agency furnishes additional capital. They are claimed to (potentially) lead to "happy employees," better educational opportunities, and better public safety. Government agencies reportedly realize cost savings of 20 to 50 percent by using PPPs.¶ Of course, PPPs, dating back to at least 1652 when the Water Works Company of Boston began providing drinking water to Massachusetts colonists, are nothing new in the United States (or any country), and most government agencies and offices are engaged in using them. From the National Council for Public-Private Partnerships website we read the following:¶ Public-Private Partnerships [are] used for water/wastewater, transportation, urban development, and delivery of social services, to name only a few areas of application. Today, the average American city works with private partners to perform 23 out of 65 basic municipal services. The use of partnerships is increasing because it provides an effective tool in meeting public needs, improving the quality of services, and [is] more cost effective.¶ The treatment of so-called "public goods" in neoclassical economics is partly responsible for offering a justification for government intervention in providing for these goods and services. A large part of Obama's economic agenda is to encourage more PPPs —well beyond what neoclassical economists mean by "public goods" (e.g., defense services, streetlights).¶ Obama claims these partnerships will promote innovation at a local level through federal funding. Before we can engage in an analysis of PPPs, we must provide an overview (lengthy, but I believe worth exposing) of the various partnerships Obama proposes. PPPs will be used in the following ways under an Obama administration:¶ Deliver real broadband to communities that currently lack it. Encourage PPPs to "get low-income communities and residents connected [through] best practices among those that have deployed citywide free wireless broadband networks and how those lessons learned can be applied in other communities."¶ Modernize public safety networks and establish a PPP to "facilitate the development of a next generation network for use by public safety agencies on a priority basis."¶ Award public contracts to companies committed to American workers and end tax breaks for companies that send jobs overseas.¶ Create a national network of public-private business incubators by "investing $250 million per year to increase the number and size of incubators in disadvantaged communities throughout the country."¶ Expand PPPs to advance "leading edge technologies" in space and aeronautics research to spur economic growth and innovation.¶ Provide funding for "Early Learning Challenge Grants" where states will have to, among other requirements, develop strong public-private partnerships.¶ Establish a Presidential Early Learning Council to expand public/private investments in the "youngest children."¶ Issue competitive grants to PPPs for evidence-based models to help students graduate.¶ Mandate public service and require American middle and high school students to perform 50 hours of service a year, and for all college students to perform 100 hours of service a year. At the community level, PPPs will be used so "students can serve more outside the classroom."¶ Develop and deploy clean coal technology by using the Department of Energy to enter into PPPs to develop five new commercial scale "coal-fired plants with clean carbon capture and sequestration technology."¶ Expand PPPs between schools and arts organizations by increasing resources for the US Department of Education's Arts Education Model Development and Dissemination Grants.¶ Improve and expand PPPs to increase cultural and arts exchanges throughout the world and promote "cultural diplomacy."¶ Interact with the private sector from "electronic health records to the general supply chain."¶ PPPs: An Economic Analysis¶ Obama uses PPPs to justify government involvement and intervention, and he typically associates PPPs with innovation, which seems like an oxymoron. Fortunately, the Austrian economist can point out the many likely effects and unintended consequences of government intervention in the form of PPPs, including the (tragic) effects on entrepreneurship. We will discuss a few of these, using as our guide Mises's excellent and insightful book, Bureaucracy. Two topics often associated with entrepreneurship, innovation and risk, are perhaps the most pertinent in our discussion.¶ Innovation¶ One of the reasons Obama gives as a justification for these partnerships is to "spur innovation." There are many reasons why this will prove difficult, if not impossible. Private businesses that have a government-granted monopoly from a PPP will have less (or no) competition, decreasing any incentive to increase efficiency and provide better quality services and products at lower prices. With a government guarantee of revenue, either through the company (or government) charging a fee to customers for its services, or through government subsidy, there is less incentive to cut costs.¶ Innovation is also less likely if the partnership specifies revenue will be obtained in a "cost plus percentage" arrangement where companies will be guaranteed a specified amount of gross profit, regardless of revenue or cost. When the PPP contract guarantees a period of time (typically years), companies may no longer be interested in increasing profits as there is little danger of going out of business during that timeframe. Thus, PPPs have no stringent requirement of meeting the market profit-and-loss test, since they cannot "lose."¶ Mises pointed out the flaw in trying to use PPPs as a catalyst to innovation:¶ To say to the entrepreneur of an enterprise with limited profit chances, "Behave as the conscientious bureaucrats do," is tantamount to telling him to shun any reform. Nobody can be at the same time a correct bureaucrat and an innovator. Progress is precisely that which the rules and regulations did not foresee; it is necessarily outside the field of bureaucratic activities.¶ In addition, progress and innovation may also be trapped by old government regulations, codes, and established ideas. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," is the motto of the government bureaucrat—and as Mises points out, these are typically old men with established ideas of what works (and what doesn't). In contrast, innovation is more than just making sure a product "ain't broke"—it is about improving an already functional and highly demanded product (think iPhone in the wireless industry, or Google Chrome in web browsers).¶ In contrast to private businesses, companies in a government partnership that wish to introduce innovations require going through red tape and levels of bureaucracy for approval. If it were not for a government guarantee of monopoly privilege, such a time gap for bureaucratic approval would likely eliminate any first-mover advantage in the market.¶ Furthermore, investment capital will not necessarily be generated from savings or business operations, but possibly from a shared government budget. Finally, instead of an incentive to earn as much profit as possible, governments often set a limit on the amount of total profit, and tax or remove any profit above the arbitrarily specified amount, thereby discouraging innovation.¶ Risk¶ Risk is another aspect that needs to be analyzed in relation to PPPs. Companies that are guaranteed a government contract in some situations may be less likely to take on risk, as risk only disrupts the existing circumstances, and increases the possibility of failure. This is because the company is "safe" (i.e., its revenue is virtually guaranteed) if it does not take any risks. Any risk the company takes may lead to its loss, not the government's.¶ Companies in a partnership with government will also lose (ultimate) control of their decision-making abilities. For instance, government would be less likely to allow a company to take risks that could affect any government "revenue" originating from the company. Maintaining the status quo is the name of the game. Companies must, in the end, follow the government's wishes and whims, not their own—nor their customers'. The company sees risk not in terms of whether the consumer will buy its product or service, but in terms of whether it is in line with the designs of the bureaucrat. Any risk then becomes focused on pleasing the bureaucrat, at the expense of pleasing the consumer.¶ On the other hand, risk of failure is essentially reduced to nil for the length of the contract due to government's ability to subsidize losses through taxation or other coercive measures. Obtaining government contracts for smaller companies becomes virtually impossible; and it eliminates any future or start-up companies and investment in that market. Thus, competition and the threat of competition are close to none. We now see that government is truly the enemy—not the oft-viewed, and mistakenly confused, supporter—of the start-up entrepreneur, i.e., the "little guy."¶ In a PPP, while revenues are guaranteed for the length of the partnership agreement, stability is only limited to the length of the current administration, i.e., to the trust placed in government to keep its agreements and promises. Ironically, by the very act of creating a public-private partnership in an industry, and eliminating or decreasing competition, government reduces that credibility, and other industries are at risk of similar partnership arrangements.¶ What is left of capitalism in the United States will be uprooted and supplanted with corporatism; any remnants of a free market will have to yield to the coercive measures of government, resulting in monopolies and cartels.¶ PPPs as a Justification for Bigger Government¶ When government is able to partner with a private company and grant access to land, labor, or capital that would not have occurred absent government intervention, everyone's property is exposed to the risk of government takeover. A private company may not be able to construct a highway through the private property of others. Government, through powers of eminent domain, is able to seize private property from individuals and construct nearly anything it desires. In other words, government is able to not only extract money from private individuals (taxes) but also to take away their (more tangible) private property.¶ In addition, public-private partnerships, because of the word "private," are often viewed as more legitimate, and with less hostility, than solely the term "public." Thus PPPs may expand and multiply without real justification, and with little hostility. The (already flawed and misunderstood) meaning of "public goods" then expands beyond the initial neoclassical interpretation to mean anything that could be deemed good for the public.¶ Murray Rothbard explains how government's violent intervention in one part of the economy results in "calculational chaos," which inevitably spreads to other parts:¶ [E]ach governmental firm introduces its own island of chaos into the economy; there is no need to wait for socialism for chaos to begin its work. No government enterprise can ever determine prices or costs or allocate factors or funds in a rational, welfare-maximizing manner.¶ Rothbard states that government cannot be run on a "business basis":¶ [A]ny government operation injects a point of chaos into the economy; and since all markets are interconnected in the economy, every governmental activity disrupts and distorts pricing, the allocation of factors, consumption/investment ratios, etc. Every government enterprise not only lowers the social utilities of the consumers by forcing the allocation of funds to ends other than those desired by the public; it also lowers the utility of everyone (including, perhaps, the utilities of government officials) by distorting the market and spreading calculational chaos. The greater the extent of government ownership, of course, the more pronounced will this impact become.¶ Thus, the greater the extent of government ownership, the larger the amount of calculational chaos, and the closer we move toward socialism.

### Link- Loans

#### Loans and loan guarantees prevent the free-market from effectively allocating resources and waste tax payer money

Edwards 04 (Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, June 2nd 2004, “Downsizing the Federal Government”, Policy Analysis, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa515.pdf>]

The federal government runs a large array¶ of loan and loan guarantee programs for¶ farmers, students, small businesses, utilities,¶ shipbuilders, weapons purchasers, exporters,¶ fishermen, and other groups. There are at¶ least 59 federal loan programs and 70 loan¶ guarantee programs.¶ 232¶ Loan guarantees are¶ promises to private creditors, such as banks,¶ that the government will cover borrower¶ defaults. At the end of 2003, there was $249¶ billion in outstanding federal loans and $1.2¶ trillion in loan guarantees.¶ 233¶ In the 1970s federal loans and loan guarantees grew rapidly as members of Congress¶ discovered that they could pay off special¶ interests with loan programs, while not paying¶ any political cost for directly supporting higher spending.¶ 234¶ Like other federal programs,¶ loan programs that make no economic sense¶ can survive by creating an “iron triangle” of¶ interests that resist reform. Supporters of loan¶ programs include loan beneficiaries, financial¶ institutions, federal loan administrators, and¶ congressional committees that authorize loan¶ programs.¶ 235¶ In the 1980s the Reagan administration¶ tried to cut federal loan programs but did¶ not have much success.¶ 236¶ Policymakers¶ should revive Reagan’s initiatives and begin¶ terminating or privatizing federal loan programs. The provision of credit is a centuriesold institution that does not need government help, especially given the sophistication¶ and liquidity of financial markets today.¶ Some federal loan programs target borrowers who could have gotten private financing.¶ In such cases, there is no need for government¶ loans because they simply displace private¶ loans. Other loan programs target borrowers¶ who cannot secure private financing. In that¶ case, federal loans support borrowers who are¶ poor credit risks, and taxpayer money is likely¶ to be wasted when loans are defaulted on. ¶ The Washington Post recently provided an¶ example of the first type of loan program.¶ 237¶ It profiled the chief executive of a construction consulting firm that is successfully winning projects. The company has good¶ prospects and is owned by an experienced¶ entrepreneur and accountant who apparently would have little trouble obtaining regular¶ business loans from a bank. But the company received a Small Business Administration¶ 7(a) loan guarantee from the government. In¶ addition, because the owner is a minority, the¶ company is applying to the SBA 8(a) program for “disadvantaged” businesses in order¶ to obtain subsidies and favored access to federal contracts. Taxpayers should not have to¶ foot the bill for handouts to such prosperous¶ members of society. ¶ Some federal loans are targeted at highrisk borrowers who perhaps should not¶ receive loans at all. For example, Farm Service¶ Agency loans are aimed at farmers who are¶ unable to obtain private credit at market¶ interest rates. But such farmers might be bad¶ credit risks with poor business prospects.¶ Sure enough, default rates on FSA loans are¶ higher than on comparable private-sector¶ loans.¶ 238¶ Taxpayers lose about half a billion¶ dollars each year because of defaults on farm¶ loans.¶ 239¶ The delinquency rate for FSA direct¶ loans was 21 percent in 2000 (down from 41¶ percent in 1995).¶ 240¶ By comparison, delinquency rates on private farm loans, and other¶ commercial loans, is only about 3 percent.¶ 241¶ The FY05 federal budget says that government loan programs are needed because private markets suffer from “imperfections,”¶ such as lenders not having perfect information about borrowers.¶ 242¶ For example, banks¶ might be more hesitant to lend to start-up¶ businesses because they do not have lengthy¶ credit histories. However, that analysis is¶ flawed. It is appropriate that start-up firms¶ face more scrutiny and pay higher interest¶ rates when they access capital because of¶ their higher risk of failure. Failure creates¶ economic waste; thus it is good that creditors¶ are more hesitant to lend to riskier businesses. Government loan subsidies result in too¶ many loans going to borrowers with excessively risky and low-value projects.¶ Certainly, market allocation of credit is far¶ from perfect. But markets have developed¶ sophisticated mechanisms for funding risky¶ endeavors. For example, venture capital and¶ “angel” investment pump tens of billions of¶ dollars of investment into new businesses¶ every year. There is no need for the government to compete with such private financial¶ mechanisms. Yet the government runs a¶ Small Business Investment Company venture capital program at taxpayer expense.¶ Taxpayers will be out $2 billion this year¶ because of recent investment losses of the¶ SBIC, according to the federal budget.¶ 243¶ Instead of fixing loan market imperfections, government intervention introduces¶ new distortions. For example, the EPA¶ spends about $2.6 billion annually for wastewater treatment facilities.¶ 244¶ EPA funding¶ flows to state governments, which make¶ loans to local governments for new facilities.¶ But the loans are set at artificially low interest rates, thus encouraging overinvestment¶ by local officials.¶ Federal loan guarantees also distort markets. When financial institutions receive federal loan guarantees, they become overeager to¶ lend to those with shaky credit because the¶ government will cover losses in case of default.¶ For example, the SBA 7(a) loan guarantee program targets businesses that cannot obtain private financing and have high default rates. The¶ default rate on 7(a) preferred lender loans has¶ averaged 14 percent in the last three years.¶ 245¶ Loans under this program are supposed to be¶ used for small business expansion. But in the¶ past the GAO found that some SBA loans were¶ going to pay off businesses’ prior debts, rather¶ than being used for new investment.¶ 246¶ Federal loan programs are generally poorly managed. The Department of Education¶ has about $100 billion in outstanding student loans under a variety of programs.¶ 247¶ Student loans have been on GAO’s high-risk¶ list for waste, fraud, and abuse every year¶ since 1990.¶ 248¶ Individuals, financial institutions, and administrators at educational¶ institutions all face incentives to make false¶ claims to gain unjustified aid.

### Link- Ports

#### **Regulation of the maritime industry destroys free market efficient allocation and prioritizes the goals of the state over those of the citizen**

Lombardo 08 (Gary A. Lombardo, assistant Academic Dean at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Founding Director of the Center for Maritime Studies and a Professor of Maritime Business, Robert F. Mulligan, August 20th 2008, Entrepreneurial Planning in a Regulated Environment: the U.S. Federal Maritime Commission and the Maritime Industry, Ludwig Von Mises institute, <http://mises.org/journals/qjae/pdf/qjae11_2_3.pdf>]

The actual practice of regulating the maritime industry often fails to follow the¶ modes economists have typically expected to observe. Entrepreneurs innovate to¶ take advantage of market opportunities. Entrepreneurial ability manifests itself in an¶ awareness or sensitivity toward market opportunities overlooked by others. Part of¶ this ability is applied toward better satisfying established consumer wants which are¶ observable to entrepreneurs in advance; but more noteworthy is entrepreneurs'¶ experimental attempts to satisfy incipient or latent wants they are among the first to¶ imagine or anticipate (Harper 1996). In a regulated market, entrepreneurs' focus is¶ shifted toward regulatory imperatives. Regulation offers different opportunities for¶ entrepreneurial innovation, as well as imposing new constraints. This results in¶ entrepreneurs developing strategies for satisfying regulatory authorities in hopes of¶ receiving rate increases, monopoly power, subsidies, tax benefits, exemptions from¶ regulation, or other rewards regulatory authorities can dispense. In the absence of¶ regulation, entrepreneurial awareness is applied exclusively to satisfying consumer¶ wants. In a regulated environment, entrepreneurs must also apply awareness toward¶ opportunities created by regulatory limitations.

### Transportation Mobility Shamanigans

**Expansion of transportation infrastructure is simply a form of extensive state planning that allows the state turn individuals into members of a “productive society”**

**Goodwin 10** (Katherine J. Goodwin, November 2010, “Reconstructing Automobility: The Making and Breaking of Modern Transportation”, Global Environmental Politics, MIT Press]

To a great extent, the commonly understood link between mobility and human flourishing is due to mobility being interpreted as freedom. Although mobility as freedom may seem feasible at a superficial level, this association begins to break down if, following Thomas Princen, we approach mobility as a myth. Princen sees mobility as a myth “not in the sense of being fictional or wrong, but in the sense of being central to a belief system, one that sees human well-being in terms of ever-increasing movement and personal choice.”51 Drawing on Roland Barthes’ foundational work Mythologies, one can view the mobility-as-freedom myth as a kind of cultural and cognitive sleight of hand. For Barthes, a myth is “constituted by the loss of the historical quality of things: in it, things lose the memory that they once were made.”52 In the same way that one cannot simultaneously look at and through a window pane, one can only see mobility as freedom if one loses focus on its historical production. In other words, one can only conceive of mobility as freedom by “losing the memory” that mobility must be made. Paterson rightly argues that “the condition of possibility of ‘autonomous mobility’ through the car is in fact extensive state planning”53—and he could easily have added the successful functioning and corresponding power of the auto and energy industries. Roads, fuel, functioning vehicles—these are prerequisites of automotive freedom. Yet in no sense is the material reality of roads, fuel, and vehicles free—it is neither gratis (without cost) nor libre (autonomous). There are material, financial, ecological, and opportunity costs involved, though these may not be reflected in the price of everyday driving. Moreover, any kind of mobility beyond using one’s own two feet engenders dependence upon systems of production, distribution, regulation and research. The use of even a simple mode of transportation such as a bicycle implies being in a relationship of at least interdependence with (if not outright dependence on) the slew of engineers, investors, manufacturers, and distributors who make that mode of transportation available. The conditions of possibility of mobility have little to do with autonomy. On a more abstract level, conceiving of mobility as freedom posits a relationship between freedom and space. This seems to make sense at first glance: the farther one can go, the more freedom one enjoys. Yet upon further consideration, this association becomes problematic. Is there a correlation between distance traveled and freedom enjoyed? Am I somehow freer when I fly to Australia than when I take the train to Boston? It is as if one posited a relationship between the freedom of speech and the number of words one uses. Do I more fully enjoy my freedom to speak when I write a two-volume tome than when I hold up a sign in the street? The thought seems faintly ridiculous. One can certainly make a case for mobility as a negative right, positing that no state can legitimately limit the movements of individuals (with certain exceptions, such as convicted criminals). This is “freedom of movement” as articulated in Article 13 of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.” Freedom of movement, in this sense, is very likely essential to human flourishing. Yet there is a difference between freedom of movement and freedom as movement. With freedom of movement, one is free to move or not. With freedom as movement, one is only free while in motion. It is the latter which may be cause for concern. Viewing freedom as movement prompts one to treat mobility as a positive right. In this view, if states are obligated to recognize the rights of its citizens, then states are obligated to provide citizens with the means to move.54 If one can only be free when one can move as far and as frequently as one wishes, then the state must ensure its citizens’ freedoms by funding roads and airports, ensuring as much mobility as possible. This becomes somewhat paradoxical for the citizen: one’s freedom is brought into being by the state through material processes which are neither gratis nor libre. Contradictions of freedom and mobility aside, there is a second important point to make regarding the link between mobility and human ºourishing. While humans have always been mobile creatures, the contemporary assumption that extensive movement is a necessary part of social well-being has fairly recent origins. The convergence in the nineteenth century of modern capitalist industry, the development of the railroad and telegraph, and the institutionalization of time by factories and states significantly changed the sense of space and time in which people lived.55 Two significant transformations concern us here. The first is the emergence of the daily commute between home and work or school, whereby routinized intraurban movement became habitual.56 The second is tourism. Before the nineteenth century, “the idea occurred to no one to go off to the seaside . . . Except for a few English aristocrats (considered perfectly eccentric), one did not travel for pleasure. One took to the road for business, for the service of the king, or to join—if one was a lady—one’s husband.”57 In the era of railroads and leisure time, however, touring other cities became feasible and desirable. These two transformations—commuting to work and travelling for pleasure—led to another new phenomenon: “the increasing experience of landscape from a moving rather than stationary vantage-point” and an “increasing sense of the body as an anonymized parcel of flesh which is shunted from place to place.”58 At the most intimate scale, mobility became a daily embodied experience, eventually to be taken for granted as a natural part of human life. On a larger scale, Nigel Thrift points to the shifting symbolism of the era, where circulation became a prevalent metaphor and was understood to be “causally connected to progress” in the way that the circulation of blood is causally connected to life.59 This perceived connection to progress was heightened and intensified by the modern capitalist impetus towards accessing markets. Fundamental to capitalism is the idea that “the ability of workers and machines and financial capital to and their best employment is essential to well-functioning markets, to efficient markets . . . a productive society is a mobile society.”60 Beginning in the nineteenth century, urban planners with the light of progress in their eyes “produced elaborate plans to improve roadways, build canals, improve river navigation and so on, in order to improve the ‘circulation’ of goods and people.”61 The state became invested in mobility on an unprecedented scale. The association of mobility with human flourishing—particularly with its components of travel, commuting, and access to distant markets—can thus be seen as a uniquely modern phenomenon. Yet highly mobile social relations may not necessarily produce the fullest and best expression of human contentment. There are other ways to organize interactions, other ways to acquire understanding, other ways to live. Interestingly, there seems to be an increasing recognition of this idea, even at the highest levels of government. In June 2009, three members of President Obama’s cabinet presented testimony at a Senate committee hearing entitled “Greener Communities, Greener Opportunities.” The hearing brought together the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. This “dream team of livable communities” (in one attending senator’s words) presented the Sustainable Communities Partnership, their collective agreement to coordinate federal funding and regulations for sustainable urban planning.62 This agreement marks a shift in the US federal government’s orientation towards mobility.

### Links- Air

#### USFG’s role in air infrastructure is too big.

Poole and Edwards 10, Robert W. Poole, Jr. [Searle Freedom Trust Transportation Fellow and Director of Transportation Policy Reason Foundation], and Chris Edwards [Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, a manager with PricewaterhouseCoopers, and an economist with the Tax Foundation], “Airports and Air Traffic Control”, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc/.

The U.S. economy depends on safe, reliable, and affordable air transportation. Beginning in 1978, airline deregulation transformed commercial aviation from a luxury for the few to a service available to essentially all Americans. Air transportation is a hugely important part of the economy for business travel, tourism, and domestic and international trade. The quality and cost efficiency of air travel relies critically on the nation's aviation infrastructure. That infrastructure includes commercial airports, which are virtually all owned and operated by state and local governments in the United States, and the air traffic control (ATC) system, which is operated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). In fiscal 2011, the FAA budget will be about $16.4 billion.1 Of the total, $9.7 billion will go toward "operations," which includes $7.6 billion for air traffic control operations, $1.3 billion for safety regulation and certification, and $0.8 billion for other functions. In addition, the FAA will spend $3.3 billion in 2011 on capital investments in ATC facilities, equipment, and research. Most of the rest of FAA's budget, about $3.4 billion, will go toward grants to state and local governments for airport investments. Many experts are predicting major problems with U.S. aviation infrastructure in coming years as large demand growth outstrips the capacity of available facilities. In addition to a rising number of airline passengers, the average size of planes has fallen, which increases the number of planes in the sky that the ATC system needs to handle. On the supply side of the aviation equation, the FAA has long had problems with capital funding, high labor costs, and an inability to efficiently implement new technologies. Major changes are needed because the increased air traffic will soon bump up against the limits of the current air traffic control system. The United States should embrace the types of reforms adopted around the world to privatize airports and commercialize air traffic control services. Investor-owned airports and commercialized ATC companies can better respond to changing market conditions, and they can freely tap debt and equity markets for capital expansion to meet rising demand. Such enterprises also have greater management flexibility to deal with workforce issues and complex technology implementation. There is vast foreign experience that can be drawn on in pursuing U.S. reforms, such as European airport privatization and Canadian air traffic control commercialization. The next section provides a brief history of federal involvement in airport funding and air traffic control. The subsequent sections describe the global trend toward airport privatization, the brewing crisis in air traffic control, and ways to reform the ATC system.

#### USFG should get out of aviation

Edwards and DeHaven 10, Chris Edwards [Cato, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, a manager with PricewaterhouseCoopers, and an economist with the Tax Foundation], and Tad DeHaven [budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute], “Privatize Transportation Spending”, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/privatize-transportation-spending

A final area in DOT to make budget savings is aviation. Federal aid to airports should be ended and local governments encouraged to privatize their airports and operate without subsidies. In recent decades, dozens of airports have been privatized in major cities such as Amsterdam, Auckland, Frankfurt, London, Melbourne, Sydney and Vienna. Air traffic control (ATC) can also be privatized. The DOT's Federal Aviation Administration has a terrible record in implementing new technologies in a timely and cost-effective manner. Many nations have moved toward a commercialized ATC structure, and the results have been very positive. Canada privatized its ATC system in 1996 in the form of a nonprofit corporation. The company, NavCanada, has a very good record on both safety and innovation. Moving to a Canadian-style ATC system would help solve the FAA's chronic management and funding problems, and allow our aviation infrastructure to meet rising aviation demand. There are few advantages in funding transportation infrastructure from Washington, but many disadvantages. America should study the market-based transportation reforms of other countries and use the best ideas to revitalize our infrastructure while ending taxpayer subsidies.

### Link - Jobs

#### Attempting to create jobs through government is a fallacy – government spending doesn’t solve and they manipulate factors such as the “multiplier affect” to get what they want

Kling 2010 (Arnold, economist Ph.D. in economics from [Massachusetts Institute of Technology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massachusetts_Institute_of_Technology). author, adjunct scholar with the Cato Institute. September/October 2010 “The Era of Expert Failure” <http://www.cato.org/pubs/policy_report/v32n5/cp32n5-1.html>)

With the unemployment rate close to 10 percent, there is a cry for the government to “create jobs.” But the issue of job creation illustrates the increasingly decentralized nature of the necessary knowledge.¶ A job is created when the skills of a worker match the needs of an employer. I like to illustrate this idea using an imaginary game in which you draw from two decks of cards, one of which contains workers and one of which contains occupations. For example, suppose that you drew “Arnold Kling” from the deck of workers and you drew “fisherman” from the deck of occupations. That would not be a good match, because my productivity as a fisherman would be zero.¶ You could do worse — my marginal product as an oral surgeon would be negative. However, you could do better if you were to draw an occupation card that said “financial modeler” or “economics teacher.” One hundred years ago, if you had played this game, you had a good chance of finding a match just by picking randomly. Most jobs required manual labor, and for most people manual labor was the most productive use of their working hours.¶ Today’s work force is more highly educated and more differentiated. As a result, the task of creating jobs requires much more knowledge than it did in the past. A New Deal program like the Public Works Administration or the Civilian Conservation Corps would not have much appeal for a recent law school graduate or laid-off financial professional.¶ Production today is more roundabout than it was 50 years ago. Only a minority of the labor force is engaged in activities that directly create output. Instead, a typical worker today is producing what George Mason University economist Garett Jones calls “organizational capital.” This includes management information systems, internal training, marketing communications, risk management, and other functions that make businesses more effective.¶ When production was less roundabout, there was a tight relationship between output and employment. When a firm needed to produce more stuff, it hired more workers.¶ Today, additional demand can often be satisfied with little or no additional employment.¶ Conversely, the decision to hire depends on how management evaluates the potential gain from adding new capabilities against the risks of carrying additional costs. The looser relationship between output and employment is implicit in the phrase “jobless recovery.” So how does the economy create jobs? There is a sense in which nobody knows the answer. In his essay, “I, Pencil,” Leonard Read famously wrote that not a single person on the face of this earth knows how to make a pencil. Pencils emerge from a complex, decentralized process. The same is true of jobs.¶ What the issue of job creation illustrates is the problem of treating government experts as responsible for a problem that cannot be solved by a single person or a single organization.¶ Economic activity consists of patterns of trade and specialization. The creation of these patterns is a process too complex and subtle for government experts to be able to manage.¶ The issue also illustrates the way hubris drives out true expertise. The vast majority of economists would say that we have very little idea how much employment is created by additional government spending. However, the economists who receive the most media attention and who obtain the most powerful positions in Washington are those who claim to have the most precise knowledge of “multipliers.”

### Link- K Aff’s/Social Change

#### Attempting to bring about social reform through governmental means inevitably results in the worst forms of violence

**Browne 95** (Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work,)

Government is a powerful tool. But it’s far easier to put it in motion than to¶ control it. When government is involved, nothing ever seems to work out as¶ intended.¶ Discussions about a new government program always focus on those who¶ “need help” — the people who will benefit immediately. They may be the¶ intended recipients of government checks, or employees whose pay will be¶ boosted, or companies whose markets will be enhanced. This is the stuff of great¶ dreams.¶ But the dreams — of instant riches or social reform — lead inevitably to¶ disappointment, and sometimes to nightmares.¶ The plans almost always ignore the inevitable complications:¶ · The people you want to help get past a difficult predicament will¶ decide it’s easier to continue receiving the help than to move¶ onward.¶ · The people you believe need help will be joined by people who¶ would rather receive help than give it.¶ · The people whose lives must be turned upside down for the¶ program to succeed — those who must be coerced — will do¶ whatever they can to avoid complying.¶ · The people who are kept from doing whatever the reformers¶ don’t like will find something worse to do instead

## \*\*\*Impacts\*\*\*

### Impact Extensions

#### Aristotelianism- self-ownership is key to respecting the rational nature of humans.

Kraut 97, Richard Kraut, [Professor of Philosophy, Northwestern University], “Aristotelianism and libertarianism”, Critical Review 11, no. 3 [Summer 1997], http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/08913819708443466

Their answer to this question is this: So long as a person does not violate the rights of others, nothing can justify interfering with his productive acts. And nothing that results from such acts can be taken away from the individual producer. "Human beings need to be at liberty to follow their own judgments in creating or producing material goods; they also need to be free to keep, use, and dispose of what they have produced in accordance with their own judgments" (117). Why so? Because such productivity is an expression of one's rational nature. We are not "disembodied ghosts" (116). Rather, our essence as self-directed and reasoning beings takes physical form in the way we transfigure the world. "The objects or possessions one has must be considered an extension of what one is" (118). Accordingly, if the state prevents me from disposing of the goods I have produced in a manner of my own choosing, then the core of what I am is taken from me, and I am treated as a mere means to some larger social purpose. Whether or not I need or use all the property I have, my well-being consists in exercising control over its disposition. So even if it could be used productively by others, not one bit of it can be taken by the state for this purpose, because to do so would be to sacrifice one person for the sake of others, and no human being should be treated in this way (77). "Taking control of another's property against their wishes can . . . be seen to be nothing less than taking control of one of the central relationships that constitute a human being's life" (127).

#### Living rationally is the ultimate end of human life.

Douglas B. Rasmussen 1989, [professor of philosophy at St. John's University], “Individual Rights and Human Flourishing”, Public Affairs Quarterly, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Jan., 1989), pp. 89-103

The aim of ethics for Aristotle is to enable the individual person to discover the principles by which to live well. Aristotle called this "eudaimonia." Though usually translated as happiness, this translation can be misleading if not qualified. Happiness should not be understood as simply the gratification of desire or even the long-run gratification of desire; rather, it is the satisfaction of right desire - the satisfaction of those desires which will lead to and constitute successful human living or, as some philosophers call it, "human flourishing." The sort of success that doing well as a human being involves is determined by the nature of a human being. The happiness of a human being is not, therefore, a state of sensory pleasure, although such pleasures are also necessary for a success- ful human life, since man is not only a rational being but an animal with the biological capacity and need for sensory experiences as well. Instead the happiness or successful life of a person must involve considerations that depend upon his conceptual capacities. Man must be a success as a rational animal. He must live in such a way that he achieves goals that are rational for him individually but also as a human being. The former will vary depending on who he is. The latter are uniform and pertain to what he is; to his humanity - his goal as human being must be to do best what is his unique capacity: live rationally.4 Most simply put, happiness for a human being requires that one live rationally or intelligently, not acting from impulse and habit, but from knowledge and understanding. However, it must be realized that such a way of life is not merely a matter of employing in- telligence or reason to achieve whatever ends one happens to desire. Rather, living intelligently or rationally prescribes or determines the ends themselves - the ends one needs to desire - and those ends in turn constitute the overall end, the telos, of human life that is human flourishing

#### **Freedom is key- we must pursue our own projects and commitments**

Eric Mack 2009, [Professor of Philosophy at Tulane University], “Individualism and Libertarian Rights”, Contemporary Debates in Political Philosophy Edited by Thomas Christiano and John Christman, 2009 Blackwell Publishing Ltd..

While the natural independence of the personal point of view is manifested in each individual’s tendency to be moved by her own core desires or commitments “out of proportion” to their signiﬁcance from any impersonal perspective, what is crucial is that, for each individual, “[h]is own projects and commitments have a distinctive claim on his attention. 7 Thus, the natural independence of the personal point of view provides a rationale for the inclusion within morality of a personal prerogative according to which it is at least morally permissible for each individual to give special weight to her own separate system of ends in her determination of how she shall act. The inclusion of such a prerogative in morality amounts to the recognition that the attainment of an individual’s good has agent-relative value and that agent’s prospective good provides her with reason to go for that good quite aside from any agent-neutral reason that agent may have to go for or to forego that good.

### Impact - Violence

#### Attempting to bring about social reform through governmental means inevitably results in the worst forms of violence

**Browne 95** (Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work,)

Government is a powerful tool. But it’s far easier to put it in motion than to¶ control it. When government is involved, nothing ever seems to work out as¶ intended.¶ Discussions about a new government program always focus on those who¶ “need help” — the people who will benefit immediately. They may be the¶ intended recipients of government checks, or employees whose pay will be¶ boosted, or companies whose markets will be enhanced. This is the stuff of great¶ dreams.¶ But the dreams — of instant riches or social reform — lead inevitably to¶ disappointment, and sometimes to nightmares.¶ The plans almost always ignore the inevitable complications:¶ · The people you want to help get past a difficult predicament will¶ decide it’s easier to continue receiving the help than to move¶ onward.¶ · The people you believe need help will be joined by people who¶ would rather receive help than give it.¶ · The people whose lives must be turned upside down for the¶ program to succeed — those who must be coerced — will do¶ whatever they can to avoid complying.¶ · The people who are kept from doing whatever the reformers¶ don’t like will find something worse to do instead

## \*\*\*Alternative\*\*\*

### Will to be Free

#### The alternative is to will to be free- Tyranny is only possible as long as you allow it

Rothbard 75 (Murray N. Rothbard, Professor at Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn and New York University, Distinguished professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, Academic vice president of the Ludwid Von Mises institute, 1975, “THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF ÉTIENNE DE LA BOÉTIE”, forward to “THE POLITICS OF OBEDIENCE: THE DISCOURSE OF VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE”, Ludwig Von Mises Institute]

THE DISCOURSE OF VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE is lucidly and coherently structured around a single axiom, a single percipient¶ insight into the nature not only of tyranny, but implicitly of¶ the State apparatus itself. Many medieval writers had attacked¶ tyranny, but La Boétie delves especially deeply into its nature,¶ and into the nature of State rule itself. This fundamental¶ insight was that every tyranny must necessarily be grounded¶ upon general popular acceptance. In short, the bulk of the¶ people themselves, for whatever reason, acquiesce in their¶ own subjection. If this were not the case, no tyranny, indeed¶ no governmental rule, could long endure. Hence, a government does not have to be popularly elected to enjoy general¶ public support; for general public support is in the very¶ nature of all governments that endure, including the most¶ oppressive of tyrannies. The tyrant is but one person, and¶ could scarcely command the obedience of another person,¶ much less of an entire country, if most of the subjects did not¶ grant their obedience by their own consent.9¶ This, then, becomes for La Boétie the central problem of¶ political theory: why in the world do people consent to their¶ own enslavement? La Boétie cuts to the heart of what is, or¶ rather should be, the central problem of political philosophy:¶ the mystery of civil obedience. Why do people, in all times¶ and places, obey the commands of the government, which¶ always constitutes a small minority of the society? To La¶ Boétie the spectacle of general consent to despotism is puzzling and appalling:¶ I should like merely to understand how it happens that so¶ many men, so many villages, so many cities, so many¶ nations, sometimes suffer under a single tyrant who has no¶ other power than the power they give him; who is able to¶ harm them only to the extent to which they have the willingness to bear with him; who could do them absolutely no¶ injury unless they preferred to put up with him rather than¶ contradict him. Surely a striking situation! Yet it is so common that one must grieve the more and wonder the less at¶ the spectacle of a million men serving in wretchedness,¶ their necks under the yoke, not constrained by a greater¶ multitude than they . . .10¶ And this mass submission must be out of consent rather than¶ simply out of fear: ¶ Shall we call subjection to such a leader cowardice? . . . [I]f¶ a hundred, if a thousand endure the caprice of a single¶ man, should we not rather say that they lack not the¶ courage but the desire to rise against him, and that such an¶ attitude indicates indifference rather than cowardice? When¶ not a hundred, not a thousand men, but a hundred¶ provinces, a thousand cities, a million men, refuse to assail¶ a single man from whom the kindest treatment received is¶ the infliction of serfdom and slavery, what shall we call¶ that? Is it cowardice? . . . [W]hen a thousand, a million men,¶ a thousand cities, fail to protect themselves against the¶ domination of one man, this cannot be called cowardly, for¶ cowardice does not sink to such a depth. . . . What monstrous vice, then, is this which does not even deserve to be¶ called cowardice, a vice for which no term can be found¶ vile enough . . . ?11¶ It is evident from the above passages that La Boétie is bitterly opposed to tyranny and to the public’s consent to its¶ own subjection. He makes clear also that this opposition is¶ grounded on a theory of natural law and a natural right to liberty. In childhood, presumably because the rational faculties¶ are not yet developed, we obey our parents; but when grown,¶ we should follow our own reason, as free individuals. As La¶ Boétie puts it: “[I]f we led our lives according to the ways¶ intended by nature and the lessons taught by her, we should¶ be intuitively obedient to our parents; later we should adopt¶ reason as our guide and become slaves to nobody.”12¶ Reason¶ is our guide to the facts and laws of nature and to humanity’s¶ proper path, and each of us has “in our souls some native¶ seed of reason, which, if nourished by good counsel and¶ training, flowers into virtue, but which, on the other hand, if¶ unable to resist the vices surrounding it, is stifled and¶ blighted.”13¶ And reason, La Boétie adds, teaches us the justice¶ of equal liberty for all. For reason shows us that nature has,¶ among other things, granted us the common gift of voice and¶ speech. Therefore, “there can be no further doubt that we are¶ all naturally free,” and hence it cannot be asserted that “nature¶ has placed some of us in slavery.”14¶ Even animals, he points¶ out, display a natural instinct to be free. But then, what in the¶ world “has so denatured man that he, the only creature really¶ born to be free, lacks the memory of his original condition¶ and the desire to return to it?”15¶ La Boétie’s celebrated and creatively original call for civil¶ disobedience, for mass nonviolent resistance as a method for¶ the overthrow of tyranny, stems directly from the above two¶ premises: the fact that all rule rests on the consent of the subject masses, and the great value of natural liberty. For if¶ tyranny really rests on mass consent, then the obvious means¶ for its overthrow is simply by mass withdrawal of that consent. The weight of tyranny would quickly and suddenly collapse under such a nonviolent revolution. (The Tory David¶ Hume did not, unsurprisingly, draw similar conclusions from¶ his theory of mass consent as the basis of all governmental¶ rule.)¶ Thus, after concluding that all tyranny rests on popular¶ consent, La Boétie eloquently concludes that “obviously there¶ is no need of fighting to overcome this single tyrant, for he is¶ automatically defeated if the country refuses consent to its¶ own enslavement.” Tyrants need not be expropriated by¶ force; they need only be deprived of the public’s continuing¶ supply of funds and resources. The more one yields to tyrants,¶ La Boétie points out, the stronger and mightier they become.¶ But if the tyrants “are simply not obeyed,” they become¶ “undone and as nothing.” La Boétie then exhorts the “poor,¶ wretched, and stupid peoples” to cast off their chains by¶ refusing to supply the tyrant any further with the instruments¶ of their own oppression. The tyrant, indeed, has¶ nothing more than the power that you confer upon him to¶ destroy you. Where has he acquired enough eyes to spy¶ upon you, if you do not provide them yourselves? How can¶ he have so many arms to beat you with, if he does not borrow them from you? The feet that trample down your cities,¶ where does he get them if they are not your own? How¶ does he have any power over you except through you?¶ How would he dare assail you if he had no cooperation¶ from you?¶ La Boétie concludes his exhortation by assuring the masses¶ that to overthrow the tyrant they need not act, nor shed their¶ blood. They can do so “merely by willing to be free.” In short, ¶ Resolve to serve no more, and you are at once freed. I do¶ not ask that you place hands upon the tyrant to topple him¶ over, but simply that you support him no longer; then you¶ will behold him, like a great Colossus whose pedestal has¶ been pulled away, fall of his own weight and break in¶ pieces.16

#### Take a stance against modern tyranny

Rothbard 75 (Murray N. Rothbard, Professor at Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn and New York University, Distinguished professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, Academic vice president of the Ludwid Von Mises institute, 1975, “THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF ÉTIENNE DE LA BOÉTIE”, forward to “THE POLITICS OF OBEDIENCE: THE DISCOURSE OF VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE”, Ludwig Von Mises Institute]

LA BOÉTIE’S DISCOURSE HAS A vital importance for the modern¶ reader—an importance that goes beyond the sheer pleasure¶ of reading a great and seminal work on political philosophy,¶ or, for the libertarian, of reading the first libertarian political¶ philosopher in the Western world. For La Boétie speaks most¶ sharply to the problem which all libertarians—indeed, all¶ opponents of despotism—find particularly difficult: the problem of strategy. Facing the devastating and seemingly overwhelming power of the modern State, how can a free and¶ very different world be brought about? How in the world can¶ we get from here to there, from a world of tyranny to a world¶ of freedom? Precisely because of his abstract and timeless¶ methodology, La Boétie offers vital insights into this eternal¶ problem. ¶ In the first place, La Boétie’s insight that any State, no matter how ruthless and despotic, rests in the long run on the¶ consent of the majority of the public, has not yet been¶ absorbed into the consciousness of intellectuals opposed to¶ State despotism. Notice, for example, how many anti-Communists write about Communist rule as if it were solely terror¶ imposed from above on the angry and discontented masses.¶ Many of the errors of American foreign policy have stemmed¶ from the idea that the majority of the population of a country¶ can never accept and believe in Communist ideas, which must¶ therefore be imposed by either a small clique or by outside¶ agents from existing Communist countries. In modern political thought, only the free-market economist Ludwig von Mises¶ has sufficiently stressed the fact that all governments must rest¶ on majority consent. ¶ Since despotic rule is against the interests of the bulk of¶ the population, how then does this consent come about?¶ Again, La Boétie highlights the point that this consent is engineered, largely by propaganda beamed at the populace by the¶ rulers and their intellectual apologists. The devices—of bread¶ and circuses, of ideological mystification—that rulers today¶ use to gull the masses and gain their consent, remain the same¶ as in La Boétie’s days. The only difference is the enormous¶ increase in the use of specialized intellectuals in the service of¶ the rulers. But in this case, the primary task of opponents of¶ modern tyranny is an educational one: to awaken the public¶ to this process, to demystify and desanctify the State apparatus. Furthermore, La Boétie’s analysis both of the engineering¶ of consent and of the role played by bureaucrats and other¶ economic interests that benefit from the State, highlights¶ another critical problem which many modern opponents of¶ statism have failed to recognize: that the problem of strategy¶ is not simply one of educating the public about the “errors”¶ committed by the government. For much of what the State¶ does is not an error at all from its own point of view, but a¶ means of maximizing its power, influence, and income. We¶ have to realize that we are facing a mighty engine of power¶ and economic exploitation, and therefore that, at the very¶ least, libertarian education of the public must include an¶ exposé of this exploitation, and of the economic interests and¶ intellectual apologists who benefit from State rule. By confining themselves to analysis of alleged intellectual “errors,”¶ opponents of government intervention have rendered themselves ineffective. For one thing, they have been beaming¶ their counterpropaganda at a public which does not have the¶ equipment or the interest to follow the complex analyses of¶ error, and which can therefore easily be rebamboozled by the¶ experts in the employ of the State. Those experts, too, must¶ be desanctified, and again La Boétie strengthens us in the¶ necessity of such desanctification.¶ The libertarian theorist Lysander Spooner, writing over¶ four hundred years after La Boétie, propounded the similar¶ view that the supporters of government consisted largely of¶ “dupes” and “knaves”: ¶ The ostensible supporters of the Constitution, like the¶ ostensible supporters of most other governments, are made¶ up of three classes, viz.: 1. Knaves, a numerous and active¶ class, who see in the government an instrument which they¶ can use for their own aggrandizement or wealth. 2.¶ Dupes—a large class, no doubt—each of whom, because¶ he is allowed one voice out of millions in deciding what he¶ may do with his own person and his own property, and¶ because he is permitted to have the same voice in robbing,¶ enslaving, and murdering others, that others have in robbing, enslaving, and murdering himself, is stupid enough to¶ imagine that he is a “free man,” a “sovereign”; that this is a¶ “free government”; “a government of equal rights,” “the¶ best government on earth,” and such like absurdities. 3. A¶ class who have some appreciation of the evils of government, but either do not see how to get rid of them, or do¶ not choose to so far sacrifice their private interests as to¶ give themselves seriously and earnestly to the work of making a change.66¶ The prime task of education, then, is not simply abstract¶ insight into governmental “errors” in advancing the general¶ welfare, but debamboozling the public on the entire nature¶ and procedures of the despotic State. In that task, La Boétie¶ also speaks to us in his stress on the importance of a perceptive, vanguard elite of libertarian and anti-statist intellectuals.¶ The role of this “cadre”—to grasp the essence of statism and¶ to desanctify the State in the eyes and minds of the rest of the¶ population—is crucial to the potential success of any movement to bring about a free society. It becomes, therefore, a¶ prime libertarian task to discover, coalesce, nurture, and¶ advance its cadre—a task of which all too many libertarians¶ remain completely ignorant. For no amount of oppression or¶ misery will lead to a successful movement for freedom unless¶ such a cadre exists and is able to educate and rally the intellectuals and the general public. ¶ There is also the hint in La Boétie of the importance of¶ finding and encouraging disaffected portions of the ruling¶ apparatus, and of stimulating them to break away and support¶ the opposition to despotism. While this can hardly play a central role in a libertarian movement, all successful movements¶ against State tyranny in the past have made use of such disaffection and inner conflicts, especially in their later stages of¶ development. ¶ La Boétie was also the first theorist to move from the¶ emphasis on the importance of consent, to the strategic¶ importance of toppling tyranny by leading the public to withdraw that consent. Hence, La Boétie was the first theorist of¶ the strategy of mass, nonviolent civil disobedience of State¶ edicts and exactions. How practical such a tactic might be is¶ difficult to say, especially since it has rarely been used. But¶ the tactic of mass refusal to pay taxes, for example, is increasingly being employed in the United States today, albeit in a¶ sporadic form. In December 1974 the residents of the city of¶ Willimantic, Connecticut, assembled in a town meeting and¶ rejected the entire city budget three times, finally forcing a tax¶ cut of 9 percent. This is but one example of growing public¶ revulsion against crippling taxation throughout the country.

### Alternative – Reject Government

#### Rejecting government intrusion in the marketplace is the only means to ensure economic freedom and individual morals

**Machan 02** (Tibor R., a Hoover research fellow, professor emeritus of philosophy at Auburn University, and holds the R. C. Hoiles Endowed Chair in Business Ethics and Free Enterprise at the Argyros School of Business & Economics, Chapman University,*“Liberty and Hard Cases”,*<http://www.hoover.org/publications/books/3001886.html>,)

Is being principled “mere ideology”? Is it “simplistic”? Is it deﬁcient in appropriate ﬂexibility? No. Nor would it be simplistically¶ ideological and excessively rigid to judge various other social matters by reference to certain tried and true principles, ones we have¶ learned over many years of human experience with community¶ life.¶ Thus, for example, when someone objects to government intrusion in the marketplace, regarding it as a violation of our economic¶ freedom, this objection is grounded in arguably well-developed¶ and well-established principled thinking about public economic¶ policy. Similarly, to criticize restraint of trade because it violates¶ private property rights and freedom of contract is no less based on¶ tried and true principles—not as they apply to one’s sovereignty¶ over sexual matters but as they apply to one’s sovereignty over¶ economic matters.¶ If we accept the validity and force of moral principles in every¶ case that the principles legitimately govern, there would be no basis¶ for excusing lying, cheating, fraud, rape, murder, assault, kidnapping, and any of the other myriad ways people can damage their¶ fellows. In politics, no less so than in ethics or morality, general¶ principles come into play as we evaluate how people conduct¶ themselves. It is not a matter of whether we need principles, only¶ of which principles we in fact need.¶ Principles are tested by hard cases. Despite the temptation to¶ abandon the principle of limited government when it comes to¶ calamities, we might do well to encourage the development of¶ institutions that meet the problems without the involvement of the¶ government (private insurance policies are one such institution).¶ Of course, the temptation to use government power is difﬁcult to¶ resist, and it is legitimate to ask whether the use of government¶ power in such cases can ever be proper and consistent with the¶ ideal of limited government or whether it must always generate¶ that slippery slope.¶ We are not unfamiliar with the hazards of the slippery slope in¶ our own personal lives. If a man hits his child in some alleged¶ emergency, the very act of doing so may render him more amenable to smacking the kid under more typical circumstances. Slapping¶ someone who is hysterical may make it easier to slap someone who¶ is only very upset or recalcitrant or annoying or just too slow fetching the beer from the refrigerator. Similarly, a “minor” breach of trust can beget more of the same, a little white lie here and there¶ can beget lying as a routine, and so forth. Moral habits promote a¶ principled course of action even in cases where bending or breaking¶ the principle might not seem too harmful to other parties or to our¶ own integrity. On the other hand, granting ourselves “reasonable”¶ exceptions tends to weaken our moral habits; as we seek to rationalize past action, differences of kind tend to devolve into differences¶ of degree. Each new exception provides the precedent for the next,¶ until we lose our principles altogether and doing what is right becomes a matter of happenstance and mood rather than of loyalty to¶ enduring values.¶ The same is true of public action. When citizens of a country¶ delegate to government, by means of democratic and judicial processes, the power to forge paternalistic public policies such as banning drug abuse, imposing censorship, restraining undesirable trade,¶ and supporting desirable trade, the bureaucratic and police actions¶ increasingly rely on the kind of violence and intrusiveness that no¶ free citizenry ought to experience or foster. And the bureaucrats¶ and the police tell themselves, no doubt, that what they’re doing is¶ perfectly just and right. Consider, for starters, that when no one complains about a¶ crime—because it is not perpetrated against someone but rather¶ involves breaking a paternalistic law—to even detect the “crime”¶ requires methods that are usually invasive. Instead of charges being¶ brought by wronged parties, phone tapping, snooping, anonymous¶ reporting, and undercover work are among the dubious means that¶ lead to prosecution. Thus the role of the police shifts from protection and peacekeeping to supervision, regimentation, and reprimand. No wonder, then, that ofﬁcers of the law are often caught¶ brutalizing suspects instead of merely apprehending them. Under a¶ paternalistic regime, their goals have multiplied, and thus the means¶ they see as necessary to achieving those goals multiply too.¶ The same general danger of corrupting a free society’s system of laws may arise when government is called on to deal with calamities. There is the perception, of course, that in such circumstances¶ the superior powers of government are indispensable, given the¶ immediateness of the danger. The immediate beneﬁts—a life saved¶ by a marine—are evident. Yet the dangers of extensive involvement by legal authorities in the handling of nonjudicial problems¶ are no less evident, if less immediate in impact.

### Alternative – Challenge Government

#### Challenging government intervention in this instance is key – deters future coercion

**Machan 02** (Tibor R., a Hoover research fellow, professor emeritus of philosophy at Auburn University, and holds the R. C. Hoiles Endowed Chair in Business Ethics and Free Enterprise at the Argyros School of Business & Economics, Chapman University,*“Liberty and Hard Cases”,*<http://www.hoover.org/publications/books/3001886.html>,)

Yet as Robert Higgs (in Crisis and Leviathan) and others have¶ shown, it is nearly impossible to reestablish limits on government¶ once it has acquired the legal authority to expand its powers for the¶ sake of handling emergencies. In the law and in the making of¶ public policy, precedent counts for a great deal; there is a slippery¶ slope here. Once an approach is legitimized, extensions of power¶ beyond the particular and special areas originally intended are almost inevitable. The dentition of what constitutes an eligible¶ emergency tends to broaden. Eventually, no dire need whatever can be neglected by lawmakers. What might slow or reverse such¶ encroachment is a change of heart, some fear of going too far or¶ the like. But once the logic of intervening in a particular special¶ case has been established, it is difﬁcult to offer a persuasive rationale¶ for declining to apply the same logic to similar cases—unless the¶ legitimacy of the original intervention itself is challenged. As a result, most “temporary powers” assumed by government remain¶ part of its permanent repertoire.

### Alternative- Rejection is moral

#### Rejecting government intrusion in the marketplace is the only means to ensure economic freedom and individual morals

**Machan 02** (Tibor R., a Hoover research fellow, professor emeritus of philosophy at Auburn University, and holds the R. C. Hoiles Endowed Chair in Business Ethics and Free Enterprise at the Argyros School of Business & Economics, Chapman University,*“Liberty and Hard Cases”,*<http://www.hoover.org/publications/books/3001886.html>,)

Is being principled “mere ideology”? Is it “simplistic”? Is it deﬁcient in appropriate ﬂexibility? No. Nor would it be simplistically¶ ideological and excessively rigid to judge various other social matters by reference to certain tried and true principles, ones we have¶ learned over many years of human experience with community¶ life.¶ Thus, for example, when someone objects to government intrusion in the marketplace, regarding it as a violation of our economic¶ freedom, this objection is grounded in arguably well-developed¶ and well-established principled thinking about public economic¶ policy. Similarly, to criticize restraint of trade because it violates¶ private property rights and freedom of contract is no less based on¶ tried and true principles—not as they apply to one’s sovereignty¶ over sexual matters but as they apply to one’s sovereignty over¶ economic matters.¶ If we accept the validity and force of moral principles in every¶ case that the principles legitimately govern, there would be no basis¶ for excusing lying, cheating, fraud, rape, murder, assault, kidnapping, and any of the other myriad ways people can damage their¶ fellows. In politics, no less so than in ethics or morality, general¶ principles come into play as we evaluate how people conduct¶ themselves. It is not a matter of whether we need principles, only¶ of which principles we in fact need.¶ Principles are tested by hard cases. Despite the temptation to¶ abandon the principle of limited government when it comes to¶ calamities, we might do well to encourage the development of¶ institutions that meet the problems without the involvement of the¶ government (private insurance policies are one such institution).¶ Of course, the temptation to use government power is difﬁcult to¶ resist, and it is legitimate to ask whether the use of government¶ power in such cases can ever be proper and consistent with the¶ ideal of limited government or whether it must always generate¶ that slippery slope.¶ We are not unfamiliar with the hazards of the slippery slope in¶ our own personal lives. If a man hits his child in some alleged¶ emergency, the very act of doing so may render him more amenable to smacking the kid under more typical circumstances. Slapping¶ someone who is hysterical may make it easier to slap someone who¶ is only very upset or recalcitrant or annoying or just too slow fetching the beer from the refrigerator. Similarly, a “minor” breach of trust can beget more of the same, a little white lie here and there¶ can beget lying as a routine, and so forth. Moral habits promote a¶ principled course of action even in cases where bending or breaking¶ the principle might not seem too harmful to other parties or to our¶ own integrity. On the other hand, granting ourselves “reasonable”¶ exceptions tends to weaken our moral habits; as we seek to rationalize past action, differences of kind tend to devolve into differences¶ of degree. Each new exception provides the precedent for the next,¶ until we lose our principles altogether and doing what is right becomes a matter of happenstance and mood rather than of loyalty to¶ enduring values.¶ The same is true of public action. When citizens of a country¶ delegate to government, by means of democratic and judicial processes, the power to forge paternalistic public policies such as banning drug abuse, imposing censorship, restraining undesirable trade,¶ and supporting desirable trade, the bureaucratic and police actions¶ increasingly rely on the kind of violence and intrusiveness that no¶ free citizenry ought to experience or foster. And the bureaucrats¶ and the police tell themselves, no doubt, that what they’re doing is¶ perfectly just and right. Consider, for starters, that when no one complains about a¶ crime—because it is not perpetrated against someone but rather¶ involves breaking a paternalistic law—to even detect the “crime”¶ requires methods that are usually invasive. Instead of charges being¶ brought by wronged parties, phone tapping, snooping, anonymous¶ reporting, and undercover work are among the dubious means that¶ lead to prosecution. Thus the role of the police shifts from protection and peacekeeping to supervision, regimentation, and reprimand. No wonder, then, that ofﬁcers of the law are often caught¶ brutalizing suspects instead of merely apprehending them. Under a¶ paternalistic regime, their goals have multiplied, and thus the means¶ they see as necessary to achieving those goals multiply too.¶ The same general danger of corrupting a free society’s system of laws may arise when government is called on to deal with calamities. There is the perception, of course, that in such circumstances¶ the superior powers of government are indispensable, given the¶ immediateness of the danger. The immediate beneﬁts—a life saved¶ by a marine—are evident. Yet the dangers of extensive involvement by legal authorities in the handling of nonjudicial problems¶ are no less evident, if less immediate in impact.

### Alternative – Individual Will

#### Individual will and voluntary action are the only forces for true change

**Browne 95** (Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work,)

Coercion can’t produce a better world. But you might help produce a better¶ one — if you’re free to act on your dreams, free to use your talents, and free to¶ invite others to enjoy what you learn and build.¶ Coercion doesn’t work. Government doesn’t work. But you do, I do, and so¶ do millions of people who manage to get what they want without threatening to¶ draw a gun.¶ The only reliable and productive endeavors are what people undertake¶ voluntarily — and to which they willingly give or trade their time and other¶ resources. Only when we turn to free individuals and voluntary endeavors — and¶ away from government and force — will we recover the American dream.¶ Part II will show how we can do that — how we can get what we want¶ without force.¶ How we can bring back the American dream.

### Alternative – states/local gov.

#### Only localized solutions can solve – ensures effectiveness and avoids the worst forms of government coercion

**Browne 95** (Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work,)

Problems in many areas — such as crime, education, and welfare — were¶ small when handled at the local level, but became crises when the federal¶ government moved in during the 1960s and 1970s. To apply real solutions we¶ have to get the federal government out of those areas. The Constitution gave the federal government no power to deal with¶ common crimes, or to regulate individual conduct, or to take care of people in¶ need. The Founding Fathers knew that politicians could use such power to¶ reward their friends, punish their enemies, and gain control over your life.¶ So all these matters were left to the individual states to deal with.¶ Did the Founding Fathers trust state politicians more than federal¶ politicians? Of course not. But they knew the states would compete with one¶ another. Any state that went too far could lose population (and tax sources) to its¶ neighbors. People could move easily from state to state without leaving America.¶ The federal system didn’t guarantee that no state would get out of line. But¶ the Founding Fathers knew it was better to let one or two states go too far than to¶ give the national government the power to go too far.¶ They created the best protection against centralized government any country¶ has ever enjoyed. But it wasn’t perfect: over the years, the decades, and the¶ centuries, the federal government has pushed further and further away from the¶ boundaries the Founding Fathers set for it.¶ Most of today’s social problems result from the federal government’s¶ intrusions into areas where it has no Constitutional authority and no competence.¶ It is imperative that we change this — and, as Thomas Jefferson said, bind down¶ the politicians from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

### Alternative – 2NC Solvency

#### Getting the government out of transportation is necessary - the free marketplace solves more effectively through competition

#### Browne 95 (Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work,)

This means getting the federal government out of welfare, education, crime control, housing, transportation, labor relations, regulation of business and the economy, and much else. That won’t mean these areas will be forsaken.In some cases, state or local governments will take them over — and¶ perform them at less cost to the taxpayer. And citizens in each state will have¶ more power to reform or abolish the programs as they choose.¶ In other cases, individuals and private organizations (companies and nonprofit groups) will pick up what the federal government abandons. In a free¶ society private companies are always looking for unfulfilled needs — hoping to¶ profit by doing for people what they can’t do themselves. And when government doesn’t interfere, competition drives those companies to improve their services continually — making them more convenient, less expensive, and more efficient. And in some cases, a federal program simply will disappear because it’s no¶ longer needed — like lamp-lighting. Politicians may say, “See, if the free market¶ won’t take care of this, government has to do so.” But the free market’s “failure”¶ to handle it is a sure sign that only politicians want it. Whatever needs to be done will be done — and done better — when we get¶ the federal government out of the way.

#### Government coercion inevitably results in failure and must be rejected quickly and permanently

Browne 95 (Harry, Former Libertarian Party candidate for President and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, Why Government Doesn't Work,)

We have to decide what kind of America we want.¶ Do we want an America in which individuals are proud of themselves —¶ confident they can handle their own problems?¶ Or do we want a country in which everyone is responsible for everyone else¶ but no one is responsible for himself, where groups dislike each other because¶ each gains only at the expense of others, and where we are dependent upon the¶ favors of politicians to survive? Do we want a society in which government takes¶ half our income from us and then doles it back to us as though we were children¶ on an allowance?¶ We no longer are proud, self-reliant Americans. Government has turned too¶ many of us into whiners, dependents, people clamoring for favors from the state.¶ Fortunately, it isn’t too late to change this.¶ But the changes have to come soon. We are fast reaching the point where¶ government will be so insolvent from over-promising that we can no longer¶ unravel the mess without shortchanging and hurting millions of people.¶ The changes have to be quick and decisive. Government doesn’t keep its¶ promises. So we can’t depend on it for 5-year plans to phase out wasteful and¶ destructive agencies — or 7-year plans to balance the budget. Like the famous¶ Soviet 5-year plans, Congressional multi-year promises are never fulfilled.¶ And each reduction in government has to be complete. Reducing an agency¶ to a small fraction of its current size leaves intact the mechanism by which it can¶ grow again. Like a weed it has to be pulled out by the roots — not cut back.¶ In each case, there are only two realistic choices:¶ 1. Get rid of the program and get rid of it quickly.¶ 2. Or resign ourselves to living with it forever.¶ There is no middle ground.

#### The affirmative must be rejected as necessary means to achieve successful ends –The government fails but insists upon coercion

#### Kling 2010 (Arnold, economist Ph.D. in economics from [Massachusetts Institute of Technology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massachusetts_Institute_of_Technology). author, adjunct scholar with the Cato Institute. September/October 2010 “The Era of Expert Failure” <http://www.cato.org/pubs/policy_report/v32n5/cp32n5-1.html>)

The additional power that is being granted to experts under the Obama administration is indeed striking. The administration has appointed “czars” to bring expertise to bear outside of the traditional cabinet positions. Congress has enacted sweeping legislation in health care and finance, and Democratic leaders have equally ambitious agendas that envision placing greater trust in experts to manage energy and the environment, education and human capital, and transportation and communications infrastructure.¶ However, equally striking is the failure of such experts. They failed to prevent the financial crisis, they failed to stimulate the economy to create jobs, they have failed in Massachusetts to hold down the cost of health care, and sometimes they have failed to prevent terrorist attacks that instead had to be thwarted by ordinary civilians.¶ Ironically, whenever government experts fail, their instinctive reaction is to ask for more power and more resources. Instead, we need to step back and recognize that what we are seeing is not the vindication of Keynes, but the vindication of Hayek. That is, decentralized knowledge is becoming increasingly important, and that in turn makes centralized power increasingly anomalous.¶ THE AGE OF THE EXPERT¶ Populists often make the mistake of bashing experts, claiming that the “common man” has just as much knowledge as the trained specialist. However, trained professionals really do have superior knowledge in their areas of expertise, and it is dangerous to pretend otherwise.¶ I have faith in experts. Every time I go to the store, I am showing faith in the experts who design, manufacture, and ship products.¶ Every time I use the services of an accountant, an attorney, or a dentist, I am showing faith in their expertise. Every time I donate to a charity, I am showing faith in the expertise of the organization to use my contributions effectively.¶ In fact, I would say that our dependence on experts has never been greater. It might seem romantic to live without experts and instead to rely solely on your own instinct and know-how, but such a life would be primitive.¶ Expertise becomes problematic when it is linked to power. First, it creates a problem for democratic governance. The elected officials who are accountable to voters lack the competence to make well-informed decisions. And, the experts to whom legislators cede authority are unelected. The citizens who are affected by the decisions of these experts have no input into their selection, evaluation, or removal.¶ A second problem with linking expertise to power is that it diminishes the diversity and competitive pressure faced by the experts.¶ A key difference between experts in the private sector and experts in the government sector is that the latter have monopoly power, ultimately backed by force. The power of government experts is concentrated and unchecked (or at best checked very poorly), whereas the power of experts in the private sector is constrained by competition and checked by choice. Private organizations have to satisfy the needs of their constituents in order to survive. Ultimately, private experts have to respect the dignity of the individual, because the individual has the freedom to ignore the expert.¶ These problems with linking expertise with power can be illustrated by specific issues. In each case, elected officials want results. They turn to experts who promise results. The experts cannot deliver. So the experts must ask for more power.

## \*\*\*Answers To\*\*\*

### AT: Libertarianism Selfish

#### Libertarianism ain’t selfish

**Somin 11** (Ilya Somin, Associate Professor of Law George Mason University, May 14th 2011, “Libertarianism and Selfishness”, The Volokh Conspiracy, <http://www.volokh.com/2011/05/14/libertarianism-and-selfishness/>]

In reality, however, **libertarianism** often **requires unselfish behavior. Libertarians routinely condemn politicians who advocate statist policies in order to expand their power or ensure their reelection, bureaucrats who seek to increase the authority and funding of their agencies, businessmen who lobby for government subsidies and handouts, politically influential developers who use the power of eminent domain to acquire property that they covet, law enforcement officials who support the War on Drugs because it increases their funding, public employees unions who support big government in part because it increases their pay, and much other self-interested behavior.** The fact that **all of these groups are motivated**, at least in part, **by self-interest** doesnt prevent libertarians from denouncing them. Thats because **libertarianism is a theory of the appropriate role of government in society, not a theory that judges the morality of human behavior based on whether or not people are acting out of self-interest.**¶ To be sure, libertarianism does appeal to self-interest in the sense that libertarians believe that the vast majority of people would be better off in a libertarian society than under any realistically feasible alternative. In this, however, libertarianism is no different from most other ideologies. Advocates of liberalism, conservatism, and socialism also contend that their preferred policies would benefit the majority of society.¶ **Obviously, some people may support libertarianism because they think it will promote their self-interest to do so. But that too does not differentiate it from many other ideologies. Plenty of people support liberalism or conservatism for similar reasons**. Consider the aforementioned politicians, bureaucrats, public employees unions, drug warriors, and rent-seeking businessmen. Are all of them purely altruistic? **Self-interested advocacy of government intervention is no less selfish than self-interested support for libertarianism**.¶ Another common formulation of the “libertarianism is selfishness” argument is the claim that libertarians are narrow individualists who deny the importance of social cooperation. In reality, however, **libertarian thinkers from John Locke to F.A. Hayek and beyond have repeatedly stressed the importance of voluntary social cooperation, which they argue is superior to state-mandated coercion**. As Hayek (probably the most influential libertarian thinker of the last 100 years) put it:¶ [**T]rue individualism affirms the value of the family an**d all the common efforts of the small community and group . . . [**and] believes in local autonomy and voluntary associations** . . [I]ndeed, its case rest largely on the contention that much for which the coercive action of the state is usually invoked can be done better by voluntary collaboration.¶ Perhaps Gerson and other critics mean to suggest not that libertarianism justifies any and all selfish behavior but merely that its supporters are disproportionately selfish people. Even if that is true, it says nothing about the validity of libertarianism. **Selfish people can make good arguments and altruistic people can make bad ones. Lots of people endorsed communism and Nazism out of altruistic motivations, for example. Moreover, the fact that selfish people disproportionately believe in a given ideology does not prove that the ideology itself is just a justification for selfishness**.¶ In reality, however, the available evidence does not support the view that libertarians are, on average, more selfish than advocates of other ideologies. For example, **Arthur Brooks research shows that supporters of free markets donate a higher percentage of their income to charity, even after controlling for both income levels and a wide range of demographic background variables**. Brooks study doesnt differentiate libertarian advocates of free markets from conservative ones. However, **accusations of libertarian selfishness** (especially from the left) **are usually directed primarily at their support for economic freedom rather than social liberties. If support for free markets isnt correlated with selfishness, libertarianism probably isnt either.** More generally, **research on voter behavior consistently finds that opposition to government intervention in the economy has little or no correlation with financial self-interest.¶ Some leftists claim that opposition to taxation or other forms of government intervention necessarily implies selfishness** and indifference to the welfare of others. But **that assumption simply ignores the possibility that anyone might sincerely believe that imposing tight limits on government power actually benefits the poor**.¶

### AT: Bias

#### **Their authors only advocate government coercion because they have never known anything else- only the alternative solves?**

Rothbard 75 (Murray N. Rothbard, Professor at Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn and New York University, Distinguished professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, Academic vice president of the Ludwid Von Mises institute, 1975, “THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF ÉTIENNE DE LA BOÉTIE”, forward to “THE POLITICS OF OBEDIENCE: THE DISCOURSE OF VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE”, Ludwig Von Mises Institute]

Thus, humanity’s natural drive for liberty is finally overpowered¶ by the force of custom, “for the reason that native endowment,¶ no matter how good, is dissipated unless encouraged, whereas¶ environment always shapes us in its own way, whatever that¶ might be, in spite of nature’s gifts.”33¶ Therefore, those who are¶ born enslaved should be pitied and forgiven, “since they have¶ not seen even the shadow of liberty, and, being quite unaware¶ of it, cannot perceive the evil endured through their own slavery.”34 While, in short, “it is truly the nature of man to be free¶ and to wish to be so,” yet a person’s character “instinctively¶ follows the tendencies that his training gives him . . .”35¶ La¶ Boétie concludes that “custom becomes the first reason for¶ voluntary servitude.” People will ¶ grow accustomed to the idea that they have always been in¶ subjection, that their fathers lived in the same way; they will¶ think they are obliged to suffer this evil, and will persuade¶ themselves by example and imitation of others, finally¶ investing those who order them around with proprietary¶ rights, based on the idea that it has always been that¶ way.36,37

### AT: Case Outweighs

#### **That’s a link- only results in increased government control**

Rothbard 75 (Murray N. Rothbard, Professor at Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn and New York University, Distinguished professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, Academic vice president of the Ludwid Von Mises institute, 1975, “THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF ÉTIENNE DE LA BOÉTIE”, forward to “THE POLITICS OF OBEDIENCE: THE DISCOURSE OF VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE”, Ludwig Von Mises Institute]

Another method of inducing consent is purely ideological:¶ duping the masses into believing that the tyrannical ruler is¶ wise, just, and benevolent. Thus, La Boétie points out, the¶ Roman emperors assumed the ancient title of Tribune of the¶ People, because the concept had gained favor among the¶ public as representing a guardian of their liberties. Hence the¶ assumption of despotism under the cloak of the old liberal¶ form. In modern times, La Boétie adds, rulers present a more¶ sophisticated version of such propaganda, for “they never¶ undertake an unjust policy, even one of some importance,¶ without prefacing it with some pretty speech concerning public welfare and common good.”39¶ Reinforcing ideological¶ propaganda is deliberate mystification:¶ The kings of the Assyrians and . . . the Medes showed¶ themselves in public as seldom as possible in order to set¶ up a doubt in the minds of the rabble as to whether they¶ were not in some way more than man. . . .40¶ Symbols of mystery and magic were woven around the¶ Crown, so that¶ by doing this they inspired their subjects with reverence¶ and admiration. . . . It is pitiful to review the list of devices¶ that early despots used to establish their tyranny; to discover how many little tricks they employed, always finding¶ the populace conveniently gullible.41¶ At times, tyrants have gone to the length of imputing themselves to the very status of divinity: “they have insisted on¶ using religion for their own protection and, where possible,¶ have borrowed a stray bit of divinity to bolster up their evil¶ ways.”42¶ Thus, “tyrants, in order to strengthen their power, have¶ made every effort to train their people not only in obedience¶ and servility toward themselves, but also in adoration.”43

### AT: Public Goods

#### The idea of public goods is used to expand government control

Rothbard 75 (Murray N. Rothbard, Professor at Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn and New York University, Distinguished professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, Academic vice president of the Ludwid Von Mises institute, 1975, “THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF ÉTIENNE DE LA BOÉTIE”, forward to “THE POLITICS OF OBEDIENCE: THE DISCOURSE OF VOLUNTARY SERVITUDE”, Ludwig Von Mises Institute]

Specious ideology, mystery, circuses; in addition to these¶ purely propagandistic devices, another device is used by¶ rulers to gain the consent of their subjects: purchase by material benefits, bread as well as circuses. The distribution of this¶ largesse to the people is also a method, and a particularly¶ cunning one, of duping them into believing that they benefit¶ from tyrannical rule. They do not realize that they are in fact¶ only receiving a small proportion of the wealth already filched¶ from them by their rulers. Thus: ¶ Roman tyrants . . . provided the city wards with feasts to¶ cajole the rabble. . . . Tyrants would distribute largesse, a¶ bushel of wheat, a gallon of wine, and a sesterce: and then¶ everybody would shamelessly cry, “Long live the King!”¶ The fools did not realize that they were merely recovering¶ a portion of their own property, and that their ruler could¶ not have given them what they were receiving without having first taken it from them. A man might one day be presented with a sesterce and gorge himself at the public feast,¶ lauding Tiberius and Nero for handsome liberality, who on¶ the morrow, would be forced to abandon his property to¶ their avarice, his children to their lust, his very blood to the¶ cruelty of these magnificent emperors, without offering any¶ more resistance than a stone or a tree stump. The mob has¶ always behaved in this way—eagerly open to bribes. . . .47¶ And La Boétie goes on to cite the cases of the monstrous¶ tyrannies of Nero and Julius Caesar, each of whose deaths was¶ deeply mourned by the people because of his supposed liberality.¶ Here La Boétie proceeds to supplement this analysis of the¶ purchase of consent by the public with another truly original¶ contribution, one which Professor Lewis considers to be the¶ most novel and important feature of his theory.48¶ This is the¶ establishment, as it were the permanent and continuing purchase, of a hierarchy of subordinate allies, a loyal band of¶ retainers, praetorians, and bureaucrats. La Boétie himself considers this factor “the mainspring and the secret of domination, the support and foundation of tyranny.”49 Here is a large¶ sector of society which is not merely duped with occasional¶ and negligible handouts from the State; here are individuals¶ who make a handsome and permanent living out of the proceeds of despotism. Hence, their stake in despotism does not¶ depend on illusion or habit or mystery; their stake is all too¶ great and all too real. A hierarchy of patronage from the fruits¶ of plunder is thus created and maintained: five or six individuals are the chief advisors and beneficiaries of the favors of¶ the king. These half-dozen in a similar manner maintain six¶ hundred “who profit under them,” and the six hundred in¶ their turn¶ maintain under them six thousand, whom they promote in¶ rank, upon whom they confer the government of provinces¶ or the direction of finances, in order that they may serve as¶ instruments of avarice and cruelty, executing orders at the¶ proper time and working such havoc all around that they¶ could not last except under the shadow of the six hundred.50¶ In this way does the fatal hierarchy pyramid and permeate¶ down through the ranks of society, until “a hundred thousand, and even millions, cling to the tyrant by this cord to¶ which they are tied.” In short, ¶ when the point is reached, through big favors or little ones,¶ that large profits or small are obtained under a tyrant, there¶ are found almost as many people to whom tyranny seems¶ advantageous as those to whom liberty would seem desirable. . . . Whenever a ruler makes himself a dictator, all the¶ wicked dregs of the nation . . . all those who are corrupted¶ by burning ambition or extraordinary avarice, these gather¶ around him and support him in order to have a share in the¶ booty and to constitute themselves petty chiefs under the¶ big tyrant.51¶ Thus, the hierarchy of privilege descends from the large gainers from despotism, to the middling and small gainers, and¶ finally down to the mass of the people who falsely think they¶ gain from the receipt of petty favors. In this way the subjects¶ are divided, and a great portion of them induced to cleave to¶ the ruler, “just as, in order to split wood, one has to use a¶ wedge of the wood itself.” Of course, the train of the tyrant’s¶ retinue and soldiers suffer at their leader’s hands, but they¶ “can be led to endure evil if permitted to commit it, not¶ against him who exploits them, but against those who like¶ themselves submit, but are helpless.”52¶ In short, in return for¶ its own subjection, this order of subordinates is permitted to¶ oppress the rest of the public.

### AT: Util

#### There is no overall social good, only individual lives

Nozick 74, Robert Nozick, [American political philosopher, former professor at Harvard University], Anarchy, State, and Utopia, 1974, p.32-33.

Side constraints express the inviolability of other persons. But why may not one violate persons for the greater social good? Individually, we each sometimes choose to undergo some pain or sacrifice for a greater benefit or to avoid greater harm: we go to the dentist to avoid worse suffering later; we do some unpleasant work for its results; some persons diet to improve their health or looks; some save money to support themselves when they are older. In each case, some cost is borne for the sake of the greater overall good. Why not, similarly, hold that some persons have to bear some costs that benefits other persons more, for the sake of the overall social good? But there is no social entity with a good that undergoes some sacrifice for its own good. There are only individual people, different individual people, with their own individual lives. Using one of these people for the benefit of others, uses him and benefits others. Nothing more. What happens is that something is done to him for the sake of others. Talk of an overall social good covers this up. (Intentionally?) To use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has. He does not get some overbalancing good from his sacrifice, and no one is entitled to force this upon him--least of all a state or government that claims his allegiance (as other individuals do not) and that therefore scrupulously must be neutral between its citizens.

#### Freedom comes first

Kraut 97, Richard Kraut, [Professor of Philosophy, Northwestern University], “Aristotelianism and libertarianism”, Critical Review 11, no. 3 [Summer 1997], http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/08913819708443466

In principle, then, they are committed to saying that even if governments could surpass the market in promoting economic prosperity, it should not attempt to do so, because its regulations would infringe upon our freedom. Even if we could become wealthier by means of a governmental scheme that pumped money into our bank accounts, we would be worse off if such an arrangement required us to yield to the state our freedom to shape our lives in accordance with our own rational skills and moral virtues. Rationality, virtue, and the freedom to develop these qualities take priority over all other goods, in any proper conception of human wellbeing. And the kind of priority RDU have in mind is so-called "lexical" priority: no increase in economic prosperity (or in the prevalence of other sorts of resources) could justify infringement of our liberty. This is a moral, not an economic, defense of a restricted state, based ultimately on the nature of human flourishing.

#### Individual rights are key to flourishing in a community

Douglas B. Rasmussen 1989, [professor of philosophy at St. John's University], “Individual Rights and Human Flourishing”, Public Affairs Quarterly, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Jan., 1989), pp. 89-103

If individual rights are not protected, then there can be no human flourishing. Individual rights provide the social and political context in which individuals apply the normative principles (vir- tues) required by human flourishing. Individual rights are absolutely essential to preserving the possibility that every individual human being might flourish when he lives with others. They protect that feature of the always highly individualized activity of human flourishing that is more fundamental than all others: the autonomy or self-directedness of the person. Thus, in a social and political con- text, one cannot speak of human flourishing apart from respect for individual rights, and one would in that sense "define" the former by the latter.

#### Separateness of persons objection

Matt Zwolinski 2012, [Professor of Political Philosophy and Normative Ethics. He is a co-director of USD's Institute for Law and Philosophy], “Why Not Utilitarianism?”, http://bleedingheartlibertarians.com/2012/05/why-not-utilitarianism/

The Separateness of Persons - Both Rawls and Nozick claim that utilitarianism does not sufficiently respect the fact that persons are separate. But what does this mean? I’ve written more extensively on this topic elsewhere, but the basic idea is that because utilitarianism focuses exclusively on maximizing total utility, it fails to take into consideration in the right sort of way the way in which utility is distributed among different persons. Most of you are probably familiar with the worry that utilitarianism sanctions injustice – the slavery of the few, for example, so long as it benefits the many. Worries about the separateness of persons are related to this, but more fundamental. The reason utilitarianism allows us (or mandates us!) to commit injustice against the few is that it is a fundamentally collectivistic morality. In focusing exclusively on aggregate happiness, it fails to show proper respect to individuals. As Nozick put it: To use a person [for another's benefit] does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has. He does not get some overbalancing good from his sacrifice (Nozick, ASU, p.33.) It’s important to realize that the worry here is not simply that utilitarianism sanctions injustice. In response to that objection, utilitarians can respond with a whole host of pragmatic reasons to suggest that injustice won’t really maximize utility in the long run. These responses may or may not ultimately work. But they miss the deeper problem. The deeper problem is that even if utilitarianism gets the right answer about how we should treat one another, it gets that answer for the wrong reason. Surely, the reason it’s wrong for me to kill you is that to do so would be to violate an obligation I have to you. It’s not that the world as a whole will be a somewhat happier place with you in it than without.

#### Separateness of person ext-

Germain Grisez 1978, [Professor of Christian Ethics at Mount St. Mary's University], “Against Consequentialism”, The American Journal of Jurisprudence Volume 23 (1978): 21-72.

Utilitarian impartiality also appears less attractive if one considers the imaginary counterexamples philosophers propose against utilitarianism. These are usually drawn from the fields of justice and personal integrity. Would it be right to secure the greatest happiness for the greatest number by isolating one innocent person in a perpetual life of horrible torture? Would it be right to save a dozen suspects from a lynch mob by offering one other—not more probably guilty than the dozen—as a victim to the mob's wrath? As John Rawls points out, utilitarianism does not take seriously enough the distinction between persons; it merges the benefits and harms to everyone into a totality: Thus there is no reason in principle why the greater gains of some should not compensate for the lesser losses of others; or more importantly, why the violation of the liberty of a few might not be made right by the greater good shared by many.6

#### Maximizing happiness is a reductio- other things have to matter

Matt Zwolinski 2012, [Professor of Political Philosophy and Normative Ethics. He is a co-director of USD's Institute for Law and Philosophy], “Why Not Utilitarianism?”, http://bleedingheartlibertarians.com/2012/05/why-not-utilitarianism/

Utility doesn’t always matter, and isn’t the only thing that matters - Utilitarianism says that utility, or happiness, is intrinsically valuable. It says, in fact, that utility is the only thing that is intrinsically valuable. But what does this mean? And how plausible is it? Does utility mean pleasure? Preference-satisfaction? Happiness in some broader, eudaimonistic sense? The more we start to think carefully about how many different things we might mean by “utility,” the less obvious it seems that any one of those things could really be the only thing that has intrinsic value. And why should we believe that utility has intrinsic value in the exclusive and universal way that utilitarianism suggests? If a child molester derives pleasure from fondling young kids, why on earth should we think that that pleasure has any moral value at all? Why should we think that whether child molesting is wrong or not depends on the empirical question of whether the child’s suffering outweighs the molester’s happiness? Another, related, point: while most of us would agree with utilitarians that the pain and pleasure of animals has some moral relevance, why should we think that it has the same kind of moral relevance as pain and pleasure in human beings? Is a unit of pleasure really always just a unit of pleasure, and that’s all morality has to say?

#### Utilitarianism ignores personal importance.

Matt Zwolinski 2012, [Professor of Political Philosophy and Normative Ethics. He is a co-director of USD's Institute for Law and Philosophy], “Why Not Utilitarianism?”, http://bleedingheartlibertarians.com/2012/05/why-not-utilitarianism/

Egalitarianism without foundations – Related to this last point, utilitarianism counsels us to be absolutely impartial in the way we measure the utility effects of our actions. Your own happiness counts for no more and no less than the happiness of any other person. But again, why should we believe this? Don’t we owe something more to our own selves than we do to a complete stranger? Aren’t we entitled to spend the $5 we worked for and earned on a cup of coffee for ourselves, even if that $5 could generate a larger sum of utility if it was spent in some other way? Don’t we owe more to our children than we do to total strangers? Utilitarianism’s egalitarian premise – that all utility everywhere has the same moral value, no matter whose utility it is and no matter what relationship (or non-relationship) you stand in to that person, is not only implausible. It is an almost entirely unargued-for assumption. And it is one that we should reject.

#### **Overlooking individual rights is repugnant**

**Sinnott-Armstrong,** Walter, 20**11**, [Professor of Practical Ethics in the Department of Philosophy and the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University], "Consequentialism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/consequentialism/>.

Another problem for utilitarianism is that it seems to overlook justice and rights. One common illustration is called Transplant. Imagine that each of five patients in a hospital will die without an organ transplant. The patient in Room 1 needs a heart, the patient in Room 2 needs a liver, the patient in Room 3 needs a kidney, and so on. The person in Room 6 is in the hospital for routine tests. Luckily (for them, not for him!), his tissue is compatible with the other five patients, and a specialist is available to transplant his organs into the other five. This operation would save their lives, while killing the “donor”. There is no other way to save any of the other five patients (Foot 1966, Thomson 1976; compare related cases in Carritt 1947 and McCloskey 1965). We need to add that the organ recipients will emerge healthy, the source of the organs will remain secret, the doctor won't be caught or punished for cutting up the “donor”, and the doctor knows all of this to a high degree of probability (despite the fact that many others will help in the operation). Still, with the right details filled in, it looks as if cutting up the “donor” will maximize utility, since five lives have more utility than one life (assuming that the five lives do not contribute too much to overpopulation). If so, then classical utilitarianism implies that it would not be morally wrong for the doctor to perform the transplant and even that it would be morally wrong for the doctor not to perform the transplant. Most people find this result abominable. They take this example to show how bad it can be when utilitarians overlook individual rights, such as the unwilling donor's right to life.

#### Utilitarianism is too demanding

**Sinnott-Armstrong,** Walter, 20**11**, [Professor of Practical Ethics in the Department of Philosophy and the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University], "Consequentialism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/consequentialism/>.

Another popular charge is that classic utilitarianism demands too much, because it requires us to do acts that are or should be moral options (neither obligatory nor forbidden). (Scheffler 1982) For example, imagine that my old shoes are serviceable but dirty, so I want a new pair of shoes that costs $100. I could wear my old shoes and give the $100 to a charity that will use my money to save someone else's life. It would seem to maximize utility for me to give the $100 to the charity. If it is morally wrong to do anything other than what maximizes utility, then it is morally wrong for me to buy the shoes. But buying the shoes does not seem morally wrong. It might be morally better to give the money to charity, but such contributions seem supererogatory, that is, above and beyond the call of duty. Of course, there are many more cases like this. When I watch television, I always (or almost always) could do more good by helping others, but it does not seem morally wrong to watch television. When I choose to teach philosophy rather than working for CARE or the Peace Corps, my choice probably fails to maximize utility overall. If we were required to maximize utility, then we would have to make very different choices in many areas of our lives. The requirement to maximize utility, thus, strikes many people as too demanding because it interferes with the personal decisions that most of us feel should be left up to the individual.

#### Objection from epistemology

**Sinnott-Armstrong,** Walter, 20**11**, [Professor of Practical Ethics in the Department of Philosophy and the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University], "Consequentialism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2011 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/consequentialism/>.

A second set of problems for classic utilitarianism is epistemological. Classic utilitarianism seems to require that agents calculate all consequences of each act for every person for all time. That's impossible. This objection rests on a misinterpretation. Critics assume that the principle of utility is supposed to be used as a decision procedure or guide, that is, as a method that agents consciously apply to acts in advance to help them make choices. However, most classic and contemporary utilitarians and consequentialists do not propose their principles as decision procedures. (Bales 1971) Bentham wrote, “It is not to be expected that this process [his hedonic calculus] should be strictly pursued previously to every moral judgment.” (1789, Chap. IV, Sec. VI) Mill agreed, “it is a misapprehension of the utilitarian mode of thought to conceive it as implying that people should fix their minds upon so wide a generality as the world, or society at large.” (1861, Chap. II, Par. 19) Sidgwick added, “It is not necessary that the end which gives the criterion of rightness should always be the end at which we consciously aim.” (1907, 413) Instead, most consequentialists claim that overall utility is the criterion or standard of what is morally right or morally ought to be done. Their theories are intended to spell out the necessary and sufficient conditions for an act to be morally right, regardless of whether the agent can tell in advance whether those conditions are met. Just as the laws of physics govern golf ball flight, but golfers need not calculate physical forces while planning shots; so overall utility can determine which decisions are morally right, even if agents need not calculate utilities while making decisions. If the principle of utility is used as a criterion of the right rather than as a decision procedure, then classical utilitarianism does not require that anyone know the total consequences of anything before making a decision. Furthermore, a utilitarian criterion of right implies that it would not be morally right to use the principle of utility as a decision procedure in cases where it would not maximize utility to try to calculate utilities before acting. Utilitarians regularly argue that most people in most circumstances ought not to try to calculate utilities, because they are too likely to make serious miscalculations that will lead them to perform actions that reduce utility. It is even possible to hold that most agents usually ought to follow their moral intuitions, because these intuitions evolved to lead us to perform acts that maximize utility, at least in likely circumstances (Hare 1981, 46–47). Some utilitarians (Sidgwick 1907, 489–90) suggest that a utilitarian decision procedure may be adopted as an esoteric morality by an elite group that is better at calculating utilities, but utilitarians can, instead, hold that nobody should use the principle of utility as a decision procedure. This move is supposed to make[s] consequentialism self-refuting, according to some opponents. However, there is nothing incoherent about proposing a decision procedure that is separate from one's criterion of the right. Similar distinctions apply in other normative realms. The criterion of a good stock investment is its total return, but the best decision procedure still might be to reduce risk by buying an index fund or blue-chip stocks. Criteria can, thus, be self-effacing without being self-refuting (Parfit 1984, chs. 1 and 4). Others object that this move takes the force out of consequentialism, because it leads agents to ignore consequentialism when they make real decisions. However, a criterion of the right can be useful at a higher level by helping us choose among available decision procedures and refine our decision procedures as circumstances change and we gain more experience and knowledge. Hence, most consequentialists do not mind giving up consequentialism as a direct decision procedure as long as consequences remain the criterion of rightness (but see Chappell 2001). If overall utility is the criterion of moral rightness, then it might seem that nobody could know what is morally right. If so, classical utilitarianism leads to moral skepticism. However, utilitarians insist that we can have strong reasons to believe that certain acts reduce utility, even if we have not yet inspected or predicted every consequence of those acts. For example, in normal circumstances, if someone were to torture and kill his children, it is possible that this would maximize utility, but that is very unlikely. Maybe they would have grown up to be mass murders, but it is at least as likely that they would cure serious diseases or do other great things, and it is much more likely that they would have led normally happy (or at least not destructive) lives. So observers as well as agents have adequate reasons to believe that such acts are morally wrong, according to act utilitarianism. In many other cases, it will still be hard to tell whether an act will maximize utility, but that shows only that there are severe limits to our knowledge of what is morally right. That should be neither surprising nor problematic for utilitarians. If utilitarians want their theory to allow more moral knowledge, they can make a different kind of move by turning from actual consequences to expected or expectable consequences. Suppose that Alice finds a runaway teenager who asks for money to get home. Alice wants to help and reasonably believes that buying a bus ticket home for this runaway will help, so she buys a bus ticket and puts the runaway on the bus. Unfortunately, the bus is involved in a freak accident, and the runaway is killed. If actual consequences are what determine moral wrongness, then it was morally wrong for Alice to buy the bus ticket for this runaway. Opponents claim that this result is absurd enough to refute classic utilitarianism. Some utilitarians bite the bullet and say that Alice's act was morally wrong, but it was blameless wrongdoing, because her motives were good, and she was not responsible, given that she could not have foreseen that her act would cause harm. Since this theory makes actual consequences determine moral rightness, it can be called actual consequentialism.

#### Overdemandingness objection

Paul E. Hurley, 2006, [Professor of Philosophy at Claremont McKenna College], “Does Consequentialism Make Too Many Demands, or None at All?”, *Ethics* , Vol. 116, No. 4 (July 2006), pp. 680-706

The extreme demandingness objection is not that consequentialism makes demands—any plausible moral theory must account for this. Nor is the objection that consequentialism sometimes makes extreme demands. Again, this is a feature it will share with other moral theories. The objection is rather that the demands that it makes strike us as so extreme that consequentialism cannot be a plausible moral theory. As Liam Murphy points out, the traditional version of consequentialism “requires us to keep benefiting others until the point where further efforts would burden us as much as they would help the others.” Although such a requirement “has the virtue of simplicity,” he continues, “the demands it makes strike just about everyone as absurd—as we say, a principle that makes such demands ‘just couldn’t be right’.”2 Shelly Kagan suggests that the problem is that “to live in accordance with such demands would drastically alter my life. In a sense, neither my time, nor my goods, nor my plans would be my own. … The claim is deeply counterintuitive.”3