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### 1nc

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Link

### General --- 2nc Link

#### ---Government regulation of transport choices interferes with individual liberty—reduces choice to psychological, moral, and ethical coercion.

Khisty and Zeitler 1 (C. Jotin, Professor in Department of Civil Engineering at Illinois Institute of Technology, and Ulli, Professor at Aalborg University, Systemic Practice and Action Research, Vol. 14, No. 5, October 2001, “Is Hypermobility a Challenge for Transport Ethics¶ and Systemicity?”, p. 607-08, <http://www.springerlink.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/content/n839qh5656rq5236/fulltext.pdf>, Accessed 7/13/12, Chan)

The concept of freedom in the social context has political, psychological,¶ and ethical interpretations. In a political sense, the regulation of transport choices¶ by the government raises questions about the justiﬁcation of interfering with the¶ liberty of individuals to make choices and raises the question of freedom being¶ seen, in contrast to coercion, as an intentional act. Hayek said that by coercion¶ we mean the control of the environment or circumstances of a person by another,¶ such that in order to avoid greater evils, he is forced to act not according to a coherent plan of his own but to serve the ends of others. From a psychological¶ standpoint, conditions are more pronounced when personal motives for actions¶ are taken into account. Freedom from an ethical context is connected with the¶ question of individual responsibility and self-determination. In all these contexts¶ it is difﬁcult to sift out appropriate notions of freedom.¶ At least three implications may be drawn from an analysis of freedom and¶ mobility. First, in accord with the concept of a well-functioning market and the¶ idea of regulating and controlling social exchanges, achieving mobility opens up¶ opportunities to offer free choices of modes and transport technology. However,¶ what is important for a liberal society is bringing about a condition of peaceful¶ coexistence. The freedom to own a car, or a plane is subordinated to the good¶ functioning of a socioeconomic system. This fact has not been clearly recognized by opponents of transport restrictions. Second, because trafﬁc movement¶ takes place in public space, the choice of a transport mode cannot be a totally¶ private or a “free” decision, without social obligations. The claim that car owners¶ generally make, that they have a right to drive their cars wherever or whenever¶ they wish to, overlooks the fact that freedom implies social obligations. Thus a¶ moral critique of present transport patterns could have a considerable impact on¶ future transport choices. Third, it is clear that emphasis on the freedom-giving¶ potential of private car use is problematic, because it does not, as presumed,¶ express a democratic and egalitarian attitude. On the contrary, our present-day¶ car-dependent society raises serious problems of justice that could be avoided if¶ instead public transport and nonmotorized modes were promoted. The so-called¶ freedom achieved by users of the private automobile is socially distorted and,¶ in many respects, is headed toward personal and social self-mutilation.

### Automobility/Cars --- 2nc Link

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

Gibbs 2011

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

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

### High Speed Rail --- 2nc Link

#### ---Investment into a national high speed rail system is an unethical extension of government coercion that annihilates individual choice and encroaches on self-organizing market structures better equipped to solve problems.

D’Amato 11

(David S. D'Amato. February 2011. D'Amato is a market anarchist and an attorney with an LL.M. Center for Stateless Society. “All Aboard the Money Train.” <http://c4ss.org/content/6090>) Sherman

The [Associated Press reports](http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5g-fkRSr2t_1GTjVdJyrU6fZEGhsg?docId=bea2225a54794a4dbd7eeec4d3247acb) 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](http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20110208/pl_nm/us_usa_transport_rail), “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](http://dc.streetsblog.org/2011/02/07/obama-finally-brings-the-chamber-a-fruitcake-its-called-infrastructure/) 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.

### Highway Investment --- 2nc Link

#### ---Federal Highway Investment reinforce control of the people—government and development firms force people into different lifestyle choices by shifting the boundaries of rational choice toward irrationality.

Kirkman 10 (Associate Professor of Philosophy, Science and Technology in the School of Public Policy at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Ethics and the Environment, Vol. 15, No. 1, Spring 2010, “Did Americans Choose Sprawl?”, p. 124-26, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v015/15.1.kirkman.html#back>, Accessed 7/12/12, Chan)

To work around this problem, anti-sprawl advocates have somehow to argue that sprawl is not what people would choose if they really had any choice in the matter. They often assert, or at least imply, that people have been duped or forced into sprawl and that, for their own good, they must be offered different choices and led in a different direction. A more extreme form of the rhetoric holds that sprawl is an especially pernicious form of addiction for which the only treatment is the discipline of new land-use and transportation policies ([Schneider 2000, 8](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v015/15.1.kirkman.html#b23)).¶ Of greater interest is a more moderate thread of anti-sprawl rhetoric according to which people are able to make their own choices, but the options the marketplace makes available to them are severely constrained by government policies and other factors. In her recent history of suburbanization, Dolores Hayden offers just such an account. Americans generally [End Page 124] have chosen to pursue what she calls the "triple dream" of "house plus land plus community" ([Hayden 2003, 8-9, 159](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v015/15.1.kirkman.html#b10)). However, in realizing that dream, individuals are in constant contention with developers whose primary interest is profit. In the end, the physical shape of the triple dream has been determined by an increasingly powerful collaboration between large development firms and the federal government.¶ Hayden draws attention in particular to the activities of Herbert Hoover who, as Secretary of Commerce in the 1920s, worked "with big business to define how the federal government could promote business growth through real estate development" (2003, 122). Since then, this line of argument runs, federal policies have most directly reflected and served the interests of lobbyists while they reflected and served the preferences of ordinary Americans only indirectly, if at all.¶ Aside from businesses involved in development and in the production of consumer goods, there is also said to have been a broad and diverse coalition of businesses with an interest in a transportation system dominated by the private automobile. Concerning the push for the interstate highway system in the 1950s, James Howard Kunstler points to "an irresistible coalition of lobbying interests—the combined might of the auto, trucking, oil, tire, asphalt, cement, steel, lumber, and construction industries, and their unions." ([Kunstler 1994, 106](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v015/15.1.kirkman.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22b17); see also [Jackson 1985, 248-49](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v015/15.1.kirkman.html#b14))¶ A broad consensus among planners, architects, historians and other urban scholars holds that three government programs in particular had a decisive influence on metropolitan form: the interstate highway system, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), and misguided attempts at urban renewal ([Fishman 1999: 1, 6-7](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v015/15.1.kirkman.html#b7)). The interstate highway system can also be seen as just one aspect of what is often cited as the automobile subsidy, that is, massive public support for private automobile use at taxpayer expense. For its part, the role of the FHA is said to be multifaceted and far-reaching—not only did its mortgage guarantees favor racially segregated suburban development, but it also provided mechanisms for regulating the quality of the housing supply and the form of subdivisions. Other programs and policies have been invoked as well to explain the emergence of sprawl, from the tax deduction for mortgage interest payments to the policy in effect from the 1950s until the 1980s that allowed accelerated depreciation of commercial buildings ([Hayden, 2003, 162-64](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v015/15.1.kirkman.html#b10)).¶ The consequence of these various federal policies, combined with state and local policies and regulations, is supposed to be that people's choices [End Page 125] are severely limited. So, even if it can be said that people are making rational choices of their own, it would seem that the meaning of "rational" itself has been skewed. Driving all the time has become a rational choice, whatever its real costs and long-term consequences, because per-trip cost to the individual consumer has been kept artificially low. Moving to a single-family house in the suburbs is a rational choice because suburban housing has been the path of least resistance for developers and consumers alike. Those who would like to live in higher-density, mixed-use neighborhoods on the model of older cities or small towns may be out of luck, since that kind of development has long been illegal in many jurisdictions ([Duany, Plater-Zyberk, and Speck 2000, 8, 94-95, 100](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ethics_and_the_environment/v015/15.1.kirkman.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22b6)).

#### ---Federal intervention into Highway systems violate freedom of choice—Reinforcing the violent governmental mindset of considering the aggregate before individuals by forcing non-highway using taxpayers to pay for roads.

Block 83 (Walter, Department of Economy at Rutgers University, The Journal of Libertarian Studies, Vol. 7, No. 1, Spring 1983, “Public Goods and Externalities: The Case of Roads”, p. 9-10, <http://direct.mises.org/journals/jls/7_1/7_1_1.pdf>, Accessed 7/11/12, Chan)

The indictment against private ownership of roads is sometimes reversed. Instead of the highway owner being accused of not building enough, the non-highway-user who benefits without cost is castigated as a "free rider" who "refuses" to pay for the benefits he receives. But certainly he has not asked for these benefits, and in no case can it be alleged that he has contracted for them. Let us now consider the gains imparted to the consumers of final goods who benefit because goods can now be more easily shipped. If too large a proportion of the benefits created by the highway are provided free of charge, consumers will gain from lower-priced goods, but a private concern may be unable to cover its costs. But through the advent of externality internalization, the road owner will receive payment for the benefits he is providing. The process is simple. All that the road owner need do is charge a price for highway usage roughly conformable to the savings in transport fees created by the facility. The road will still benefit its users (the shippers) and their customers (the fmal consumers), but there will ¶ be no benefits seeping out, or spilling over, as it were, for "free." Such benefits will he paid for, given a price that makes it still profitable for a trucker to use the road. This point is made by Brownlee and Heller as follows: That highways may cut transportation costs undoubtedly is true; but this truth does not warrant special taxes for highways purpose levied against persons who do not use the highways. Insofar as truckers pay for using the ¶ highways, those persons not directly using the highways &help pay highway ¶ costs indirectly through the price system. If appropriate charges for highway-use were levied against the highway, nonusers would also pay indirectly for the highways from general tax funds spent by them for highway services. The alleged benefits of highways to those who do not use them directly are primarily illusions arising from failure to charge highway user appropriately for the services provided by the highway system. Without this insight, one might assume that highways necessarily involve the creation of an external benefit by the road building company to the advantage of the rest of the public. According to this reasoning, to the extent that highways are important for the national defense effort, the population at large gains a measure of security from them. But the Brownlee-Heller statement shows this argument to be false, for if the military, like anyone else, were required to pay for (potential) road use, then roads would be no more of a positive externality than shoes, lead, paper, or any other material used by the army.

#### ---Investment in state highway systems is immoral --- Government subsidizing has a coercive function in individual choice and the exercise of autonomy.

Snyder 12 [[Tanya Snyder](http://dc.streetsblog.org/author/tanya-snyder/), 1/5/12 ,  became Streetsblog's Capitol Hill editor in September 2010 after covering Congress for Pacifica and public radio. She lives car-free in a transit-oriented and bike-friendly neighborhood of Washington, DC, “Ron Paul: Stop Subsidizing Highways, Let “Transits” Flourish”, *DC Streets Blog*, <http://dc.streetsblog.org/2012/01/05/ron-paul-stop-subsidizing-highways-let-transit-flourish/>.] Ari Jacobson

First, **if you didn’t have government subsidized highways**, at least **at the federal** **level** **– and have all these wonderful superhighways sailing from city to city and downtown –** **there would have been a greater incentive for the market to develop transits, trains going back and forth.** Before the government got involved, before Penn Central and these other railroads were destroyed by regulations and union wages and featherbedding, we did have private transportation. **By subsidizing highways and destroying mass transit, we ended up with this monstrosity**. He said **subsidized transit is wasteful, since it spends more than it makes,** and **that makes it morally “wrong.”** But still, his point is an interesting one: **Transit is subsidized, in part, because it has to compete with highly-subsidized roadways**. **If we didn’t subsidize those roads, they would cost more to use – Paul puts in a plug for tolling – and been on a more level playing field with other modes.** Ryan Avent wrote something similar [on this blog](http://dc.streetsblog.org/2009/09/17/a-few-words-on-user-fees/) right around the time Rep. Paul made this video. Would Paul’s free-market utopia really result in a better transportation system — or a better anything? We all have our own opinions on that. But it’s nice to see that he gets that **roads don’t pay for themselves, and that his vision is mode-inclusive**: **If** only **we’d kept government out of it**, he said, “**We would have had less fancy highways, more mass transits, more interstate highways that would have been privately owned**.”

### Federal Infrastructure Jobs --- 2nc Link

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

Darnato 2011 (David, “All Aboard the money train”, member of the center for a stateless society, 2/9/11, http://c4ss.org/content/6090)

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

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

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

Carson 2011 (Kevin, senior fellow of the Center for a stateless society, “One of these things just doesn’t belong here”, 9/20/11, http://c4ss.org/content/8381)

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

### Infrastructure Bank --- 2nc Link

#### **---The national infrastructure bank is an immoral extension of federal control --- Federal coercion in transportation policy leads to environmentally and economically damaging programs better solved by individuals at a local level.**

Washington Post 11 (Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at Cato  Institute and senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, “Infrastructure Projects to Fix the Economy? Don't Bank on It.” 9/21/11, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/infrastructure-projects-to-fix-the-economy-dont-bank-on-it/2011/10/18/gIQAgtZi3L_story.html>, Accessed 7/9/12, Chan)

Increased infrastructure spending has bipartisan support in Washington these days. President Obama wants a new federal infrastructure bank, and members of both parties want to pass big highway and air-traffic-control funding bills. The politicians think these bills will create desperately needed jobs, but the cost of that perceived benefit is too high: Federal infrastructure spending has a long and painful history of pork-barrel politics and bureaucratic bungling, with money often going to wasteful and environmentally damaging projects.¶ For plenty of examples of the downside of federal infrastructure, look at the two oldest infrastructure agencies — the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Their histories show that the federal government shouldn't be in the infrastructure business. Rather, state governments and the private sector are best equipped to provide it.¶ The Corps of Engineers has been building levees, canals and other civilian water infrastructure for more than 200 years — and it has made missteps the entire time. In the post-Civil War era, for example, there were widespread complaints about the Corps' wastefulness and mismanagement. A 1971 book by Arthur Morgan, a distinguished engineer and former chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, concluded: "There have been over the past 100 years consistent and disastrous failures by the Corps in public works areas ... resulting in enormous and unnecessary costs to ecology [and] the taxpayer." Some of the highest-profile failures include the Great Mississippi Flood of 1927. That disaster dramatically proved the shortcomings of the Corps' approach to flood control, which it had stubbornly defended despite outside criticism. Hurricane Katrina in 2005 was like a dreadful repeat. The flooding was in large part a man-made disaster stemming from poor engineering by the Corps and misdirected funding by Congress.¶ Meanwhile, the Bureau of Reclamation has been building economically dubious and environmentally harmful dams since 1902. Right from the start, "every Senator ... wanted a project in his state; every Congressman wanted one in his district; they didn't care whether they made economic sense or not," concluded Marc Reisner in his classic history of the agency, *Cadillac Desert*. The dam-building pork barrel went on for decades, until the agency ran out of rivers into which it could pour concrete.¶ Looking at the Corps and Reclamation, the first lesson about federal infrastructure projects is that you can't trust the cost-benefit analyses. Both agencies have a history of fudging their studies to make proposed projects look better, understating the costs and overstating the benefits.¶ And we've known it, too. In the 1950s, Sen. Paul Douglas (D-Ill.), lambasted the distorted analyses of the Corps and Reclamation. According to Reisner, Reclamation's chief analyst admitted that in the 1960s he had to "jerk around" the numbers to make one major project look sound and that others were "pure trash" from an economics perspective. In the 1970s, Jimmy Carter ripped into the "computational manipulation" of the Corps. And in 2006, the Government Accountability Office found that the Corps' analyses were "fraught with errors, mistakes, and miscalculations, and used invalid assumptions and outdated data." Even if federal agencies calculate the numbers properly, members of Congress often push ahead with "trash" projects anyway. Then-senator Christopher Bond of Missouri vowed to make sure that the Corps' projects in his state were funded, no matter what the economic studies concluded, according to extensive Washington Post reporting on the Corps in 2000. And the onetime head of the Senate committee overseeing the Corps, George Voinovich of Ohio, blurted out at a hearing: "We don't care what the Corps cost-benefit is. We're going to build it anyhow because Congress says it's going to be built."¶ As Morgan noted in his 1971 book, these big projects have often damaged both taxpayers and ecology. The Corps, Reisner argues, has "ruined more wetlands than anyone in history" with its infrastructure. Meanwhile, Reclamation killed wetlands and salmon fisheries as it built dams to provide high-cost irrigation water to farmers in the West — so they could grow crops that often compete with more efficiently grown crops in the East.¶ Taxpayers are double losers from all this infrastructure. They paid to build it, and now they are paying to clean up the environmental damage. In Florida, for example, the Corps' projects, along with federal sugar subsidies, have damaged the Everglades. So the government is helping to fund a multibillion-dollar restoration plan. In the West, federal irrigation has increased salinity levels in rivers, necessitating desalination efforts such as a $245 millionplant in Yuma, Ariz. And in a large area of California's San Joaquin Valley, federal irrigation has created such toxic runoff that the government is considering spending up to $2 billion to fix the damage, according to some estimates.¶ When the federal government "thinks big," it often makes big mistakes. And when Washington follows bad policies, such as destroying wetlands or overbuilding dams, it replicates the mistakes across the nation. Today, for instance, Reclamation's huge underpricing of irrigation water is contributing to a water crisis across much of the West.¶ Similar distortions occur in other areas of infrastructure, such as transportation. The federal government subsidizes the construction of urban light-rail systems, for example, which has caused these systems to spring up across the country. But urban rail systems are generally less efficient and flexible than bus systems, and they saddle cities with higher operating and maintenance costs down the road. Similar misallocation of investment occurs with Amtrak; lawmakers make demands for their districts, and funding is sprinkled across the country, even to rural areas where passenger rail makes no economic sense because of low population densities.¶ When the federal government is paying for infrastructure, state officials and members of Congress fight for their shares of the funding, without worrying too much about efficiency, environmental issues or other longer-term factors. The solution is to move as much infrastructure funding as we can to the state, local and private levels. That would limit the misallocation of projects by Congress, while encouraging states to experiment with lower-cost solutions. It's true that the states make infrastructure mistakes as well, as California appears to be doing by subsidizing high-speed rail. But at least state-level mistakes aren't automatically repeated across the country.

### Public Transit --- 2nc Link

#### ---The motivation for mass public transit is collectivism – the State wants to remove our autonomy by prying us away from our individual property.

Will 11 (George F. Will, former editor of The National Review, has taught political philosophy at Michigan University and at the University of Toronoto, 1979 finalist for the National Magazine Award for essays and criticism, 1978 recipient of the National Headliner Award for consistently outstanding feature columns, the 1980 and 1991 Silurian Award for editorial writing, First Place/Interpretive Column in the 1991 Clarion Awards Competition from Women in Communications, the author of two books and three published collections of columns, educated at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut, Magdalene College, Oxford University, and Princeton, where he received an MA and Ph.D. in politics, “High Speed to Insolvency: Why Liberals Love Trains,” Newsweek Magazine, 27 February 2011, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/02/27/high-speed-to-insolvency.html>, AFJ)

Generations hence, when the river of time has worn this presidency’s importance to a small, smooth pebble in the stream of history, people will still marvel that its defining trait was a mania for high-speed rail projects. This disorder illuminates the progressive mind. Remarkably widespread derision has greeted the Obama administration’s damn-the-arithmetic-full-speed-ahead proposal to spend $53 billion more (after the $8 billion in stimulus money and $2.4 billion in enticements to 23 states) in the next six years pursuant to the president’s loopy goal of giving “80 percent of Americans access to high-speed rail.” “Access” and “high-speed” to be defined later. Criticism of this optional and irrational spending—meaning: borrowing —during a deficit crisis has been withering. Only an administration blinkered by ideology would persist. Florida’s new Republican governor, Rick Scott, has joined Ohio’s (John Kasich) and Wisconsin’s (Scott Walker) in rejecting federal incentives—more than $2 billion in Florida’s case—to begin a high-speed rail project. Florida’s 84-mile line, which would have run parallel to Interstate 4, would have connected Tampa and Orlando. One preposterous projection was that it would attract 3 million passengers a year—almost as many as ride Amtrak’s Acela in the densely populated Boston–New York–Washington corridor. The three governors want to spare their states from paying the much larger sums likely to be required for construction-cost overruns and operating subsidies when ridership projections prove to be delusional. Kasich and Walker, who were elected promising to stop the nonsense, asked Washington for permission to use the high-speed-rail money for more pressing transportation needs than a train running along Interstate 71 between Cleveland and Cincinnati, or a train parallel to Interstate 94 between Milwaukee and Madison. Washington, disdaining the decisions of Ohio and Wisconsin voters, replied that it will find states that will waste the money. California will. Although prostrate from its own profligacy, it will sink tens of billions of its own taxpayers’ money in the 616-mile San Francisco–to–San Diego line. Supposedly 39 million people will eagerly pay much more than an airfare in order to travel slower. Between 2008 and 2009, the projected cost increased from $33 billion to $42.6 billion. Randal O’Toole of the Cato Institute notes that high-speed rail connects big-city downtowns, where only 7 percent of Americans work and 1 percent live. “The average intercity auto trip today uses less energy per passenger mile than the average Amtrak train.” And high speed will not displace enough cars to measurably reduce congestion. The Washington Post says China’s fast trains are priced beyond ordinary workers’ budgets, and that France, like Japan, has only one profitable line. So why is America’s “win the future” administration so fixated on railroads, a technology that was the future two centuries ago? Because progressivism’s aim is the modification of (other people’s) behavior. Forever seeking Archimedean levers for prying the world in directions they prefer, progressives say they embrace high-speed rail for many reasons—to improve the climate, increase competitiveness, enhance national security, reduce congestion, and rationalize land use. The length of the list of reasons, and the flimsiness of each, points to this conclusion: the real reason for progressives’ passion for trains is their goal of diminishing Americans’ individualism in order to make them more amenable to collectivism. To progressives, the best thing about railroads is that people riding them are not in automobiles, which are subversive of the deference on which progressivism depends. Automobiles go hither and yon, wherever and whenever the driver desires, without timetables. Automobiles encourage people to think they—unsupervised, untutored, and unscripted—are masters of their fates. The automobile encourages people in delusions of adequacy, which make them resistant to government by experts who know what choices people should make. Time was, the progressive cry was “Workers of the world unite!” or “Power to the people!” Now it is less resonant: “All aboard!”

### Trains --- 2nc Link

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

Will 2011

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

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

### Waterways --- 2nc Link

#### ---Federal management of waterways violate individual rights—Undermines individual autonomy while force taxpayers to incur higher burdens as a result of over-centralized mismanagement.

Mattei 4 (Erich, graduate school education at University of Georgia and Financial Advisor at Mattei and Associates, Mises Daily, “The Rivers Run Through It”, 6/3/4, <http://mises.org/daily/1531>, Accessed 7/11/12, Chan)

First and probably most obvious is the real estate both along and including the river. A system of private property rights is the only just, and in most cases productive and efficient, way for mankind to deal with scarcity. The fact that the state holds and prohibits individuals from using and homesteading the river predestines the waterway and all activities taking place on and along it to inevitable conflict in determining how it may be utilized, such as the case of the river pilot controversy. Second, the market for river pilots, as a labor market, is not a "market" at all, but an extremely rich labor union resembling the processes of political appointment rather than trade and competition. River pilots are arguably the most protected workers in all of the state, licensed solely by the state and free of virtually all market forces pertaining to wage and working conditions. Consequently, not only is there no profit-loss incentive or competition for employment, but there are no signals to note and reward productive pilots while flagging those who perform poorly. Finally, the market for virtually every consumer and producer good transported along the river is effected by the dynamics of the river pilot industry. The individuals who incur the greatest burdens and expenses as a result of the current organization of the river and transportation along it are consumers.¶ As though being taxed for the upkeep of the river were not enough (upkeep which itself would be much better in a market setting), any individual purchasing goods traded along the river now pays higher prices for the additional transaction and transportation expenses. Once one succeeds in taking into account the costs associated with the lack of efficiency and quality that typically characterize monopolies without the existence or the threat of competition, the full costs of the river pilot industry may be gauged.

#### ---Federal Waterway investment’s top down way of organizing knowledge fails to consider individuals resulting in overly-simplistic policies that fail and limit the free choice of consumers and private companies.

Phillips and Germani 10 (J. Brian, contractor and free-lance writer, and Alan,  associate editor of *The Objective Standard*, The Objective Standard, Vol. 5, No. 1, Spring 2010, “The Practicality of Private Waterways”, <http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp>, Accessed 7/11/12, Chan)

 “Public ownership” of waterways has led to, among other problems, harmful levels of pollution and depleted fish populations. Many waterways around the world have become so polluted that they are no longer fit for human use. In 2004, the Environmental Protection Agency reported that one-third of America’s lakes and nearly one-fourth of its rivers were under fish-consumption advisories due to polluted waters.[2](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn2) In 2005, officials in China estimated that 75 percent of that nation’s lakes were contaminated with potentially toxic algal blooms caused by[sewage](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp) and industrial waste.[3](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn3) And the World Commission on Water has found that half the world’s rivers are either seriously polluted or running dry from irrigation and other human uses or both.[4](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn4) By one estimate, the contaminated drinking water and poor sanitation that result from pollution and low water levels account for five to ten million deaths per year worldwide.[5](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn5)¶ In addition to containing harmful levels of pollution, many of the world’s waterways are being fished in a manner that is depleting fish populations and threatening with extinction fish species such as red snapper, white sturgeon, and bluefin tuna—species highly valuable to human life.[6](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn6) By 2003, primarily due to fishing practices associated with public waterways, 27 percent of the world’s fisheries (zones where fish and other seafood is caught) had “collapsed”—the term used by scientists to denote fish populations that drop to 10 percent or less of their historical highs.[7](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn7) In 2006, the journal Science published a study that offered a grim prediction: All of the world’s fisheries will collapse by 2048.[8](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn8)Whether or not all of the world’s fisheries will collapse in a mere forty years, the data clearly show that current fishing practices are depleting supplies of many species of consumable fish. At best, at the [current rate](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp) of fish depletion, many fishermen will lose their livelihoods and consumers will have fewer and fewer species from which to choose, species that will become more and more expensive.¶ What solutions have been proposed? Federal and state governments have attempted to remedy these problems through regulation—violating rights and creating new problems in the process. For example, twenty-five states prohibit or severely restrict the use of laundry [detergents](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp) containing phosphates, substances that harm aquatic life when present in water in high quantities.[9](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn9) A growing number of state and local governments—including Westchester County, New York, and Annapolis, Maryland—are enacting similar regulations on phosphate-containing fertilizers.[10](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn10) These laws violate the rights of detergent and fertilizer manufacturers by precluding them from creating the products they choose to create—and they violate the rights of consumers who want to buy such products rather than more-expensive, less-effective alternatives. Further, these rights-violating prohibitions have proven impractical in achieving their purpose: Despite many such regulations having been in effect for nearly forty years,[11](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn11) an estimated two-thirds of America’s bays and estuaries still contain harmful amounts of phosphates.[12](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn12)¶ Regulations regarding sewage treatment have proven similarly impractical: Since 1972, the federal government has forced water utilities to spend billions of dollars upgrading water treatment facilities, and yet, during the past four years, record numbers of beaches have closed due to pollution from sewage.[13](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn13) And, for what it is worth, the EPA predicts that by 2016 American rivers will be as polluted by sewage as they were in the 1970s.[14](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn14)¶ Government efforts to address depleted fish populations have proven similarly impractical. The history of the halibut industry in Alaska is an illuminating case in point. In the 1970s, the International Pacific Halibut Commission (IPHC)—a U.S.-backed intergovernmental regulatory agency—established a five-month fishing season in public waters off the Alaskan coast with the hope of maintaining halibut populations, which had become severely depleted. But forcibly limiting the time during which fishermen could operate did little to improve the fishery’s viability: Fishermen simply worked more vigorously during the season, and the halibut population remained at historically low levels. So, in the 1980s, the IPHC attempted to remedy the problem by reducing the five-month fishing season dramatically—to as few as two days.[15](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn15) During these shortened windows of opportunity, fishermen took extreme risks to maximize their catches, only to be “rewarded” onshore with the plummeting prices of a glutted market. And, in the end, the huge catches brought in by fishermen on these days were still large enough to jeopardize the halibut population.[16](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn16) So, in 1995, the IPHC dropped the idea of a short fishing season and instead introduced a “catch share program,” through which it limits each fisherman’s yearly catch to a percentage of what it deems to be a “safe” overall halibut harvest. But neither has this policy helped the situation; today, after more than two decades of shifting regulations, the usable halibut population in Alaskan waters is less than in 1985.[17](http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2010-spring/private-waterways.asp%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn17)¶ Although some claim that still more government regulations are required to combat the ongoing problems of pollution and depleted fish populations, any such coercive measures are in principle doomed to failure because they attempt to treat problems in the waterways while ignoring their actual cause: “public ownership.” Government force may provide a disincentive for certain behaviors, but this disincentive does not motivate the users of waterways to maintain or enhance the life-serving value of these resources. As a result, America’s waterways remain largely and significantly polluted, and fish populations, even where they are stabilizing, remain at levels insufficient to meet the growing demand for seafood.

## Impact

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

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

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

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

### Collectivism --- 2nc Impact

#### ---The greatest threat to civilization and societal progress is collectivism – It pampers the passive and hampers the active at the expense of both.

Rand 44 (Ayn Rand, witnessed the Russian revolution, graduated from the University of Petrograd, the State Institute for Cinema Arts, scriptwriter and author of The Fountainhead, Anthem and Atlas Shrugged, founder of Objectivism, “The Only Path to Tomorrow,” Reader’s Digest, January 1944, <http://fare.tunes.org/liberty/library/toptt.html>, AFJ)

The greatest threat to mankind and civilization is the spread of the totalitarian philosophy. Its best ally is not the devotion of its followers but the confusion of its enemies. To fight it, we must understand it. Totalitarianism is collectivism. Collectivism means the subjugation of the individual to a group — whether to a race, class or state does not matter. Collectivism holds that man must be chained to collective action and collective thought for the sake of what is called “the common good.” Throughout history, no tyrant ever rose to power except on the claim of representing “the common good.” Napoleon “served the common good” of France. Hitler is “serving the common good” of Germany. Horrors which no man would dare consider for his own selfish sake are perpetrated with a clear conscience by “altruists” who justify themselves by the common good. No tyrant has ever lasted long by force of arms alone. Men have been enslaved primarily by spiritual weapons. And the greatest of these is the collectivist doctrine that the supremacy of the state over the individual constitutes the common good. No dictator could rise if men held as a sacred faith the conviction that they have inalienable rights of which they cannot be deprived for any cause whatsoever, by any man whatsoever, neither by evildoer *nor supposed benefactor*. This is the basic tenet of individualism, as opposed to collectivism. Individualism holds that man is an independent entity with an inalienable right to the pursuit of his own happiness in a society where men deal with one another as equals. The American system is founded on individualism. If it is to survive, we must understand the principles of individualism and hold them as our standard in any public question, in every issue we face. We must have a positive credo, a clear consistent faith. We must learn to reject as total evil the conception that the common good is served by the abolition of individual rights. General happiness cannot be created out of general suffering and self-immolation. The only happy society is one of happy individuals. One cannot have a healthy forest made up of rotten trees. The power of society must always be limited by the basic, inalienable rights of the individual. The right of liberty means man's right to individual action, individual choice, individual initiative and individual property. Without the right to private property no independent action is possible. The right to the pursuit of happiness means man's right to live for himself, to choose what constitutes his own, private, personal happiness and to work for its achievement. Each individual is the sole and final judge in this choice. A man's happiness cannot be prescribed to him by another man or by any number of other men. These rights are the unconditional, personal, private, individual possession of every man, granted to him by the fact of his birth and requiring no other sanction. Such was the conception of the founders of our country, who placed individual rights above any and all collective claims. Society can only be a traffic policeman in the intercourse of men with one another. From the beginning of history, two antagonists have stood face to face, two opposite types of men: the Active and the Passive. The Active Man is the producer, the creator, the originator, the individualist. His basic need is independence — in order to think and work. He neither needs nor seeks power over other men — nor can he be made to work under any form of compulsion. Every type of good work — from laying bricks to writing a symphony — is done by the Active Man. Degrees of human ability vary, but the basic principle remains the same: the degree of a man's independence and initiative determines his talent as a worker and his worth as a man. The Passive Man is found on every level of society, in mansions and in slums, and his identification mark is his dread of independence. He is a parasite who expects to be taken care of by others, who wishes to be given directives, to obey, to submit, to be regulated, to be told. He welcomes collectivism, which eliminates any chance that he might have to think or act on his own initiative. When a society is based on the needs of the Passive Man it destroys the Active; but when the Active is destroyed, the Passive can no longer be cared for. When a society is based on the needs of the Active Man, he carries the Passive ones along on his energy and raises them as he rises, as the whole society rises. This has been the pattern of all human progress. Some humanitarians demand a collective state because of their pity for the incompetent or Passive Man. For his sake they wish to harness the Active. But the Active Man cannot function in harness. And once he is destroyed, the destruction of the Passive Man follows automatically. So if pity is the humanitarians' first consideration, then in the name of pity, if nothing else, they should leave the Active Man free to function, in order to help the Passive. There is no other way to help him in the long run. The history of mankind is the history of the struggle between the Active Man and the Passive, between the individual and the collective. The countries which have produced the happiest men, the highest standards of living and the greatest cultural advances have been the countries where the power of the collective — of the government, of the state — was limited and the individual was given freedom of independent action. As examples: The rise of Rome, with its conception of law based on a citizen's rights, over the collectivist barbarism of its time. The rise of England, with a system of government based on the Magna Carta, over collectivist, totalitarian Spain. The rise of the United States to a degree of achievement unequaled in history — by grace of the individual freedom and independence which our Constitution gave each citizen against the collective. While men are still pondering upon the causes of the rise and fall of civilizations, every page of history cries to us that there is but one source of progress: Individual Man in independent action. Collectivism is the ancient principle of savagery. A savage's whole existence is ruled by the leaders of his tribe. Civilization is the process of setting man free from men. We are now facing a choice: to go forward or to go back. Collectivism is not the “New Order of Tomorrow.” It is the order of a very dark yesterday. But there is a New Order of Tomorrow. It belongs to Individual Man — the only creator of any tomorrows humanity has ever been granted.

### Liberty --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Liberty outweighs human extinction --- It’s the basis for self definition and interpretation of value which is a prerequisite to the experiences that make life desirable in the first place.

Osterfeld 83 (Dr. David, assistant professor of political science at Saint Joseph's College, THE JOURNAL OF LIBERTARIAN STUDIES, Vol. 7, No. 1, The Natural Rights Debate: A Comment on a Reply, p. 107-8, Spring 1983, <http://mises.org/journals/jls/7_1/7_1_5.pdf>, Accessed 7/10/12, Chan)

How, however, can the minor premise that "everyone values life" be demonstrated without recourse to the impossible task of perpetual interviewing referred to above? Values are accurately revealed only through what economists term "demonstrated preference." An individual's values are made known to hiiself and others through his actual choice^.'^ And since anyone can end his life at any ¶ time he chooses, this means that we have incontrovertible empirical verification that everyone in the world today does actually value life more highly than death. It is imponant here to point out what is not being claimed. It is not being claimed that life is a universally held absolute or intrinsic value. It is clear, I think, that at least some, and probably many, do not regard it so. Nor is it even being claimed ¶ that life is a necessary condition for the attainment of all possible ends. It is being claimed, rather, that life is seen either as an end-in-itself, Le., an intrinsic value, or as a necessary condition for the attainment of any end that people in the world ¶ actually d o hold. This is so since, as the doctrine of demonstrated preference tells ¶ us, the moment continued life is seen as impeding or preventing the attainment of any individually held end, the individual will forego his life for the attainment of that value. A despondent individual may, for example, decide to end his misery on earth by taking his own life. In such a case, not only would life no longer have any value for that individual, it would actually impede the attainment of a higher value: the termination of his living hell. We can see this similarly with Ludwig von Mises' Buddhist (for whom adherence to his religious practices was more important than life itself), with Max Weber's syndicalist (for whom adherence to his politico-economic doctrines was of greater importance than life), and with the Shakers (a religious group whose prohibition of sexual intercourse on religious ¶ grounds resulted in their extinction in the early part of the twentieth century). But ¶ the important point here is that in taking his life the individual also takes himself ¶ out of the picture. Hence, everyone in the world empirically demonstrates by the simple fact of his continued existence that he values life more highly than death.

#### ---Liberty is the highest value --- It’s an objective necessity for human rights and value.

Imm 09 (Jeffrey, human rights activist at Responsible for Equality and Liberty, “The Universal Truths of Human Equality and Liberty”, Responsible for Equality and Liberty, 4/1/09, <http://www.realcourage.org/2009/04/universal-truths/>) SWOAP

Universal truths are truths for everyone. Equality and liberty are objective human rights, not subjective opinions. Therefore when we defend the truths of human equality and liberty, we must defend such truths for everyone – not just who we like or who are like us. The truths of such human rights of equality and liberty are not negotiable for countries, states, cities, or people who want some people to have different human rights than others. Universal truths are not an option for some, but not for others. Universal truths apply to everyone. Universal truths are not relativist, they are absolute.

### Slavery --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Statism enables slavery and genocide.

Cline 2012 (Edward, author of numerous published articles, book reviews and essays, “The Bedlam of Statism”, Capitalist Magazine, 6/20/12, <http://capitalismmagazine.com/2012/06/the-bedlam-of-statism/>) SWOAP

A statist or command economy is therefore a Sisyphean nightmare that grows worse with each new echelon of salaried mediocrities put in charge of regulating the latest “public concern.” Statists declare society blighted and proceed to impose eminent domain on neighborhoods, choices, habits, and everyone. This has been the incremental history of Progressivism, which has never had to look far for a “social ill” to cure and regulate. Any human action may be deemed a “social ill” and a candidate for taxation, regulation, or prohibition, from consuming milkshakes to stock or commodity speculation. The purpose of the taxes, regulations, and prohibitions is to impose the “social justice” clamored for by various social engineering groups that wish to punish, control, or extinguish other groups. Governments – federal, state and local – wish to have enough revenue to either balance their budgets, or at least stave off bigger than usual deficits, while at the same time heeding the social justice brigades’ demands for smoke-free air or reduced car emissions or nutritional information on food products or a “fairer” redistribution of earned income. This compels government policymakers to seek a median, which only ratchets up costs all around. It is a no-win episode of bipolarism for everyone, two steps forward, one step back. It is disguised as “social progress” by the pronouncements of activists, politicians, and public interest groups. What it is in reality is an insidious conditioning of men so that they become inured to slavery.

### War --- 2nc Impact

#### **---Government transportation infrastructure will be assimilated into larger structures of sovereign domination resulting in the promotion of statist violence and war.**

Weisbord 37 (Albert. Harvard Law School Graduate. Leading Communist Radical.“The Conquest of Power: The Age of Violence, Chapter 25” Indiana University Press. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/weisbord/conquest25.htm> Pismarov)

As war becomes transformed into a modern industry, the inventions which were laid at the feet of peace now are carried elsewhere. Inventors turn from private industry to the patronage of the State. The contradictions of imperialism prevent the trusts from utilizing to the maximum their productive capacities or from making the best applications of the ever increasing host of inventions presenting themselves. The State is forced to resort to the organization of laboratories and research bureaus, to stimulate discovery and inventions, and to organize its many universities and higher centers of learning for the express purpose of advancing technological knowledge. But the primary interest of the State is not peace, but war. “Peace established by the State, or resting in the discretion of the State, is necessarily of the nature of an armistice, in effect terminable at will and on short notice… . At the best, the State, or the government, is an instrumentality for making peace, not for perpetuating it.” (\*2) Thus the inventive ability of mankind, which heretofore had been directed towards constructive processes of peace-time endeavor, now become directed towards destructive activities for war. Peace becomes a feverish preparation for military activities.

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

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

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

### 40,000 a Year (Highway Specific) --- 2nc Impact

#### ---State mismanagement of highway infrastructure kills 40,000 people a year and follows the logic of the worst soviet atrocities.

Crovelli 8

Mark R. Crovelli is a contributing writer for Mises Daily. March 18, 2008. Lew Rockwell Institute. “The Hidden Costs of Road Socialism” <http://www.lewrockwell.com/crovelli/crovelli12.html>) Sherman

The first step toward understanding how to make America's roads and highways safer and cleaner (and just plain tolerable to navigate without losing one's mind), is to recognize that the type of road provision that we currently have in this country is a pure form of socialism. That is to say, since America's roads and highways are funded purely through tax money (and "fees," if you prefer Mit Romney's double-speak), they are therefore managed wholly by faceless government bureaucrats and politicians in precisely the same manner that tractors and rubber boots were managed and produced in the former Soviet Union. The provision of roads in this country thus has absolutely no link to the preferences of the consumers of the "service," all of whom are forced to pay for it whether they want to or not. (And, if any of us poor saps should sensibly try to opt out of paying the taxes that fund these horribly mismanaged assets, we will very quickly find ourselves rotting in Federal prison.) Hence, the first step toward understanding how to remedy the gravely disordered road system in this country is simply to recognize that the current system of road provision in the U.S. blatantly satisfies Arthur Balfour's famous definition of socialism: "Socialism means the public ownership of the means of production and distribution; that is Socialism and nothing else is Socialism." (See Garret Garret's powerful essay The March for this definition).¶ As an aside, it would be ridiculous to object that the purported consumers of road "services" in the U.S. do indeed have a say in how the roads in this country are produced through voting, because: 1) a gigantic chunk of the populace in the U.S simply does not vote, 2) even when they do vote, they almost never have any idea whatsoever about what their representative will do about roads, and finally 3) the vast majority of decisions regarding roads in this country are made by unelected bureaucrats, none of whom the voting public will ever even know, let alone vote for.¶ The second step toward remedying the gravely flawed road system in this country is to recognize that road socialism, just like every form of socialism, imposes severe and unavoidable costs on the consumer of the socialized good. Foremost among these costs of road socialism is the enormous loss of human life that occurs on socialized roads; a staggering 40,000+ Americans lose their lives on government roads every year. (On this statistic, see especially the excellent article by Walter Block, "Deaths by Government: Another Missing Chapter.") As Dr. Block has tirelessly striven to point out to an American population that isn't even aware it has a socialized road system, these 40,000+ deaths every year on America's roads are ultimately attributable to the fact that the roads are socialized (see his website for an extensive list of publications on this topic). In this article, I focus on several other areas of socialized road provision that illustrate the dangerousness and mind-boggling inefficiency of road socialism. The areas I have chosen to focus on here offer, I think, a remarkably stark illustration of some of the hidden costs of this form of socialism in the United States that are often (and lamentably) overlooked.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### ---This is a function of flawed epistemology --- Centralized transportation planning fails because knowledge is distributed throughout the market and can never be accumulated under sovereign management. Only markets come to grips with the reality of how aggregate knowledge functions.

Hayek 1945 (Friedrich A, “The Use of Knowledge in Society”, American Economic Review, Volume 35, issue 4, pgs 519-530, <http://www.econlib.org/library/Essays/hykKnw1.html>) SWOAP

Today it is almost heresy to suggest that scientific knowledge is not the sum of all knowledge. But a little reflection will show that there is beyond question a body of very important but unorganized knowledge which cannot possibly be called scientific in the sense of knowledge of general rules: the knowledge of the particular circumstances of time and place. It is with respect to this that practically every individual has some advantage over all others because he possesses unique information of which beneficial use might be made, but of which use can be made only if the decisions depending on it are left to him or are made with his active coöperation. We need to remember only how much we have to learn in any occupation after we have completed our theoretical training, how big a part of our working life we spend learning particular jobs, and how valuable an asset in all walks of life is knowledge of people, of local conditions, and of special circumstances. To know of and put to use a machine not fully employed, or somebody's skill which could be better utilized, or to be aware of a surplus stock which can be drawn upon during an interruption of supplies, is socially quite as useful as the knowledge of better alternative techniques. And the shipper who earns his living from using otherwise empty or half-filled journeys of tramp-steamers, or the estate agent whose whole knowledge is almost exclusively one of temporary opportunities, or the *arbitrageur* who gains from local differences of commodity prices, are all performing eminently useful functions based on special knowledge of circumstances of the fleeting moment not known to others. It is a curious fact that this sort of knowledge should today be generally regarded with a kind of contempt and that anyone who by such knowledge gains an advantage over somebody better equipped with theoretical or technical knowledge is thought to have acted almost disreputably. To gain an advantage from better knowledge of facilities of communication or transport is sometimes regarded as almost dishonest, although it is quite as important that society make use of the best opportunities in this respect as in using the latest scientific discoveries. This prejudice has in a considerable measure affected the attitude toward commerce in general compared with that toward production. Even economists who regard themselves as definitely immune to the crude materialist fallacies of the past constantly commit the same mistake where activities directed toward the acquisition of such practical knowledge are concerned—apparently because in their scheme of things all such knowledge is supposed to be "given." The common idea now seems to be that all such knowledge should as a matter of course be readily at the command of everybody, and the reproach of irrationality leveled against the existing economic order is frequently based on the fact that it is not so available. This view disregards the fact that the method by which such knowledge can be made as widely available as possible is precisely the problem to which we have to find an answer.

### State Infrastructure Fails (Aviation) --- 2nc Impact

#### ---The root cause of all Aviation transportation problems is the state --- It coerces taxpayers into supporting inefficient resource allocation and flawed planning.

Carson 10 (November. Kevin A. Senior fellow and holder of the Karl Hess Chair in Social Theory at the Center for a Stateless Society. “[The Distorting Effects of Transportation Subsidies](http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-distorting-effects-of-transportation-subsidies/),” Volume 60 Issue 9 The Freeman, [**http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-distorting-effects-of-transportation-subsidies/**](http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/the-distorting-effects-of-transportation-subsidies/) Pismarov)

As for the civil aviation system, from the beginning it was a creature of the State. Its original physical infrastructure was built entirely with federal grants and tax-free municipal bonds. Professor Stephen Paul Dempsey of the University of Denver in 1992 estimated the replacement value of this infrastructure at $1 trillion. The federal government didn’t even start collecting user fees from airline passengers and freight shippers until 1971. Even with such user fees paid into the Airport and Airways Trust Fund, the system still required taxpayer subsidies of $3 billion to maintain the Federal Aviation Administration’s network of control towers, air traffic control centers, and tens of thousands of air traffic controllers.

### State Infrastructure Fails (Highways) --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Federal road spending homogenizes solutions—Taking away the ability of the individual’s choice by basing decisions on simplistic political solutions rather than specific consequences empirically results in serial policy failure.

Roth 10 (Gabriel, civil engineer, transportation economist with twenty years at the World Bank, a research fellow at the Independent Institute, “Federal Highway Funding”, June 2010, <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding/>, 7/10/12, Chan)

Americans are frustrated by rising traffic congestion. In the period 1980 to 2008, the vehicle-miles driven in the nation increased 96 percent, but the lane-miles of public roads increased only 7.5 percent. The problem is that U.S. road systems are run by governments, which do not respond to the wishes of road users but to the preferences of politicians. Transportation markets need to be liberated from government control so that road users can directly finance the needed highway improvements that they are prepared to pay for. We need to recognize "road space" as a scarce resource and allow road owners to increase supply and charge market prices for it. We should allow the revenues to stimulate investment in new capacity and in technologies to reduce congestion. If the market is allowed to work, profits will attract investors willing to spend their own money to expand the road system in response to the wishes of consumers. To make progress toward a market-based highway system, we should first end the federal role in highway financing. In his 1982 State of the Union address, President Reagan proposed that all federal highway and transit programs, except the interstate highway system, be "turned back" to the states and the related federal gasoline taxes ended. Similar efforts to phase out federal financing of state roads were introduced in 1996 by Sen. Connie Mack (R-FL) and Rep. John Kasich (R-OH). Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK) introduced a similar bill in 2002, and Rep. Scott Garrett (R-NJ) and Rep. Jeff Flake (R-AZ) have each proposed bills to allow states to fully or partly opt out of federal highway financing.[47](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn47%22%20%5Co%20%22)¶ Such reforms would give states the freedom to innovate with toll roads, electronic road-pricing technologies, and private highway investment. Unfortunately, these reforms have so far received little action in Congress. But there is a growing acceptance of innovative financing and management of highways in many states.¶ With the devolution of highway financing and control to the states, successful innovations in one state would be copied in other states. And without federal subsidies, state governments would have stronger incentives to ensure that funds were spent efficiently. An additional advantage is that highway financing would be more transparent without the complex federal trust fund. Citizens could better understand how their transportation dollars were being spent.¶ The time is ripe for repeal of the current central planning approach to highway financing. Given more autonomy, state governments and the private sector would have the power and flexibility to meet the huge challenges ahead that America faces in highway infrastructure.¶

#### ---Federal Highway Investment is self-defeating --- Causes vicious cycle, inefficiency and corruption follow.

Bacon 8 [Jim Bacon, 4/29/08, After a 25-year career in Virginia journalism, James A. Bacon In 2009, Bacon took a full-time job as Vice President-Publishing with the Boomer Project. He continued publishing the blog, and passed on the website and electronic newsletter to the Thomas Jefferson Institute for Public Policy. Leaving the Boomer Project, Bacon took time off to write his book, “Boomergeddon: How Runaway Deficits Will Bankrupt the Country and Ruin Retirement for Aging Baby Boomers — And What You Can Do About It,” publish the accompanying “Boomergeddon” blog, and contribute op-ed pieces to the Washington Times, “$120-Per-Barrel Oil and the Abject Failure of Virginia’s Political Class”, *Bacon’s Rebellion,* <http://www.baconsrebellion.com/2008/04/120-per-barrel-oil-and-utter-failure-of.html>.] Ari Jacobson

But transportation subsidies are a different matter entirely. The problem is that **the more we subsidize the cost of road construction and maintenance, the more we encourage people to utilize the automobile, which**, in turn, **puts more stress on the transportation system and genertes calls for more spending**, **in a** vicious circle**.** Furthermore, **the expenditure of funds on roads, highways and other transportation projects is subject to the political process, which means that** certain players (**big developers, contractors, etc**.) **are willing to expend large amounts of money to influence those expenditures in ways that favor them, not the public.** **Politicians**, of course, **are only too happy to play along**. **As a consequence**, **the process of allocating tax dollars has been hopelessly corrupted**. Like farm subsidies, **transportation subsidies lead to demonstrable inequities and inefficiencies**. What we’re doing is not working.

#### ---Structural deficiencies in Federal Highway Investment ensure the plan’s inevitable failure

Block 2007 (Walter Edward Block, currently professor of economics at Loyola University New Orleans and Senior Fellow with the Ludwig von Mises Institute, “Free Market Transportation: Denationalizing the Roads,” <http://mises.org/journals/jls/3_2/3_2_7.pdf>, AFJ)

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 to 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 merchants who have served them well. These businesses are thus allowed to earn a profit. They can prosper and expand. Entrepreneurs who fail to satisfy, on 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.

### State Infrastructure Fails (Rail) --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Federal rail investment is self-defeating --- Incentivizes mismanagement, coercion and inefficiency that can only be solved by the alternative.

O’Toole 10 [Randal O’Toole, June 2010, Randal O'Toole is a Cato Institute Senior Fellow working on urban growth, public land, and transportation issues. O'Toole's research on national forest management, culminating in his 1988 book, [Reforming the Forest Service](http://www.amazon.com/dp/0933280459/?tag=catoinstitute-20), has had a major influence on Forest Service policy and on-the-ground management. His analysis of urban land-use and transportation issues, brought together in his 2001 book, [The Vanishing Automobile and Other Urban Myths](http://www.amazon.com/dp/097064390X/?tag=catoinstitute-20), has influenced decisions in cities across the country. In his book [The Best-Laid Plans](http://store.cato.org/index.asp?fa=ProductDetails&method=cats&scid=43&pid=1441366), O'Toole calls for repealing federal, state, and local planning laws and proposes reforms that can help solve social and environmental problems without heavy-handed government regulation. O'Toole is the author of numerous Cato papers. He has also written for [Regulation](http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regulation_currentissue.html) magazine as well as op-eds and articles for numerous other national journals and newspapers. O'Toole travels extensively and has spoken about free-market environmental issues in dozens of cities. An Oregon native, O'Toole was educated in forestry at Oregon State University and in economics at the University of Oregon.

 “Urban Transit, *Downsizing the Federal Government,* <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/>.] Ari Jacobson

**The first step toward reform is to remove federal subsidies and related regulations** **from the transit equation**. **Federal intervention creates all kinds of perverse incentives for state and local governments**. These include the following: **Cities are encouraged to build very inefficient rail lines because more than half of all federal funds are dedicated to rail transit. Transit agencies are encouraged to find the most expensive transit solutions because rail construction funds are** an open bucket—**first-come, first-served**. **Innovative** transit **solutions are bypassed and high costs are guaranteed because of the requirement that transit agencies obtain the approval of their unions to be eligible for federal grants. Local** transit **agencies have strong incentives to claim success with their projects no matter how badly they fail because of the requirement that agencies must refund federal grants if projects are cancelled. Federal rules impose a transit planning process that is biased in favor of higher-cost transit projects, and the process allows agencies to systematically low-ball cost estimates and overstate potential ridership. Federal subsidies have been mainly directed to capital costs of local transit, not operating costs. That has led to a host of distortions, such as agencies favoring rail over buses and favoring larger buses when smaller ones would do the job. Many federal regulations distort the flow of funding to the most efficient solutions, such as rules that tie the distribution of transportation funds to air quality planning**. **These factors** and others **have promoted less efficient transportation solutions than would have likely been employed without federal intervention.** I have discussed these problems elsewhere at length.[61](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn61) **With the federal government out of the picture, state and local governments would need to rethink their own urban transit financing**. One problem is that the average American transit agency gets only a third of its operating funds and none of its capital funds from fares. This means that transit officials are less interested in increasing transit ridership than they are in persuading politicians and taxpayers to give them more money. Increased ridership is actually a burden on transit systems: even though transit vehicles are, on average, only one-sixth full, they tend to be fullest during rush hour, when new riders are most likely to use transit. **Today's government rail transit systems make no financial or transportation sense. They only work because few people use them and everyone else subsidizes them.** Because rail transit costs at least four times as much, per passenger mile, as driving, **if everyone rode today's rail systems instead of automobiles, cities would go bankrupt trying to keep the systems running**. Yet urban transit does not have to be expensive, and it does not even have to be subsidized. **The United States has several completely unsubsidized transit systems that work very well. One is the Atlantic City Jitney Association, whose members own identical 13-passenger buses. Each bus is operated by its owner on routes scheduled by the association. Rides are $1.50 each and cover all major attractions in the city. Unlike most publicly owned transit systems, the jitneys operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and receive absolutely no subsidies from any government agency.**[62](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn62) **Such jitney service is illegal in most other American cities because it would compete against the government's monopoly transit agency.**

### A2 Coercion Inevitable --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Even if coercion is inevitable it should still frame your decision --- Only starting from the assumption that the individual determines their own value allows for individual meaning.

Koopman 2008 (Colin. Assistant Professor in Philosophy at the University of Oregon. “Morals and Markets: Liberal Democracy through Dewey and Hayek” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1226437> Pismarov)

A central point of Hayek’s neoliberalism is that we can strictly isolate freedom from coercion by containing each in the mutually exclusive political spheres of the public and the private. **Coercion can never be fully eliminated and freedom made absolute. But freedom can be increased and coercion minimized “by conferring the monopoly of coercion on the state,” and enabling “the state’s protecting known private spheres of the individuals against interference by others.”17 The idea is that all coercive power will be consolidated in the public sphere so that the private sphere can be a space of maximal liberty.** Hayek puts it this way: “What distinguishes a free from an unfree society is that in the former each individual has a recognized private sphere clearly distinct form the public sphere.”18 Elsewhere he writes that, “The central concept of liberalism is that under the enforcement of universal rules of just conduct, protecting a recognizable private domain of individuals, a spontaneous order of human activities of much greater complexity will form itself than could ever be produced by deliberate arrangement.”19 Hayekian **liberalism thus seeks to provide a public framework of rules within which we can privately pursue our own projects. The essential quality of the private sphere, from which all other private qualities emanate, is the exclusive control of individuals over their property and their selves.**20 The public sphere, on the other hand, is defined as the exclusive control of individuals by universal and necessary rules of social interaction, a control optimally achieved by the impersonal rule of law.21 These two concepts, **private property and the public rule of law, are the cornerstones of Hayek’s liberalism. That they can function together with mutual benefit to each is the burden of one of the centermost theoretical innovations of neoliberalism: the invisible hand.**

#### ---Small violations of freedom spillover --- We must resist every violation to halt the slide to totalitarianism.

Petro 1974 (Sylvester. professor of law, Wake Forest University, TOLEDO LAW REVIEW, Spring, p. 480. Pismarov)

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

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

#### ---Government transportation investment in is not inevitable or necessary --- Only starting from an autonomous position within the markets allows us to realize that there are other methods to getting things done. Even if we don’t have a specific vision for our alternative, the act of rejecting state blinders opens up our thinking to new possibilities that could solve the aff better but are incomprehensible to our current frame of thinking.

Block 79 (Walter. PhD in Economics at Columbia University. “[Free Market Transportation: Denationalizing the Roads”](http://www.mises.org/journals/jls/3_2/3_2_7.pdf) Journal of Libertarian Studies: An Interdisciplinary Review, Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 209-238 [**https://mises.org/journals/jls/3\_2/3\_2\_7.pdf**](https://mises.org/journals/jls/3_2/3_2_7.pdf) Pismarov)

But there is also an emotive element which is responsible, perhaps, not for the content of the objection, but for the hysterical manner in which it is usually couched and the unwillingness, even, to consider the case. The psychological component stems from a feeling that government road management is inevitable and that any other alternative is therefore unthinkable. It is this emotional factor that must he flatly rejected. We must realize that just because the government has alwaysL0built and managed the roadway network, this is not necessarily inevitable, the most efficient procedure, nor even justifiable. On the contrary, the state of affairs that has characterized the past is, logically, almost entirely irrelevant. Just because "we have 'always' exorcised devils with broomsticks in order to cure disease" does not mean that this is the best way.

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

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

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

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

### A2 Realism --- 2nc Impact

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### A2 State K to Rights --- 2nc Impact

#### ---False; rights exist and have value independent of state recognition or enforcement.

Hager 2012 (Anthony W, writer for the Right Slant, “Government isn’t the creator of rights”, American Thinker, 4/14/12, <http://www.americanthinker.com/2012/04/government_isnt_the_creator_of_rights.html>)

To assume that human liberties, defined as rights, are products of government is illogical. Since government produces nothing of its own accord, and therefore possesses nothing, it can only distribute what it first takes. Government can bestow retractable privileges, but not inalienable rights. For example, governments issue the driver's license, which is considered a privilege. As such, governments can disperse the driver's license on their terms, according to their will, or revoke the privilege altogether. A veritable right is quite different. Genuine rights are inalienable and self-evident. A right exists without government permission, and no expert translation is necessary to understand its presence. Rational people instinctively understand their rights and how government incursions weaken their liberties. So to recognize the Creator as the source of liberty is entirely sensible. What a Creator has granted, no government can retract. Government may ignore a right -- a too common occurrence -- but the right still exists for those who will undergo the [fatigues](http://www.ushistory.org/paine/crisis/c-04.htm) of supporting it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### A2 Taxation Good --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Taxation is the moral equivalent of slavery.

Rothbard 73 (Murray N. Rothbard, founded the Center for Libertarian Studies, began the Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics, professor at University of Nevada, has a BA in mathematics and economics, an MA, and a Doctor of Philosophy degree in economics from Columbia University, studied under Ludwig von Mises at New York University, and later was the academic vice president of the Ludwig von Mises Institute, “For a New Liberty: The Libertarian Manifesto,” 1973, <http://mises.org/books/newliberty.pdf>, AFJ)

In a sense, the entire system of taxation is a form of involuntary servitude. Take, in particular, the income tax. The high levels of income tax mean that all of us work a large part of the year—several months—for nothing for Uncle Sam before being allowed to enjoy our incomes on the market. Part of the essence of slavery, after all, is forced work for someone at little or no pay. But the income tax means that we sweat and earn income, only to see the government extract a large chunk of it by coercion for its own purposes. What is this but forced labor at no pay? The withholding feature of the income tax is a still more clear-cut instance of involuntary servitude. For as the intrepid Connecticut industrialist Vivien Kellems argued years ago, the employer is forced to expend time, labor, and money in the business of deducting and transmitting his employees’ taxes to the federal and state governments—yet the employer is not recompensed for this expenditure. What moral principle justifies the government’s forcing employers to act as its unpaid tax collectors? The withholding principle, of course, is the linchpin of the whole federal income tax system. Without the steady and relatively painless process of deducting the tax from the worker’s paycheck, the government could never hope to raise the high levels of tax from the workers in one lump sum. Few people remember that the withholding system was only instituted during World War II and was supposed to be a wartime expedient. Like so many other features of State despotism, however, the wartime emergency measure soon became a hallowed part of the American system. It is perhaps significant that the federal government, challenged by Vivien Kellems to test the constitutionality of the withholding system, failed to take up the challenge. In February 1948 Miss Kellems, a small manufacturer in Westport, Connecticut, announced that she was defying the withholding law and was refusing to deduct the tax from her employees. She demanded that the federal government indict her, so that the courts would be able to rule on the constitutionality of the withholding system. The government refused to do so, but instead seized the amount due from her bank account. Miss Kellems then sued in federal court for the government to return her funds. When the suit finally came to trial in February 1951, the jury ordered the government to refund her money. But the test of constitutionality never came. To add insult to injury, the individual taxpayer, in filling out his tax form, is also forced by the government to work at no pay on the laborious and thankless task of reckoning how much he owes the government. Here again, he cannot charge the government for the cost and labor expended in making out his return. Furthermore, the law requiring everyone to fill out his tax form is a clear violation of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, prohibiting the government from forcing anyone to incriminate himself. Yet the courts, often zealous in protecting Fifth Amendment rights in less sensitive areas, have done nothing here, in a case where the entire existence of the swollen federal government structure is at stake. The repeal of either the income tax or the withholding or self-incriminating provisions would force the government back to the relatively minor levels of power that the country enjoyed before the twentieth century. Retail sales, excise, and admission taxes also compel unpaid labor—in these cases, the unpaid labor of the retailer in collecting and forwarding the taxes to the government. The high costs of tax collecting for the government have another unfortunate effect—perhaps not unintended by the powers-that-be. These costs, readily undertaken by large businesses, impose a disproportionately heavy and often crippling cost upon the small employer. The large employer can then cheerfully shoulder the cost knowing that his small competitor bears far more of the burden.

### A2 Utilitarianism --- 2nc Impact

#### ---Utilitarianism fails and you should default to an objective prioritization of individual liberty when assessing impacts --- Utilitarianism by itself is meaningless and leaves vulnerable liberty and basic human rights.

Shestack 98 (Jerome J. , “The Philosophic Foundations of Human Rights”, Human Rights Quarterly, Volume 20 Issue 2, pgs 214-215, 1998, <http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v020/20.2shestack.html>) SWOAP

The essential criticism of utilitarianism is that it fails to recognize individual autonomy; it fails to take rights seriously. [28](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v020/20.2shestack.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT28) Utilitarianism, however refined, retains the central principle of maximizing the aggregate desires or general welfare as the ultimate criterion of value. While utilitarianism treats persons as equals, it does so only in the sense of including them in the mathematical equation, but not in the sense of attributing worth to each individual. Under the utilitarian equation, one individual's desires or welfare may be sacrificed as long as aggregate satisfaction or welfare is increased. Utilitarianism thus fails to treat persons as equals, in that it literally dissolves moral personality into utilitarian aggregates. Moreover, the mere increase in aggregate happiness or welfare, if abstracted from questions of distribution and worth of the individual, is not a real value or true moral goal.¶ Hence, despite the egalitarian pretensions of utilitarian doctrine, it has a sinister side in which the well-being of the individual may be sacrificed for what are claimed to be aggregate interests, and justice and right have no secure place. Utilitarian philosophy thus leaves liberty and rights vulnerable to contingencies, and therefore at risk. [29](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/human_rights_quarterly/v020/20.2shestack.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT29) In an era characterized by inhumanity, the dark side of utilitarianism made the philosophy too suspect [End Page 214] to be accepted as a prevailing philosophy. Indeed, most modern moral theorists seem to have reached an antiutilitarian consensus, at least in recognizing certain basic individual rights as constraints on any maximizing aggregative principle. In Ronald Dworkin's felicitous phrase, rights must be "trumps" over countervailing utilitarian calculations.

## Alternative

### Solves Case --- 2nc Alternative

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

Shaffer, 2010 (Butler, professor of law and author, “Anarchy in the Streets”, 4/7/10, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer223.html)

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

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

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

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

#### ---Transportation systems are empirically more effective absent government intervention.

O’Toole 10 [Randal O’Toole, June 2010, Randal O'Toole is a Cato Institute Senior Fellow working on urban growth, public land, and transportation issues. O'Toole's research on national forest management, culminating in his 1988 book, [Reforming the Forest Service](http://www.amazon.com/dp/0933280459/?tag=catoinstitute-20), has had a major influence on Forest Service policy and on-the-ground management. His analysis of urban land-use and transportation issues, brought together in his 2001 book, [The Vanishing Automobile and Other Urban Myths](http://www.amazon.com/dp/097064390X/?tag=catoinstitute-20), has influenced decisions in cities across the country. In his book [The Best-Laid Plans](http://store.cato.org/index.asp?fa=ProductDetails&method=cats&scid=43&pid=1441366), O'Toole calls for repealing federal, state, and local planning laws and proposes reforms that can help solve social and environmental problems without heavy-handed government regulation. O'Toole is the author of numerous Cato papers. He has also written for [Regulation](http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regulation_currentissue.html) magazine as well as op-eds and articles for numerous other national journals and newspapers. O'Toole travels extensively and has spoken about free-market environmental issues in dozens of cities. An Oregon native, O'Toole was educated in forestry at Oregon State University and in economics at the University of Oregon.

 “Urban Transit, *Downsizing the Federal Government,* <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/>.] Ari Jacobson

Yet **urban transit** does not have to be expensive, and it **does not** even **have to be subsidized.** **The United States has several completely unsubsidized transit systems that work very well.** **One is the Atlantic City Jitney Association, whose members own identical 13-passenger buses. Each bus is operated by its owner on routes scheduled by the association**. Rides are $1.50 each and cover all major attractions in the city. Unlike most publicly owned transit systems, **the jitneys operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and receive absolutely no subsidies from any government agency.**[62](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/#_edn62) **Such jitney service is illegal in most other American cities because it would compete against the government's monopoly transit agency.** **Another unsubsidized transit system is the públicos**, [poo-bleek-os] or public cars, **of San Juan, Puerto Rico**. Públicos are independently owned and operated buses that typically seat 17 passengers. At least six different companies operate públicos and they provide both urban and intercity service. Fares vary depending on the length of the ride, but in 2007 they averaged less than a dollar. **Although públicos compete against a public bus system and a recently built heavy-rail line** (whose cost rose from a projected $1.0 billion to $2.2 billion**), the públicos carry more riders each year than the public buses and trains combined**.[63](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn63) **A third unsubsidized transit system is the NY Waterway ferries, which connect multiple points in New Jersey and Manhattan.** Founded in 1986 by Arthur Imperatore**, NY Waterway offers a service that none of the many government transit agencies in the metropolitan area thought to provide.**[64](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn64) Passengers arriving in New York City can take NY Waterway buses to and from various points in Manhattan at no extra charge. **Although the company accepted a federal subsidy in 2001 to temporarily replace subway service between New Jersey and the World Trade Center after 9/11, it is otherwise funded entirely out of fares.**[65](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn65) The company carried 4.8 million passengers **in 2007**, collecting **$33 million in revenues against $21 million in operating expenses.**[66](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit/%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn66) **Public transit agencies encourage people to believe that if their large subsidies disappeared, people without cars would lack any mobility. In fact, private forms of transit would quickly spring up to take the place of government transit**. Such **private transit would,** in many ways, be superior to the government transit. It **would be more likely to offer door-to-door service, operate during more hours of the day, and provide more limited or nonstop services to popular destinations. American taxpayers can no longer afford costly and inefficient government transit systems, particularly rail transit systems**. **Federal subsidies ought to be eliminated and local governments should open up transit to private and entrepreneurial solutions to relieving traffic congestion.**

### (S) High Speed Rail --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---Separating high speed rail from government coercion is the only way to solve --- Italy proves only privatization leads to lower prices and increased growth.

The Environmental Blog 11

(The Environmental Blog is an environmental justice, environmental issues, human rights, green tech, green living, and sustainable news site. December 25, 2011. “ARE PRIVATE HIGH SPEED TRAINS THE FUTURE?” <http://www.theenvironmentalblog.org/2011/12/private-high-speed-trains-future/>) Sherman

Privatization of High Speed Rails is the question.¶ The first completely private high speed rail is the Italian “NTV AGV” trains from luxury car maker Ferrari. These high speed trains, in the iconic red colour of Ferrari, are stated to start functioning throughout Italy in the summer of 2012. Highlights of the trains:¶ Funding: All the funding to purchase the trains, technology and train the staff has been taken up by NTV alone. No government funding of any sort has been used.¶ Luxury: Since the trains were designed by Ferrari, you will find luxuries such as leather seats, tunnel proof Wi-Fi, access to television, dedicated cinema coaches, staff trained in hospitality and panoramic windows in all of their rails.¶ Pricing: While the trains are luxury trains, the pricing system used will be one similar to flights i.e. tiered pricing. Based on factors such as season, day, and time, the price will change. But it is said that even at their costliest prices, the trains will be affordable to the common public. Additionally, since there are three levels of seating, finding the perfect fit according to your budget should be easy. Lastly, since competition in the mass transport arena is high, prices will remain low.¶ Service: Since the rails are owned by a private company, customer service will be excellent. Unlike government rails, everything from timing to food will be perfect.¶ Since the above project has been taken up by a private company, construction and functioning should be better than government funded operations. Funding and completion of projects will be simpler and faster and the everyday taxpayer won’t have to worry about the government spending excess funds on transportation projects.¶

### (S) Highways --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---Alternative solves Case --- Commercialization is a weak option, only the free market can reduce congestion.

Carnis 2001 (Laurent Carnis, researches the economics of road safety with the Group Risk Analysis and its Governance Road, holds a diploma from the Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Paris in Economics and Finance and a BA in Business Economics, defended his thesis in Economics at the University of Champagne-Ardenne, “Management versus Ownership: The Road-Privatization Debate,” The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics Vol. 4, No. 2, summer 2001, <http://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar?q=cache:vvjMSAqgYrcJ:scholar.google.com/+libertarianism+transportation+infrastructure&hl=en&as_sdt=0,14&as_vis=1>, AFJ)

What are the benefits that can be expect from privatization of the public roads network? It is difficult to answer without engaging in the methodological error of attempting to predict the results of the competitive market process, the very purpose of which is to discover the most suitable means of achieving ends. Economists make their most solid arguments when enunciating general considerations, based on a priori knowledge and general principles arrived at through means of deductive reasoning (Hoppe 1989, p. 1). At the same time, history provides some illustrative instances of privately built and operated roads. These examples demonstrate how private roads might operate in a market economy. The private roads network might consist of a number of different companies competing against each other for customers. Some roads would serve a purely complementary role. The existence of competition would be ensured, not only by the number of roads and road owners, but also from new firms gaining entry into a market uninhibited by legal barriers. Some new roads would be built in response to the desires of consumers, while others would disappear because they are no longer useful or profitable. This private market would discourage the overproduction of roads in specific areas and the underproduction of roads in others. Consumer demand and economic viability would drive and direct the level and type of investment, while profits and losses would reward some production and discourage others. Entrepreneurs, backed by investors from either privately or publicly held companies, would assume the risks and bear the consequences (Kirzner 1996).There seems to be some confusion, however, in the relevant literature concerning the crucial distinction between full privatization and mere commercialization. Commercialization offers only partial solutions to the problems associated with public ownership. The pro-commercialization economists understand the importance of the market price and market mechanisms but misleadingly recommend it in the absence of property rights (Roth 1996,1967; Friedman 1989; Vickrey 1963; Brownlee and Heller 1956). For instance, Roth (1996) proposes that the following principle should govern commercial pricing: in a market economy, ways have to be found to enable all road costs to be paid for by those who use, or benefit from, roads, and that the amounts payable need not be determined by governments except when road users face monopolistic road suppliers. (p. 104) The question remains how the price, in these cases, is to be determined, and by whom (Lipsman and Sandler 1996).The problems associated with government determination of prices (Rothbard 1970) do not disappear when dealing with transportation issues. The general laws concerning price-fixing still apply. When the fixed price is too low, users receive a subsidy that corresponds to the difference between these price and the market price; resources are under evaluated, and overutilization is the result. When the fixed price is too high, some drivers are obliged to spend more than would be necessary in an open market and, consequent-lee, they decrease their level of consumption. It is certainly true that “it is essential that means of transport be properly priced so as to avoid overallocation or underallocation of resources to transport services as a whole, to particular forms of transport, or to particular segments of any given form” (Brownleeand Heller 1956, p. 249). An arbitrary, administrative price provides only a partial answer to the problem of congestion. Instead of reflecting the value judgments of market actors, the price expresses only the preferences of a single individual: the planner. Because public intervention prevents the emergence of market structures that reflect consumer value judgments, the correct market price cannot be established (Mises 1998). An arbitrarily determined price implies huge inefficiencies for producers and consumers and distortions in the allocation of resources. The lack of attention given to problems of traffic congestion by economists suggests that the issue of “circulation” is generally regarded as an engineering management problem. By using the laws of physics, the engineer tries to regulate the flow of a river to produce electricity. To this end the engineer uses dams, weirs, and other tools. Similarly, in the field of traffic movement, the main problem is managing the flow of drivers. Drivers are considered as atoms, capable of being manipulated and without wills of their own. The variety of ways used to improve road safety is viewed from the same perspective. The wills of individuals disappear behind the experiences of engineers and the decisions of bureaucrats (Cahier des Autoroutes Françaises 1994; O.C.D.E. 1996; Wiel 1966, 1997).

#### ---Accidents, delays, and costs are multiplied when the state controls transportation infrastructure and privatization is the only solution.

**Glaeser, 10** (Edward L. Glaeser, an economics professor at Harvard, BA in Economics from Princeton, Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, “Right-Turn Signal: Privatizing Our Way Out of Traffic,” Economix: Explaining the Science of Everyday Life, The New York Times, 28 September 2010, <http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/09/28/right-turn-signal-privatizing-our-way-out-of-traffic/>, AFJ)

Clifford Winston, a distinguished transportation economist at the Brookings Institution, has argued for many years that the American transportation system could use a major overhaul. I began reading his new book, “Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,” on a flight to New York. After an hour circling over Nantucket, returning to Boston and missing my connecting flight, I found myself warming to Mr. Winston’s cry for privatization and pricing changes aimed at reducing flight delays. What a comfort it was to read that the Federal Aviation Administration “estimates that more than 50 percent of airline delays nationwide originate from the New York area airspace.” At this point, Mr. Winston is calling only for experiments, but if they are successful, he envisions “privatizing and deregulating the vast majority of the transportation system” and “reducing the government’s primary role in this sector to mitigating externalities, such as emissions, and to enforcing the antitrust laws.” His vision is breathtaking, and to make his ideas less overwhelming, Mr. Winston begins by reminding us that roads, rails and airports were not always a public affair. America’s early 19th century road network was built by turnpike entrepreneurs; airports and streetcar systems often began in private hands. More than a tenth of the people listed in Harvard Business School’s “Great American Business Leaders of the Twentieth Century” had something to do with transportation. Mr. Winston justifies his call for experimentation and reform with a series of scathing critiques of the status quo. Some of his complaints will ring true to both economists and consumers: “In-flight delays and earlier airport arrivals for security screening were estimated to cost passengers and airlines in the United States at least $40 billion in 2005,” and “poor highway design and road conditions are a major contributor to accidents and fatalities that cost the U.S. economy hundreds of billions.” Other criticisms are more nuanced: “Urban bus and rail systems tend to use standardized vehicles, instead of a mixed-vehicle fleet that could enable transit managers to adjust seat capacity to variations in passenger demand by time of day and route,” he writes. He also says that “given Amtrak’s limited ability to attract passengers on most routes, the loss in social welfare from a highly subsidized high-speed rail system is likely to be substantial.” And he concludes that “the F.A.A. could also reduce delays by expeditiously implementing technologies that have the capability of expanding navigable airspace around airports,” noting that “the NextGen satellite-based system could reduce air travel times and carrier operating costs.” What public interventions could significantly improve travel? Policies can be split into “physical science” fixes – the approach of the engineer – and “social science” solutions that try to change behaviors. Some problems require an engineering solution; it is hard to imagine almost a million New Yorkers drinking clean water in the 1850s without the Croton Aqueduct. In other cases, engineering just won’t work without economics. Gilles Duranton and Matthew Turner’s “Fundamental Law of Traffic Congestion: Evidence From the U.S.” states that vehicle-miles-traveled increases roughly one-for-one with miles of roads built. More highways mean more drivers, so we are never going to build our way out of traffic congestion. People will keep on driving until they are made to pay for that privilege. Privatization, in principle, offers the possibility of working on both the engineering and economics fronts. Private road operators or airports will charge higher fees during peak periods to cut down on congestion, and they have incentives to innovate technologically to attract customers and cut costs. Mr. Winston notes that capsule, or pod, hotels, “which enable fliers to nap between flights,” happen to be “available in private airports, but none is available in the United States.” But markets are not perfect and private provision has its own pitfalls. In transportation, as in every other setting, Mr. Winston properly notes that the important question is whether government failure is a more serious problem than market failure. Because the public sector controls almost all roads, airports and urban transit, we see the downsides of public control on a daily basis, but we don’t experience the social costs that could accompany privatization. A private airport operator might try to exploit its monopoly power over a particular market or cut costs in a way that increases the probability of very costly, but rare, disaster. The complexity and risks of switching to private provision means that Mr. Winston is wise to call for experimentation rather than wholesale privatization. An incremental process of trying things out will provide information and build public support. Yet many of Mr. Winston’s recommendations are incremental and can be done without privatization or much risk. Private jitney operators could be permitted to compete freely with public bus lines in urban markets (In New York City, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority is already testing this idea.) New York could also implement a congestion charge (as Mayor Bloomberg has proposed on several occasions, to clamorous opposition). Tolls could be increased on busy commuting highways during peak hours and lowered off-peak. Airports — especially those in the New York area — could raise the landing fees during peak periods. We could all do with a little less time stuck in traffic.

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

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

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

### (S) Next Gen --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---Only by separating Next Gen technology from the state allows for effective deployment and implementation.

DeHaven 10

(Tad DeHaven is a budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute. December 3, 2010. The Cato Institute. “Huge Cost Overrun for FAA's NextGen” <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/huge-cost-overrun-faas-nextgen>) Sherman

A year ago I discussed problems that the Federal Aviation Administration was having in trying to implement an overhaul of the nation's air traffic control system. The “NextGen” overhaul would replace old-fashioned radar technology with modern satellite-based GPS navigation.¶ In a new letter to Congress, the Government Accountability Office reports that NextGen could ultimately cost four times more than originally estimated: ¶ According to this analysis, implementing the highest performance levels envisioned in the [Integrated Work Plan] for ground and aircraft capabilities by 2025 could increase NextGen’s costs significantly beyond the initial cost estimate of $40 billion (e.g., in some scenarios that require every aircraft to be equipped with extensive avionics in a shorter time frame, estimated costs can go as high as $160 billion). If the highest performance levels are implemented over a longer period, by 2035, the cost estimates would be lower, but still would be considerably higher than $40 billion.¶ As a Cato essay on airports and air traffic control points out, the FAA has a poor track record when it comes to implementing new technologies: ¶ The FAA has been attempting to modernize its system, expand capacity, and increase its productivity for decades. But dozens of reports over the years from the Government Accountability Office and the Office of Inspector General in the Department of Transportation have faulted the FAA for poor management of major projects, which are often delayed and over budget. The Advanced Automation System, Wide Area Augmentation System, and other major projects have had large cost overruns and been years behind schedule or cancelled. ¶ The essay explains that the solution to the FAA’s constant problems “is to take the ATC system out of the federal budget process and make it a self-supporting entity, funded directly by its customers.” The Clinton administration proposed such a transformation as part of Vice President Al Gore’s “reinventing government” initiative in the 1990s.¶ ¶ Unfortunately, the United States remains woefully behind the times as the essay explains: ¶ During the past two decades, nearly 50 governments have commercialized their air traffic control systems. That means they have separated their ATC activities from their transport ministries, removed them from the civil service, and made them self-supporting from fees charged to aircraft operators. These new air navigation service providers (ANSPs) are usually regulated at arm's length by their government's aviation safety agency. ¶ We only need to look north of the border to Canada to see that privatizing the nation’s air traffic control system is the right move. Unlike the government-run ATC system in the U.S., Nav Canada is a privately run, not-for-profit corporation. Nav Canada recently received its second “Eagle Award” from the International Air Transport Association. The Eagle Awards “honor air navigation service providers and airports for outstanding performance in customer satisfaction, cost efficiency, and continuous improvement.”

#### ---Privatization of air traffic control works – Canada proves the alternative can empirically solve the case.

Dehaven 10

(Tad DeHaven is a budget analyst on federal and state budget issues for the Cato Institute. September 20, 2010. The Cato Institute. “Canada’s Private ATC Wins Award” <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/canadas-private-atc-wins-award/>) Sherman

Canada’s private air traffic control system, Nav Canada, recently received its second “Eagle Award” from the International Air Transport Association. The Eagle Awards “honor air navigation service providers and airports for outstanding performance in customer satisfaction, cost efficiency, and continuous improvement.” Unlike the government-run ATC system in the U.S., Nav Canada is a privately run, not-for-profit corporation. As a Cato essay on [privatization](http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/privatization) explains, the U.S. system leaves a lot to be desired while the private Canadian system has been a tremendous success: Critics of privatization claim that it’s “too risky” to place such activities in the hands of the private sector. Canada’s success undermines that argument. In fact, air traffic control is far too important for such government mismanagement and should therefore be privatized. In doing so, policymakers should look to our neighbors to the north as a model for how to get the job done right.

### Walk Away --- 2nc Alternative

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

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

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

### A2 => Invasion --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---The Alternative decreases the likelihood and chance of success for foreign invasion --- Government centralization creates a single symbolic target easily conquered as opposed to the impossible task of conquering individuals.

Shaffer 2008

Butler, teaches at the Southwestern University School of Law, The Myth of National Defense, Lew Rockwell, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer182.html

When explaining the advantages of living in a society grounded in liberty and voluntary relationships — rather than the statist model of institutionalized violence — the question that invariably provides the final hurdle to overcome is that involving national defense. Intelligent minds can grasp how streets and highways, schools, fire protection, parks, and other traditional governmental functions can be performed in the marketplace. But as if out of fear of letting go of the statist model altogether, most will hang on to the question: how would a non-statist society protect people from invasion and occupation by a foreign state? In a stateless society, what would prevent our being taken over and tyrannized by outside forces? For many — even those who favor a minimal state — "national defense" is a necessity not to be entrusted to the unstructured nature of a society of free people. My initial response to such hesitancy is to point out that a strong, national government makes us more vulnerable to attack and invasion. The state serves not as a shield that protects us, but a jugular vein that provides others with a central target to be subdued. If men and women have been foolish enough to identify themselves with a nation-state, such attachments make it easy for their governments to transfer their compliant herds to another power. Consider how easily Hitler and Stalin were able — in some cases within a matter of days — to subdue neighboring lands, acquiring in the processes of surrender people already well-trained in the duties of obedience. Imagine, by contrast, the difficulties that would be faced by any political system intent on invading and subduing men and women already accustomed to liberty. If the Chinese government was intent on conquering a stateless America, how would it go about doing so? If shiploads of trained soldiers arrived in Los Angeles, for example, where would they go to bring about a surrender of the population? There would be no mayor, governor, or president to surrender a collective horde to such external forces. Knowing that whatever defenses they had to such an attack rested upon themselves, millions of individuals would doubtless devise their own methods of protection. The invading soldiers would have to go door-to-door in an effort to subdue Angelenos. Local people do not take kindly to being invaded and occupied, and will vigorously resist same, a truth that is being rediscovered in places like Iraq, whose state army was long ago disbanded. The inability of governments to effectively resist invasions and attacks has been well-demonstrated in the continuing immigration of Central Americans into America — people who come for peaceful purposes — as well as the attacks of 9/11. That otherwise intelligent beings can continue to sanction the looting of trillions of dollars in furtherance of the illusion that the state is protecting them in some way, is a testament to how well their minds have been conditioned by their masters!

#### ---National defense is an illusion that masks incalculable structural violence justified in the name of protecting the sanctity of the ‘nation-state.’

Shaffer 2008

Butler, teaches at the Southwestern University School of Law, The Myth of National Defense, Lew Rockwell, http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer182.html

But beyond such apparent arguments against the national defense myth is to be found a more significant truth: national "defense" has nothing whatsoever to do with defending the lives, liberty, and property interests of Americans! The "defense" system is, in fact, a system of offense against, principally, the American people. During my youth, this proposition was made much clearer in identifying the conduct of war as being under the direction of the "War Department." Once World War II was over, and the American government had decided that peace was no longer a value to be pursued; that a permanent war machine was to be set up on behalf of a worldwide corporate-state hegemony, such an emergent purpose had to be disguised as "national defense." The "state" has been defined, by most, as an institution with a monopoly on the use of violence within a given territory. Violence must be resorted to by political systems in order to overcome the self-interested purposes by which individuals conduct their lives. As the state increases the numbers of people to be regulated — as well as the size of the territory within which it operates — it is increasingly confronted by the countervailing forces of individual and private group interests. The state's response, invariably, is to further expand the coercively-backed demands by which it rules.

### A2 => Poverty --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---Only libertarianism attacks the root cause of poverty while actualizing individual autonomy.

King 6

(Arnold Kling is an adjunct scholar and author of Crisis of Abundance: Rethinking How We Pay for Health Care. June 5, 2006. The Cato institute. “Libertarianism and Poverty.” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/libertarianism-poverty>) Sherman

This essay outlines a libertarian approach to poverty. No, it's not "Leave them in the gutter." It's an approach that tries to be pragmatic and compassionate. Even if -- especially if -- you are not a libertarian, you need to understand that when it comes to government doing something about poverty, "less is more." Further below, I even include a policy proposal -- something that is rare coming from a libertarian.¶ I describe myself as a pragmatic libertarian. If I had to give up a little bit of freedom in order to see a meaningful reduction in poverty, I would do so. My problem with government is that I see it doing harm on both counts.¶ What is the fundamental cause of poverty? The Class Oppression view, which is expressed by the first comment quoted above, is that rich people extract and hoard wealth, leaving everyone else poorer. The Pathology view, which is expressed by the second comment, is that poverty is part of a pathology.¶ Neither of these comments came from a libertarian. The first comment seems to reflect the common perception that what libertarians actually believe is the Class Oppression view, and that we are looking for ways to justify continued class oppression. Instead, my position is much closer to the Pathology view, and that leaves open the question of how well or how poorly government programs work to ameliorate the pathology of poverty.

### A2 => War --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---Individual autonomy and market structures disincentivize war; Their arguments are backwards.

Bandow 5

(Doug Bandow is a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. He served as a special assistant to President Reagan. November 10, 2005. The Cato Institute. “Spreading Capitalism Is Good for Peace.” <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/spreading-capitalism-is-good-peace>) Sherman

The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism.¶ But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets ¶ An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanual Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems.¶ Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq. The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches.

Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.

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

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

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

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

### A2 No Incentive for Transportation Investment --- 2nc Alternative

#### ---Eliminating federal domination of transportation ensures market fill-in by eliminating federal barriers to communication between consumer and producer; allowing transportation infrastructure to finally be responsive to the people.

Worden 10

(Darian Worden is a left-libertarian writer and activist. June 22, 2010. The Center for a Stateless Society. “Who Would Maintain Roads Worse Than the State?” <http://c4ss.org/content/2961>) Sherman

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

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

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

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

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

## Answers to Answers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### ---Roleplaying federal intervention is bad --- Assumes flawed economic models that undermine freedom and effective policymaking.

Pongracic 4

(Ivan Pongracic Sr. is Associate Professor of Economics at Indiana Wesleyan University. June 2004. Volume 24. Number 6. The Mises Institute Monthly. “Government Fuels the Drive to Outsource” <http://mises.org/freemarket_detail.aspx?control=499>) Sherman

Blaming free trade for the present predicament of so many workers is misplaced. But who should be blamed? The American politicians have themselves to blame for most of the job losses we have seen over the last several years. The simple fact is, our politicians continue to engage in something Ludwig von Mises used to call "interventionism." He defined interventionism as the government’s attempts to correct some perceived market failing through its own power of coercion. Good intentions may be behind interventionism, but, as the saying goes, "the road to hell is paved with good intentions." ¶ As Mises never tired of emphasizing, inevitably, government coercion leads to unexpected and unintended consequences that often create a situation worse than the one the government was trying to fix. This "surprising result" usually prompts further interventions intended to fix the new problems, which of course lead to some other unexpected and unintended consequences, once again creating a worse outcome. One round of interventions follows another until the original situation is long forgotten, and the current undesirable state of affairs is blamed on market forces, though it was not created by the "market" but exclusively by the intervening politicians.¶ This interventionist dynamic can these days be seen in the labor markets, especially in relation to two issues: high nominal wages and regulations. Both forms of interventions have led to job losses, a fact not recognized by often economically ignorant politicians.¶

#### ---Policymaking education is bad --- Creates a passive citizenry open to coercion.

Freeman 97 (David T, “Why You Must Recognize and Understand Coercion”, Advanced Personal Empowerment, 1997, <http://www.mind-trek.com/reports/misc/coercion.htm>) SWOAP

Then there's blackmail: compelling someone to make a payment or perform a specific action, or be harmed in some way (typically by disclosure of a secret). And extortion: unjustly obtaining (money, promise, etc.) by violence, force (or threat of force), intimidation, persistent demands, etc. Sound familiar? Consider the possibility that the word "government" is largely a euphemism for institutionalized extortion.The lowest level of coercion is to use misrepresentation or fraud to induce someone to do something (usually harmful to themselves) that they wouldn't do if they knew all the relevant facts. Much of "government" operates at this level. This is also the level of the sophisticated criminal, the conman, the embezzler. They lie to get your money. It is also the level of the brainwasher (e.g.: "government teacher", coercive religions, cults, etc.). They lie to get your mind.We also need to examine indirect coercion. When I buy gas for my car, part of my money goes to "government" bureaucrats in the form of "taxes". Whenever I pay "taxes", I'm being coerced indirectly, and I'm also indirectly supporting the coercion perpetrated by terrocrats (terrorist bureaucrats or coercive "government" agents) - by paying their wages to practice more coercion. Terrocrats use this "tax"-money to pay more terrocrats to further coerce others through their "tax" and other "systems", and to murder people in their "wars", amongst countless other atrocities (like the massacre at Waco).

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

#### ---Perms fail --- Combining market and state logic results in complacency with governmental power. Concessions to state coercion corrupt the movement from within by undermining the objective basis for individual liberty.

Rothbard 73 (Murray N., dean of the Austrian School of economics, founder of libertarianism, “FOR A NEW LIBERTY THE LIBERTARIAN MANIFESTO”, p. 17-20, 1973, <http://mises.org/books/newliberty.pdf>, Accessed 7/10/12, Chan)

But after achieving impressive partial victories against statism, the classical liberals began to lose their radicalism, their¶ dogged insistence on carrying the battle against conservative statism to the point of final victory. Instead of using partial victories as a stepping-stone for evermore pressure, the classical liberals began to lose their fervor for change and for purity of principle. They began to rest content with trying to safeguard their existing victories, and thus turned themselves¶ from a radical into a conservative movement—”conservative”¶ in the sense of being content to preserve the status quo. In short, the liberals left the field wide open for socialism to become the party of hope and of radicalism, and even for the later corporatists to pose as “liberals” and “progressives” as¶ against the “extreme right wing” and “conservative” libertarian classical liberals, since the latter allowed themselves to be boxed into a position of hoping for nothing more than stasis, than absence of change. Such a strategy is foolish and untenable in a changing world.¶ But the degeneration of liberalism was not merely one of stance and strategy, but one of principle as well. For the liberals became content to leave the war-making power in the hands of the State, to leave the education power in its hands, to leave the power over money and banking, and over roads, in the hands of the State—in short, to concede to State dominion over all the crucial levers of power in society. In contrast to the eighteenth-century liberals’ total hostility to the executive and to bureaucracy, the nineteenth-century liberals tolerated and even welcomed the buildup of executive power and of an entrenched oligarchic civil service bureaucracy. Moreover, principle and strategy merged in the decay of eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century liberal devotion to “abolitionism”—to the view that, whether the institution be slavery or any other aspect of statism, it should be abolished as quickly as possible, since the immediate abolition of statism, while unlikely in practice, was to be sought after as the only possible moral position. For to prefer a gradual whittling away to immediate abolition of an evil and coercive institution is to ratify and sanction such evil, and therefore to violate libertarian principles. As the great abolitionist of slavery¶ and libertarian William Lloyd Garrison explained: “Urge immediate abolition as earnestly as we may, it will, alas! be¶ gradual abolition in the end. We have never said that slavery would be overthrown by a single blow; that it ought to be, we¶ shall always contend.”4 There were two critically important changes in the philosophy and ideology of classical liberalism which both exemplified and contributed to its decay as a vital, progressive, and radical force in the Western world. The first, and most important, occurring in the early to mid-nineteenth century, was the abandonment of the philosophy of natural rights, and its¶ replacement by technocratic utilitarianism. Instead of liberty grounded on the imperative morality of each individual’s¶ right to person and property, that is, instead of liberty being sought primarily on the basis of right and justice, utilitarianism preferred liberty as generally the best way to achieve a vaguely defined general welfare or common good. There were two grave consequences of this shift from natural rights to utilitarianism. First, the purity of the goal, the consistency of the principle, was inevitably shattered. For whereas the natural-rights libertarian seeking morality and justice cleaves militantly to pure principle, the utilitarian only values liberty as an ad hoc expedient. And since expediency can and does shift with the wind, it will become easy for the utilitarian in his cool calculus of cost and benefit to plump for statism in ad hoc case after case, and thus to give principle away. Indeed, this is precisely what happened to the Benthamite utilitarians in England: beginning with ad hoc libertarianism and laissez-faire, they found it ever easier to slide further and further into statism. An example was the drive for an “efficient” and therefore strong civil service and executive power, an efficiency that took precedence, indeed replaced, any concept of justice or right. Second, and equally important, it is rare indeed ever to find a utilitarian who is also radical, who burns for immediate abolition of evil and coercion. Utilitarians, with their devotion to expediency, almost inevitably oppose any sort of upsetting or radical change. There have been no utilitarian revolutionaries. Hence, utilitarians are never immediate abolitionists. The abolitionist is such because he wishes to eliminate wrong and injustice as rapidly as possible. In choosing this goal, there is no room for cool, ad hoc weighing of cost and benefit. Hence, the classical liberal utilitarians abandoned radicalism¶ and became mere gradualist reformers. But in becoming reformers, they also put themselves inevitably into the position of advisers and efficiency experts to the State. In other words, they inevitably came to abandon libertarian principle as well as a principled libertarian strategy. The utilitarians wound up as apologists for the existing order, for the status¶ quo, and hence were all too open to the charge by socialists and progressive corporatists that they were mere narrowminded and conservative opponents of any and all change. Thus, starting as radicals and revolutionaries, as the polar¶ opposites of conservatives, the classical liberals wound up as the image of the thing they had fought.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **---Perm fails --- The affirmative’s utilization of government funding destroys intellectual consistency which is the lynch pin to an effective libertarian politics.**

Konkin 83 (Samuel Edward. Prominent libertarianist. Koman Publishing. “New Libertarian Manifesto” <http://agorism.info/NewLibertarianManifesto.pdf> Pismarov)

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

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

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

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

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

# Affirmative Answers

### Aff Prereq to Alt --- Aff Ans

#### ---Aff is a prerequisite to the alternative ---

#### (A.) Governments are key to the Market --- The free market is only free insofar as the state is empowered to enforce fair trade norms and regulate competition.

Amy 2007

(Douglas J. Amy is a Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College. 2007. Governmentisgood.com. “A Guide to Rebutting Right-Wing Criticisms of Government” http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=13) Sherman

One of the most common and misleading economic myths in the United States is the idea that the free market is “natural” – that it exists in some natural world, separate from government. In this view, government rules and regulations only “interfere” with the natural beneficial workings of the market. Even the term “free market” implies that it can exist free from government and that it prospers best when government leaves it alone. Nothing could be further from the truth. In reality, a market economy does not exist separate from government – it is very much a product of government rules and regulations. The dirty little secret of our “free” market system is that it would simply not exist as we know it without the presence of an active government that creates and maintains the rules and conditions that allow it to operate efficiently.

#### (B.) Access to public transportation determines individual liberty --- Transportation is a key part of anti-systemic movement, leading to autonomy in shaping one’s life and individuality in a larger space.

Sager 6 (Tore, Department of Civil and Transport Engineering, Norwegian¶ University of Science and Technology, Mobilities, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 471, 11/21/6, “Freedom as Mobility: Implications of¶ the Distinction between Actual and¶ Potential Travelling”, <http://www.tandfonline.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/17450100600902420>, Accessed 7/13/12, Chan)

A number of theorists regard recourse to mobility as one type of resistance to the¶ routine of everyday life (Bridge, 2004; de Certeau, 1984; Cohen & Taylor, 1992;¶ Joyce, 2003, pp.210–233) or as a central trope for anti-systemic movements of one¶ kind or another (Cresswell, 2001, p.15). ‘Nothing is further from bourgeois¶ civilization … than an existence based on a refusal to put down roots’ (Prato &¶ Treviro, 1985, pp.39–40). Mobility and travelling are considered a strategy of¶ resistance against rootedness and traditional values. For instance, Kerouac’s (1957)¶ On the Road represents a form of resistance to the ‘establishment’.¶ 6¶ The mobile¶ lifestyle of the main characters raises questions about the value of ideas such as¶ roots, community, home, and neighbourhood (Cresswell, 1993, p.258). Their crisscrossing of the North-American continent by automobile relates to the experience of having autonomy over the processes shaping their own lives. Kerouac boosts nonstop ‘going’ for its own sake as the main joy; freedom as mobility is celebrated as¶ intrinsically valuable. This is underlined by the aimlessness of the journeys. The¶ unruly directionless movement of the central figures reinforces their freedom as¶ mobility, as it means they do not have to go any particular place.¶ Mobility in physical space is about the ability to link places. The desirability of¶ mobility does not primarily spring from disillusionment with some places and the¶ need to access other places. Mobility may be more about creating a pattern, a¶ tapestry of familiar places, in order to gain knowledge of, master, and feel at home in¶ a larger geographical space. In contrast to the rootlessness alluded to above,¶ therefore, the aim might be to take root in a vastly expanded area. The improved¶ mastering relates to the opportunity aspect of freedom. What is achieved is a feeling¶ of having a much enlarged choice set at one’s disposal. Cresswell captures this point¶ well when summing up the motives of the restless and footloose characters in¶ Kerouac’s novel. All their frantic movement is to answer a question ‘connected to¶ what it is like to be an American in America rather than just a resident in ‘‘anytown’’¶ USA’ (Cresswell, 1993, p.260).

### Alt Fails --- Aff Ans

#### (\_\_) Libertarian economics theory fails ---

#### (A.) New Deal proves government spending is a prerequisite to the free market.

Welch 10 [Matt Welch, 5/21/10, Matt Welch is editor in chief ofReason, the libertarian magazine of "Free Minds and Free Markets.", “[Salon: "Libertarianism is juvenile," "stupid," "silly," "bratty"](http://reason.com/blog/2010/05/21/salon-libertarianism-is-juveni), *Reason,* <http://reason.com/blog/2010/05/21/salon-libertarianism-is-juveni>.] Ari Jacobson

Over at the publication famous for (among other impressive accomplishments) having a political columnist write about [licking doorknobs at Gary Bauer's campaign headquarters](http://www.google.com/#hl=en&q=Salon+licking+doorknobs+%22Dan+Savage%22&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=&gs_rfai=&fp=6f78d0ffc1b1e58c), Gabriel Winant uses the [Rand Paul/Civil Rights Act controversy](http://reason.com/blog/2010/05/20/rand-paul-property-rights-and) as a teaching moment about the [irredeemable immaturity of libertarianism](http://www.salon.com/news/rand_paul_kentucky_senate_republican/index.html?story=/politics/war_room/2010/05/21/libertarianism_who_needs_it). Sample: It's not just that he screwed up and said something stupid because he's so committed to a purist fancy. No, it's worse than that. **Libertarianism itself is** what's **stupid** here, not just Paul. We should stop tip-toeing around this belief system like its adherents are the noble last remnants of a dying breed, still clinging to their ancient, proud ways. Now, to be clear, before continuing: there are legions of brilliant individual libertarians. [Dave] Weigel himself, for example, is a great writer and reporter, and a true master of Twitter. We've never met, but by all accounts, he's also very much a stand-up fellow. But brilliant, decent people can think silly things. And that's what's going on here. It's time to stop taking libertarianism seriously. [...] Think about the New Deal. **Although libertarian ingrates will never admit it, without the reforms of the 1930s, there might not be private property left for them to complain about the government infringing on.** Not many capitalist democracies could survive 25 percent unemployment, and it doesn't just happen by good luck. [...] **The government didn't just help make the "free market" in the first place -- although it did do that. It's also constantly busy trimming around the edges, maintaining the thing, keeping it healthy. The state can think ahead and balance competing interests in a way that no single company can**. [...]

#### (B.) The libertarian revolution throws the baby out with the bathwater; dismantling democratic institutional structure from the inside out and replacing it with corporate totalitarianism and a starry-eyed populous willing to commit communist like atrocities.

Kienitz 2002 (Paul Kienitz, “I’m Still Not a Libertarian: So I Guess That Means I’m Opposed to Personal Freedom,” 6/22, <http://world.std.com/~mhuben/pk-is-against-liberty.html>, AFJ)

The first fallacy is one I call the Fallacy of Revolution.  It can be found in any movement that seeks to radically revise the underpinnings of society, whether by abolishing money, imposing a theocracy, eliminating undesirable ethnic groups, repealing all law, organizing everyone's diet according to principles of macrobiotics, or whatever other secret of a perfect society any group comes up with.  In particular, it comes up in exactly equal form among communists seeking to eliminate private property and anarcho-libertarians trying to do the opposite.  The fallacy can be expressed more or less as follows: *By making these radical changes, we are removing the root cause of all the failures and evils of society as it presently stands.  This will eliminate all of the existing problems, and since we have no knowledge of what new problems might arise, we can assume there will be none.  Everything will work right, because there are no foreseeable things that can go wrong.* In other words, since we are removing the basis by which any problems already known to us can be predicted, there is no shortcoming of the new system that can be anticipated in advance. Therefore it is within the margin of error that there might not be any at all – that we will achieve the perfect society. Once the possibility is apparent, someone who wants to believe in the system will find every argument to show that this is not just possible but inevitable. Every counterargument that occurs to nonbelievers is met by either a tortuous chain of logic showing how people, once "freed" of money or godlessness or mongrelization or law enforcement or nonmacrobiotic misbalance of yin and yang, would spontaneously take care of the problem in the best way, or an assertion that the difficulty the nonbeliever raises is not really a problem and it's morally right that it should not be solved. The advocate of the new system simply refuses to believe in anything going wrong with it. The more radical the change from the old way, and the less we know from experience about how things would really work under the new rules, the more unshakable this belief is. He can deal with any objections by dreaming up a simple answer that's plausible enough to satisfy himself, and then just promising everyone that it's sure to work. Nobody can prove it won't. (I have heard a Libertarian answer objections from a doubting friend with nothing more than "Trust me, it will all work out.") This is why top-to-bottom revolutions can have a special appeal that evolutionary change does not: because it's easy to think that maybe all problems might be solved. A corrolary of this fallacy is that if one believes that there is one big solution, you usually have to believe that there is only one big problem.  This means that once you have identified the bad guy, he gets blamed for *everything*.  The identified group or institution becomes a scapegoat, so that even problems that have nothing to do with it are laid at its door.  What communists, anti-communists, Nazis and other ethnic nationalists, religionists, fringe feminists, and revolutionaries of every kind all have in common is that they can name the source of society's ills in one or two words.  For anarchists and libertarians, the word is "government". We can laugh now at the naive Communists of 90 years ago, with their vision of a world of peace and plenty brought about by centralized bureaucracy.  (For a particularly mind-boggling example, see the polemic novel *Looking Backward* by Edward Bellamy.) The horror that came from the revolution they once viewed with starry-eyed rapture is blood-chilling to us now.  But the terms it was described in before the fact are eerily reminiscent of the way the Libertarians of today foresee a revolution in the opposite direction, abolishing public property instead of private property -- and without hindsight, each argument sounds about equally credible to the listeners of its time. This is the first reason I do not support the present Libertarian movement: because it demands that I take so much on faith.  It is too clearly an *article of faith* that one must believe that certain untested actions will have beneficial outcomes.  Since the real world offers no evidence whatever to back up these expectations as certainties, but only offers the hope that it *might* happen if the path is cleared, any sensible person has to conclude that trying it might be quite a gamble.  But a true Libertarian, in my experience, can be depended on to insist that it's no gamble at all. I am not going to gamble my future on a movement that bases so much of its hope on such blatant wishful thinking.  Especially when the fallback belief is that, should some hopes fail, it would only mean that such failure is therefore the right outcome and should be embraced.

#### (C.) Libertarian economic theory abstracts material consequences and lacks effective feedback mechanisms to promote good policy.

Davies 12 (Geoff, published two papers with the [World Economics Association](http://rwer.wordpress.com/) , Senior Fellow (now a Visiting Fellow) in geophysics in the Research School of Earth Sciences at the Australian National University, “How Free-Market Fundamentalists are Hopelessly Wrong: Part II: the Theory”, Better Nature, 2/26/12, <http://betternature.wordpress.com/2012/02/26/fundamentalists-wrong-ii-theory/>) SWOAP

This theory is an abstraction well over 100 years old, from a time when the idea of a clockwork universe still prevailed in science. To maintain mathematical tractability, the theory makes simplifying assumptions about people and firms. It assumes we are narrowly rational and that we can foretell the future. It assumes we have access to all relevant information for free, and can assimilate its implications immediately. It assumes we are brute materialists. It assumes there are no social interactions. It assumes there is a limit to economies of scale, based on constraints peasant farmers used to face. With enough assumptions like this, you can deduce, using clever mathematics, that a market will balance all supplies with all demands and the economic system will come to an equilibrium. This “general equilibrium” turns out to be the most efficient conceivable configuration of this abstract system, in the sense of producing the most goods from the least inputs of human effort. This abstraction has proven extremely seductive to rich people, because it seems to say they should keep making money as fast as they can, and to the mathematically inclined, because they can play endless games with the theory. However it is absurd to suggest that this abstract theory has any relevance to real economies. If any one of those assumptions is violated you predict very different behaviour of the economy. If the behaviour is very different then the central theoretical conclusion, that a free-market economy comes to an optimal equilibrium, is lost. Lost with it is the basis for all the free-market rhetoric. For example if information is incomplete or delayed then feedback is too weak to restore equilibrium. If there are social interactions then there are phenomena like herd behaviour that destroy equilibrium. If we all cannot foretell the future then feedbacks are erratic and so is the system’s behaviour. If economies of scale apply up to very large firms, like Microsoft or McDonalds, then one or a few firms can grow exponentially at the expense of others, and yield oligopoly or monopoly, which is not optimal. And of course if we are more than brute materialists then perhaps we want more out of life than ever more stuff, inequitably distributed.

#### (D.) Libertarianism undermines liberty by establishing market forces as the new source of unquestionable authority; merely changing the forced choice of exploitation from “pay taxes or go to jail” to “surrender your capital or starve.”

Chomsky 2008 (Noam Chomsky, an Institute Professor and Professor Emeritus in the Department of Linguistics and Philosophy at MIT, has authored over 100 books, co-created the Chomsky hierarchy, the universal grammar theory, and the Chomsky-Schutzenberger theorem, was cited more than any living scholar between 1980 and 1992, and the eighth overall, according to the Arts and Humanities Citation Index, from Understanding Power: The Indespensible Chomsky,” edited by Peter R. Mitchell and John Schoeffel, <http://www.distantocean.com/2008/04/chomsky-on-libe.html>, AFJ)

Man: What's the difference between "libertarian" and "anarchist," exactly? Chomsky: There's no difference, really. I think they're the same thing. But you see, "libertarian" has a special meaning in the United States. The United States is off the spectrum of the main tradition in this respect: what's called "libertarianism" here is unbridled capitalism. Now, that's always been opposed in the European libertarian tradition, where every anarchist has been a socialist—because the point is, if you have unbridled capitalism, you have all kinds of authority: you have extreme authority. If capital is privately controlled, then people are going to have to rent themselves in order to survive. Now, you can say, "they rent themselves freely, it's a free contract"—but that's a joke. If your choice is, "do what I tell you or starve," that's not a choice—it's in fact what was commonly referred to as wage slavery in more civilized times, like the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, for example. The American version of "libertarianism" is an aberration, though—nobody really takes it seriously. I mean, everybody knows that a society that worked by American libertarian principles would self-destruct in three seconds. The only reason people pretend to take it seriously is because you can use it as a weapon. Like, when somebody comes out in favor of a tax, you can say: "No, I'm a libertarian, I'm against that tax"—but of course, I'm still in favor of the government building roads, and having schools, and killing Libyans, and all that sort of stuff. Now, there are consistent libertarians, people like Murray Rothbard—and if you just read the world that they describe, it's a world so full of hate that no human being would want to live in it. This is a world where you don't have roads because you don't see any reason why you should cooperate in building a road that you're not going to use: if you want a road, you get together with a bunch of other people who are going to use that road and you build it, then you charge people to ride on it. If you don't like the pollution from somebody's automobile, you take them to court and you litigate it. Who would want to live in a world like that? It's a world built on hatred. The whole thing's not even worth talking about, though. First of all, it couldn't function for a second—and if it could, all you'd want to do is get out, or commit suicide or something. But this is a special American aberration, it's not really serious.

#### (E.) Libertarianism increases poverty and widens wealth disparities.

Loo 2003 (Dennis, Cal Poly Pomona Sociology Professor “Libertarianism and Poverty”, The Ethical Spectacle, 4/03, <http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html>) SWOAP

One common argument from libertarians is that the repeal of the minimum wage and labor regulations would lead to the creation of more jobs to fight poverty.[(66)](http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html#a66) So what happened in Chile as regulations and wage laws were repealed or loosened? Unemployment, which averaged around 6 percent in the 1960s[(67)](http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html#a67) and dropped to around 5 percent in 1973 before Pinochet took over, averaged 20 percent from 1974 to 1987, peaked at 35 percent in 1982, and even when official unemployment numbers dropped, it was because working one day a week was enough to be considered not unemployed[(68)](http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html#a68). It also spawned other problems for the now unemployed or underemployed, such as alcoholism and depression[(69)](http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html#a69). What are a few of the results that we can expect in the United States? Aside from the previously mentioned study by Linder and Nygaard which suggests that workers will once again be urinating in their pants as bathroom breaks are repealed, the repeal of pesticide exposure laws will likely increase the rate of poisoning in farm workers[(70)](http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html#a70). Additionally, any business failure will lead to the possibility of mass layoffs coupled with the absence of significant governmental help[**(71)**](http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html#a71) to those laid off. A common libertarian objection to charges that the repeal of welfare would hurt the poor is that the rich will donate more money to private charities, which in turn would be more efficient than the government. The combination of private charity, churches, communities, and family would be able to "bridge the gap" for those who do not earn enough to support themselves. Clearly, this did not happen in Chile as governmental spending on the poor dropped even as the rich got richer. Malnourishment increased[(72)](http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html#a72), and the number of families which could not afford a basic "basket" of necessary goods doubled in the twenty years leading up to 1989. By that point, fewer than half the families in Santiago could afford that basic basket[(73)](http://www.spectacle.org/0403/loo.html#a73).

#### (F.) Government intervention is key to liberty --- The state is the only market actor with an economic interest in the promotion of equality.

Lubienski 6 (Christopher, University of Illinois, Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies
Volume 4, Number 1, March 2006, “School Choice and Privatization in Education: An Alternative Analytical Framework” <http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=57>, Accessed 7/15/12, Chan)

Of course, this logic is disputed by others on at least two counts. First, while democratic governance can be coercive, particularly from the perspective of minority voters, this is not a categorical evil to be avoided in all circumstances. Neoliberals and social conservatives have embraced coercive measures such as mandated investing or taxation as a viable method of financing mass pensions or paying for publicly funded vouchers. Likewise, even some libertarians recognize the need for government intervention to promote autonomous individuals (Brighouse, 1997). In fact, public control can secure freedom for social minorities in a democracy. After all, it was government intervention that has won social and political rights for African Americans, women, workers, and people with disabilities, for example—rights that had been eroded or precluded in a large part because of the dynamics of the market. Similarly, markets can be coercive: job insecurity can compel certain behaviors, and economic conditions can constrain free choices (Carl, 1994). The second criticism of the social-capital case comes from the field of political theory. Under the notions of a social contract propounded by Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, governments are formed through the consent of the governed—individuals who surrender some rights in deference to the will of the people embodied in the government—in order to avoid the more anarchic consequence of chaos and rampant individualism (Curtis, 1981). Thus, as Champlin (1998) suggests, privatization denies the essential tenet of social contract theory that the state is an association established by the voluntary cooperation of the citizens, since the state is now portrayed simply as a source of coercion against those citizens. Argyres and Liebeskind (1998) note that such an attack on a social contract premise is not just limited to the relationship of the citizenry and the governing institution of the state. Proponents of privatization also decry traditional social contractual obligations between society and other institutions, such as research universities, as impediments to progress.

### Alt => Invasion --- Aff Ans

#### ---Turn --- Red Dawn

#### (A.) The alternative eviscerates American military power opening us up to invasion from foreign powers.

Darren 10 (“Would a stateless society be conquered?” No Coercion, 3 September 2010, <http://www.nocoercion.com/2010/09/03/would-a-stateless-society-be-conquered/>) SWOAP

If a stateless, anarchic society were to emerge it would surely be conquered by a foreign state. Naturally, this can be broken down into at least two levels of reasoning. The first is the question of whether a state would actually choose to attack a stateless society. The second is the question of how successful such an attack would be. Regarding the first question, it is clear that a reasonably strong and aggressive state (of which there have always been--and continue to be--many) would choose to invade a stateless territory relatively soon after its birth. There are several (somewhat inter-related) reasons for this. First, states exist to expropriate resources. The state, as Franz Oppenheimer famously noted, obtains resources by the “political means” (i.e. expropriation) rather than by the “economic means” (i.e. voluntary exchange). The predominant reason some states refrain from invading their neighbors is the existence of a relatively organized and effective standing military force controlled by the central state. For at least some of these potential aggressors, the existence of a territory reasonably endowed with natural resources and not protected by a central state would be simply too much to resist. Even if the only resource were habitable land the lure would still be too strong. Second, states would see a successful stateless society as a destabilizing influence on their own regimes. Even if an aggressive state were not motivated to invade by lust for resources, it seems likely that one or more states would still attack the anarchist society (and attempt to annex the territory) if only to wipe any hopes of a stateless society from their own subjects’ minds. Consider that one of the most common arguments given by those opposed to statelessness is that it simply can’t work; there’s no successful example of it in the modern world. If an anarchist society were to emerge, the resultant peace and prosperity for the members of that society would forever invalidate the argument that anarchy can’t work. Those who long for freedom around the world would suddenly have a working example, something to strive for and seek. Furthermore, the more vibrant and prosperous economy of the stateless society would cause a brain drain for many states as their most talented individuals left to seek more reward in the stateless territory. Such eventualities would be so threatening to powerful states that they would waste no time in crushing such a society. The final primary reason one or more states would choose to invade the stateless territory is the state’s distorted cost-benefit analysis. The political elites in control of a state are able to shift most of the cost of conflict onto the state’s hapless subjects, thus making a military attack on a stateless society far more likely than if the political elites had to bear the costs themselves. The decision-makers can force the tax payers to cover the financial costs of war and can even conscript subjects to do the fighting. Even in the absence of conscription, the state is able to bring to bear its powerful propaganda machine to convince large numbers of ‘patriots’ to go off and fight for the state. All of this makes the decision to launch an attack artificially easy for the state’s rulers. The second question is whether a state would succeed in conquering the stateless society once the decision is made. There appear to be at least a few reasons the state would be successful. First, states are able to forcibly acquire and concentrate resources. Consider the effort and resources that go into state weapons programs, especially the development of nuclear weapons. In less than five years, the U.S. government developed and deployed nuclear weapons. The government was able to use its power of taxation to spend over $20 billion (adjusted for inflation) and employ 130,000 people to accomplish this task. It used its power of eminent domain to construct the interstate highway system to facilitate military transportation. It used taxation and the lack of a need to maximize efficiency to amass a vast arsenal of tanks, planes, ships, bombs, artillery, firearms, and more. It used the power of conscription to and propaganda to force millions into military service. The stateless society, on the other hand, would be defended merely by decentralized private defense forces funded by voluntary payments or donations. Unfortunately, the anarchists wouldn’t stand a chance. Second, states have a long history of military organization and expertise (especially a state that would go to the trouble of attacking an anarchist society). It must be noted that not just any state would initiate a war against a free society. The kinds of states that are aggressive enough to do such a thing are the kinds of states that devote a lot of time and resources to military matters. They have long traditions and well-developed operational procedures. They have extensive, high-tech command and control systems. They have officers who have studied war-making and are versed in a variety of tactics and strategies. In comparison, the stateless defense forces would have little history and real-life experience on which to draw. They would be made up of a variety of independent defense firms or volunteer organizations with no coordinated and standardized way of doing things. In addition, if the anarchists didn’t have very long to prepare, they would be at the mercy of price-gouging weapons manufacturers looking to take advantage of the defenders’ urgent needs. Another point is that the state is in a good position to subvert the anarchist society, possibly even eliminating the need for an armed invasion. The state’s ability to expropriate and concentrate wealth from its subjects makes it much easier for it to bribe the top players in key industries (like banking, education, and the media). We know from historical experience that successful business figures are often quick to use the regulatory power of states to better position themselves and harm their competitors. We can expect a significant degree of this to occur with anarchist business owners and foreign states. If a state succeeds in dramatically influencing industries like education and media, it may be able to undermine the very anarchist nature of the stateless society and cause large parts of it to return to statism and seek the protection of a neighboring state. Finally, the anarchist forces would be highly constrained by the need to avoid harming innocents, while the invading state would have no such constraint. The aggressors could engage in massive and indiscriminate bombing campaigns, perhaps even including weapons of mass destruction (keeping in mind the attacking state may not be interested in controlling territory or exploiting resources but rather in destroying an anarchist society before it could lead the state’s subjects to start contemplating statelessness). It seems clear that a stateless society would indeed by attacked by one or more states and that the attack would be successful in either subduing and occupying the territory or outright destroying the society. One need only look at the history of the Russian Civil War (1917-1923), during which the anarchists (under Makhno) were immediately attacked by the Red Army, and the resistance was destroyed.

#### (B.) The turn outweighs the link --- Even if America is bad, it’s nothing compared to the totalitarian efficiency of the communist puppet government which will make our lives a living hell in the aftermath of targeted nuclear strikes.

Nyquist 2001

J.R., WorldNetDaily contributing editor and a renowned expert in geopolitics and international relations, is the author of "Origins of the Fourth World,” Defending America, http://www.wnd.com/2001/07/9944/

Got nukes, Mr. Libertarian? If you don’t, how will you deter the Russians and the Chinese, the North Koreans and the Iranians? Evidently, the shoppers’ version of freedom hopes to stand against the sage advice of liberty’s American author (George Washington). But let us ask a visiting Chechen or Tibetan what it means to be overrun by Russian or Chinese soldiers, who happen to consider us their final target (aiming the bulk of their nuclear weapons our way). Let us ask what murderous campaigns continue, today – at this very moment – against stateless persons in the Northern Caucasus (Russia’s test-ground for World War III). You think military disaster cannot overwhelm us? But the conceit of invincibility is the arrogance of a rich and spoiled people. You may despise Washington, D.C., as a tyranny, but try living in Cuba, Vietnam, North Korea, Sudan. You want to see real tyranny? The police in Russia do not respect any rights at all, unless a citizen is politically connected. In Russia the main investigative tool of the police is torture. Yes, there are abuses of power in America. Yes, we are sliding toward totalitarianism. But we still have a lot of liberty to defend. And we are the envy of the world. In fact, it is the poverty of Russia and China that motivates a definite hatred toward Americans. After all, without destructive war Americans will continue to enjoy more of the good things life has to offer. Russians and Chinese will continue to struggle, regardless. Therefore America’s success, more than anything, is resented. We must not forget that communism is a feeling first and a system afterwards. It is an excuse for taking revenge and spilling blood – an excuse which became a system. Here is the acme of the murderous impulse in those countries best known for mass murder. National security is not a phony phrase meant to scare you into building up the evil “military-industrial complex.” National security in an age of mass destruction weapons refers to the machinery required for your continued existence, in safety and liberty. And that machinery belongs to the national government. It is not right to despise our national unity. And as someone who writes on this subject, I will not be bullied by those who want to refight the civil war. Go and fly your Confederate flag and dream of some other country which does not exist. My concern is for the country of my birth, the country created by Washington and adorned by the Constitution. I want this country to survive, and that has always been my message. My advocacy of America, of our country, is not based on blind or shallow considerations. What you have can be destroyed in a matter of hours. The bombs and missiles are sitting in Russia, on a hair trigger. The lives of your sons and daughters, of your grandchildren and great grandchildren depend on the unity of our country. Would you therefore be blameless if your disunifying themes contributed to a future catastrophe?

### Permutation Do Both --- Aff Ans

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

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

Litman 2011

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

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

#### ---Libertarianism and the state can co-exist—allows limited government to carry out legitimate functions that allow existence of civil society.

Boaz 10 (David,  executive vice president of the Cato Institute, “Are Libertarians Anti-Government?”, 4/16/10, <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/are-libertarians-anti-government/>, Accessed 7/14/12, Chan)

Libertarians want people to be able to live peacefully together in civil society. Cooperation is better than coercion. Peaceful coexistence and voluntary cooperation require an [institution](http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/are-libertarians-anti-government/) to protect us from outside threats, deter or punish criminals, and settle the disputes that will inevitably arise among neighbors—a government, in short. Thus, to criticize a wide range of the activities undertaken by federal and state governments—from Social Security to drug prohibition to out-of-control taxation—is not to be “anti-government.” It is simply to insist that what we want is a limited government that attends to its necessary and proper functions.¶ But if libertarians are not “anti-government,” then how do we describe the kind of government that libertarians support? One formulation found in the media is that “libertarians support weak government.” That has a certain appeal. But consider a prominent case of “weak government.” Numerous reports have told us recently about the weakness of the Russian government. Not only does it have trouble raising taxes and paying its still numerous employees, it has trouble deterring or punishing criminals. It is in fact too weak to carry out its legitimate functions. The Russian government is a failure on two counts: it is massive, clumsy, overextended, and virtually unconstrained in scope, yet too weak to perform its essential job. (Residents of many American cities may find that description a bit too close for comfort.)¶ Not “weak government,” then. How about “small government”? Lots of people, including many libertarians, like that phrase to describe libertarian views. And it has a certain plausibility. We rail against “big government,” so we must prefer small government, or “less government.” Of course, we wouldn’t want a government too small to deter military threats or apprehend criminals. And Washington Post columnist E. J. Dionne, Jr., offers us this comparison: “a dictatorship in which the government provides no social security, health, welfare or pension programs of any kind” and “levies relatively low taxes that go almost entirely toward the support of large military and secret police forces that regularly kill or jail people for their political or religious views” or “a democracy with open elections and full freedom of speech and religion [which] levies higher taxes than the dictatorship to support an extensive welfare state.”¶ “The first country might technically have a ‘smaller government,’” Dionne writes, “but it undoubtedly is not a free society. The second country would have a ‘bigger government,’ but it is indeed a free society.”¶ Now there are several problems with this comparison, not least Dionne’s apparent view that high taxes don’t limit the freedom of those forced to pay them. But our concern here is the term “smaller government.” Measured as a percentage of GDP or by the number of employees, the second government may well be larger than the first. Measured by its power and control over individuals and society, however, the first government is doubtless larger. Thus, as long as the term is properly understood, it’s reasonable for libertarians to endorse “smaller government.” But Dionne’s criticism should remind us that the term may not be well understood.¶ So if we’re not anti-government, and not really for weak or small government, how should we describe the libertarian position? To answer that question, we need to go back to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Libertarians generally support a government formed by the consent of the governed and designed to achieve certain limited purposes. Both the form of government and the limits on its powers should be specified in a constitution, and the challenge in any society is to keep government constrained and limited so that individuals can prosper and solve problems in a free and civil society.¶ Thus libertarians are not “anti-government.” Libertarians support limited, constitutional government—limited not just in size but, of far greater importance, in the scope of its powers.

### Alt Doesn’t Solve the Aff --- Aff Ans

#### ---Critique can’t solve the case ---

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

Litman 2011

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

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

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

Litman 2011

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

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

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

Litman 2011

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

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

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

Lind 11 [William Lind, 5/16/11, William S. Lind is an American expert on military affairs and a pundit on cultural conservatism. “Adam Smith Versus the Libertarians”, The American Conservative, http://www.theamericanconservative.com/cpt/2011/05/16/adam-smith-versus-the-libertarians/.] Ari Jacobson

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

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

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

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

### State Inevitable --- Aff Ans

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

Solomon 1996

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

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

### A2 Coercion Bad --- Aff Ans

#### ---Coercion is good --- It’s key to protect liberty and property rights. Blanket rejection in the name of liberty is self defeating.

Klein 2007

(Daniel B. Klein is a professor of economics at George Mason University. May 14, 2007. Economist’s Views. “Acceptable Government Coercion?” <http://economistsview.typepad.com/economistsview/2007/05/acceptable_gove.html>) Sherman

But, as Klein notes, just because something is coercive, doesn’t mean that it is wrong. The coercive power of the state is useful when it protects our lives and property from outside harm. If we think that state-sponsored redistribution is desirable, then we are willing to accept more coercion to help the less fortunate. We also rely on state-sponsored coercion regularly when writing private contracts. The ability of creditors to collect depends on the power of the state to coerce borrowers.

#### ---The affirmative view of freedom from coercion as the absence of law is a fallacy that artificially inflates the importance of government while simultaneously masking private coercion and violence which is worse because under the affirmative’s view .

Kienitz 2002 (Paul Kienitz, “I’m Still Not a Libertarian: So I Guess That Means I’m Opposed to Personal Freedom,” 6/22, <http://world.std.com/~mhuben/pk-is-against-liberty.html>, AFJ)

The second fallacy is one that I personally refer to as the Libertarian Fallacy, since unlike the Revolutionary Fallacy it is specific to this branch of philosophy.  It is popular with several subtypes of conservatives and most anarchists, as well as with Libertarians.  It can be expressed as the idea that freedom is measured by absence of laws.  Another say of stating it is that only the government can restrict your rights.  (Some Libertarians strongly support this wording, saying that a law removes or restricts your rights, but a private entity can only infringe on your rights without changing them.)  To me, this is an artificial double standard, which labels a restraint on your freedom by one outfit in a completely different way than the same restraint by a different outfit, because one has the label of "government" and the other does not.  Indeed, much of the fabric of reasoning in Libertarianism is based on presuming that the government is uniquely unlike any other entity, and therefore must be judged by entirely different standards from how anything else is appraised. To me, the question is how much power others have over you and how constrained your choice of actions is, not whether the constraint is by public action rather than private action.  In the viewpoint of those who hold this fallacy, what matters is how free you are on paper, not how free you are in what choices are actually open to you right now in real life.  According to this view, a destitute person with no public support is more free than one who gets some kind of pension or welfare, despite the fact that the latter is the one who can do many things that are closed off to the former.

#### ---Private coercion is worse-greater impact on the poor.

Taylor 2003 (Ian L, “Why I am not a Libertarian”, Airs, 2003, <http://airs.com/ian/essays/libertarian/libertarian.html>) SWOAP

A key reason that libertarians give for their dislike of government is that government action constrains personal liberty. Taxation is a typical example: if you don't pay your taxes, the government will send men with guns to collect them. Libertarians consider this to be an unacceptable form of coercion. However, there are many types of coercion which come from the private sector. For example, your employer may tell you that you must start working mandatory unpaid overtime. This effectively lowers your hourly wage. Naturally, you can quit, but there may not be any other jobs in town, and you may not be able to afford to move, or to get training for another type of job. (I didn't just make up this example--there is a [class action lawsuit against Walmart about this](http://www.lieffcabraser.com/walmart%20lawsuit.htm)). For another example, your landlord may decide to raise the rent, or to stop doing maintenance on the heating system, unless you agree to do some personal chores. Naturally, you can move elsewhere, but there may not be any other place available which is close enough to your work, or all the other places may be more expensive. These and other typical examples of coercion by the private sector have a greater effect on people who happen to be poor. Poor people generally have fewer options. Many people become poor through no fault of their own, for reasons such as an unexpected death in the family or being laid off. Such people are very vulnerable to many types of private sector coercion. In general, in daily life in the U.S., coercion by the private sector is much more obvious day to day than coercion by the government. The government normally leaves people alone other than garnishing their paycheck. The private sector rarely leaves people alone, and limits our choices every day--most obviously at our jobs. The fact that private sector coercion is not backed by the threat of direct violence does not mean that it is not coercion. Indirect violence, in the form of loss of income, shelter, or food, is just as effective as direct violence. People sometimes cite a couple of reasons why private sector coercion seems different from government coercion: you can refuse to take part, or you can move somewhere else. However, those reasons are misleading. Refusing to take part can mean losing your job and/or becoming homeless. Moving elsewhere, besides being expensive in itself, is only possible if there is a job elsewhere. It's true that in principle, if everything works out, you have a choice. But in practice, if something goes wrong, you do not. Moreover, you actually have the same choices with a government. If you refuse to pay your taxes, you may eventually be put in jail. But at least you will be fed and sheltered. Or you can always move to a different country. There are countries with very minimal governments, such as Afghanistan or Somalia. While those choices may not seem appealing, they are just as real as the choices you have to avoid private sector coercion.

### A2 Liberty First --- Aff Ans

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

Rothbard 1973

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

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

#### ---Government intervention is key to liberty --- It’s the only actor capable and motivated to enforce the protection of individual rights.

Amy 7

(Douglas J. Amy is a Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College. 2007. Governmentisgood.com. “A Guide to Rebutting Right-Wing Criticisms of Government” http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=19) Sherman

But consider this: Who comes to the rescue when our government violates our rights in these ways? To whom do Americans turn to revoke or remedy those actions and to make sure that they don’t happen again? The government. Sometimes the government acts independently in this protective role, as when federal authorities intervened in the 1960s when some states were violating the civil rights and voting rights of African Americans. But often it is citizens themselves who use one part of the government – usually the courts – to stop another part of the government from infringing on their freedoms and rights. Citizen organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union have been particularly active in using the courts to protect our freedom of speech, freedom of religion, the right to vote, etc. In the end, then, we depend heavily on the tools of democratic government to protect people’s rights. When we want to limit the abusive activities of government – such as unreasonable searches or unfair appropriations of our property – we need to rely on the positive actions of another part of the government to do so. This is a point that anti-government conservatives consistently ignore. Yes, government can violate our rights, but democratic government also functions as the main protector of our rights and freedoms as well – and it has often done so very effectively. Certainly totalitarian and dictatorial governments are the enemies of freedom, but democratic governments have constitutions and institutions that enable us to effectively protect our rights and freedoms. We often make the mistake of seeing our rights and civil liberties as merely the absence of some kind of governmental action. We believe that we have free speech or freedom of religion when the government does nothing to impede those freedoms. But in reality, our rights depend heavily on active government – on positive government actions. In fact, the very existence of rights depends on government. In a very real way, rights and civil liberties are actually political constructs – creations of government. Formal rights do not exist until they are created by law or established in a constitution. We only have the right of free speech because it is guaranteed in our constitution. If we didn’t have our constitution, or if we didn’t have government, our civil liberties would literally not exist. In the preamble of the Constitution, the founding fathers did not say that in order to “secure liberty for ourselves and our posterity” they were going to abolish government; they said that they were going to “ordain and establish” a democratic constitutional government to do so.1 They knew, as Benjamin Barber has explained, that “in democracies, representative institutions do not steal our liberties from us, they are the precious medium through which we secure our liberties."2

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

Sunstein 1999

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

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

#### ---No impact to state coercion --- The State does not exclude individual freedom and can often help protect it.

Glaeser 07 ( Ed,  Professor of Economics at [Harvard University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harvard_University) “Acceptable Government Coercion?” Economist’s View 5/14/07 <http://economistsview.typepad.com/economistsview/2007/05/acceptable_gove.html>) SWOAP

But, as Klein notes, just because something is coercive, doesn’t mean that it is wrong. The coercive power of the state is useful when it protects our lives and property from outside harm. If we think that state-sponsored redistribution is desirable, then we are willing to accept more coercion to help the less fortunate. We also rely on state-sponsored coercion regularly when writing private contracts. The ability of creditors to collect depends on the power of the state to coerce borrowers. The great difficulty is that coercion is both necessary and terrifying. For millenia, governments have abused their control over the tools of violence. The historical track record insists that we treat any governmental intervention warily. What principles help us decide on the appropriate limits to government-sponsored coercion? Are minimum wage laws acceptable coercion or do they fall outside of the pale? I start with the view that individual freedom is the ultimate goal for any government. The ultimate job of the state is to increase the range of options available to its citizens. To me, this is ... justified by both philosophy and history. ... A belief in the value of liberty flows strongly through mainstream neoclassical economics. Economists frequently speak about an aim of maximizing utility levels, and this is often mistranslated as maximizing happiness. Maximizing freedom would be a better translation. The only way that economists know that utility has increased is if a person has more options to choose from, and that sounds like freedom to me. It is this attachment to liberty that makes neoclassical economists fond of political liberty and making people richer, because more wealth means more choices... But putting freedom first doesn’t mean abandoning the state. At the very least, we rely on the government to protect our private property against incursions by others. Even most libertarians think that it is reasonable for the state to enforce contracts. ...

### A2 Property Rights First --- Aff Ans

#### **---Libertarianism’s freedom of property and self-ownership directly contradict each other --- Gives contracts the right to invoke coercive state power.**

Freeman 2001 (Samuel R. Philosophy & Public Affairs, Volume 30, Number 2, Spring 2001 “Illiberal Libertarians: Why Libertarianism Is Not a Liberal View” p. 131-133, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/philosophy_and_public_affairs/summary/v030/30.2freeman.html>, Accessed 7/12/12, Chan)

I claimed that the most central liberal institution is the protection of¶ the basic rights and liberties needed to secure individual freedom and¶ independence. Libertarians would have us believe that they accept all¶ the basic rights that liberals do and simply add more liberties, namely,¶ absolute freedom of contract and of property. Libertarians then claim¶ their view offers us even greater liberty, as if it they were just improving¶ upon liberalism, drawing its natural conclusion. The problem is these added liberties, when combined with the libertarian account of¶ self-ownership, undermine the idea of basic liberties. For what libertarian¶ self-ownership ultimately means is that we stand toward our¶ person, its capacities, and the rights of moral personality in the same¶ normative relationship as we stand to our rights in things. All rights are¶ conceived as property rights. Rights to liberties then become just one¶ among several kinds of rights that persons own and have at their disposal.¶ Basic liberties are of no greater moral or political significance¶ than any other kind of property right. But given the crucial role of¶ absolute freedom of contract—that all contractual agreements are to¶ be publicly recognized and enforced—it follows that all liberties can¶ be alienated, just like any economic good.¶ Consequently, there is no place in a libertarian scheme for inalienability,¶ the idea that certain rights are so essential to maintaining the¶ dignity and independence of persons that they cannot be given up by¶ consent. So Nozick says, “My nonpaternalistic position holds that¶ someone may choose (or permit another) to do to himself anything,¶ unless he has acquired an obligation to some third party not to do or allow it.”54 Read within the context of a libertarian acceptance of complete¶ freedom of contract, permitting another to do “anything” to oneself¶ implies the capacity to give another the right to invoke the coercive¶ powers of the state (or anyone else) to force you to comply with¶ your earlier agreements, no matter what you have agreed to or how¶ much you presently object to it. Not surprisingly, then, Nozick later¶ says that a free system allows a person to sell himself into slavery.55¶ Assuming the transaction is freely entered into, it is the role of the¶ minimal state to enforce it against the unfortunate person who once¶ consented to enslavement, but who now, quite understandably, has¶ had a change of mind. It should follow that there is nothing morally¶ objectionable about owning slaves and treating people as objects¶ against their will56; moreover, it is not unjust for the State, or any third¶ party, to compel people to abide by their slavery or other servitude¶ contracts.¶ Earlier I argued that it is a mistake to conceive of servitude agreements¶ as simply private matters between consenting adults protected¶ by freedom of association. If genuine freedom of association were involved,¶ then either party could terminate the relationship freely. But¶ here we have something very different: contractual transfers of rights¶ in oneself, the result of which negates a person’s freedom of association¶ as well as other basic rights. Contracts by their nature are no¶ longer simply private relationships that leave others’ rights and duties¶ unaffected; they become publicly enforceable agreements altering¶ others’ rights and obligations. Contracts impose upon others duties to¶ recognize and respect contractual terms, and upon governments duties¶ of coercive enforceability. These facts should not be obscured by¶ the common locution of “private contracts.” Libertarians describe full¶ alienability of rights as if it were a matter of showing respect for people’s¶ freedom and voluntary choices. A better description of a social system that enforces complete or even partial dominion over human¶ beings is that it is a perverse property system. For it is not as if libertarians¶ put a premium upon maintaining individuals’ freedom of action,¶ much less so their independence, or their capacities to exercise¶ their rights and control significant aspects of their lives. Instead what¶ is fundamentally important for libertarians is maintaining a system of¶ historically generated property rights, whatever the consequences for¶ individuals’ freedom, independence, or interests. Libertarianism is, in¶ the end, not so much about liberty as it is about protecting and enforcing¶ absolute property and contract rights. The liberties that libertarians¶ provide are defined by reference to absolute property in persons¶ and in things; who has these rights in the end is not morally¶ important, so long as their holdings come about by observing libertarian¶ transfer procedures and side-constraints.

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

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

Litman 2011

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

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

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

Litman 2011

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

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

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

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

Partridge 1999

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

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

### A2 Taxation Bad --- Aff Ans

#### ---Taxation is good --- Governmental forced exchanges are beneficial to the individual and are equivalent exchange because people have what they would choose.

Epstein 2004 (Richard A.,  Laurence A. Tisch Professor of Law at the New York University School of Law, [Natural Rights Liberalism from Locke to Nozick](http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ebook.jsf?bid=CBO9780511599712), Volume 22, Part 1, “One Step Beyond Nozick's Minimal State: The Role of Forced Exchanges in Political Theory”, <http://journals.cambridge.org.turing.library.northwestern.edu/action/displayFulltext?type=6&fid=275209&jid=SOY&volumeId=22&issueId>, Accessed 7/14/12, Chan)

Nozick is mistaken in his treatment of taxation, which looks solely at the cost and never at the benefit side. Here, and in other contexts, he fails to see how allowing forced exchanges introduces an extra degree of (analytical) freedom into the overall analysis, which requires close attention. It is now possible to have, as it were, justice in forced transactions so long as the party who is subject to coercion is left better off than before. This is not an effort to introduce into the law some Rousseauian notion that individuals may be forced to be free, for the use of forced exchanges is not designed to alter or override the preference structures that ordinary individuals hold. It is only intended to allow them to move to higher levels of utility (albeit with lower levels of political freedom) than they could achieve through voluntary transactions in light of the well-known coordination problems that arise in the provision of public goods. The full range of examples should make it clear how risky matters become once forced exchanges are allowed into the system. Clearly the permissible domain of forced exchanges should not be infinite, and one advantage of Nozick's more limited rules of acquisition, transfer, and protection is that they preclude petty and tyrannical abuses from the outset, abuses that often take place when the state uses its eminent domain power. But the price of his parsimonious assumptions is to block any coherent account for the legitimacy of the state at all. The key challenge, therefore, is to develop a set of rules that permit some forced exchanges while guarding against the potential for systematic abuses, including the forms of redistribution that were the subject of Nozick's attack. Within the American constitutional tradition (which speaks to concerns that transcend America's borders), this effort is dominated by two conditions that require some attention. [24](http://journals.cambridge.org.turing.library.northwestern.edu/action/displayFulltext?type=6&fid=275209&jid=SOY&volumeId=22&issueId=01&aid=275208&fulltextType=RA&fileId=S0265052505041117#fn24) The forced exchanges in question should be made with “just compensation,” and should only be allowed in those cases where they are for “public use.” This formulation is suggestive of and consistent with the following set of conditions for allowing forced exchanges under the eminent domain power.¶ First, the transaction costs of voluntary arrangements must be high if not prohibitive. This condition alone suggests that it is not appropriate for me to take your watch while leaving its replacement cost in your mailbox. There are many individuals who can supply watches through ordinary market exchanges; why take the risk of abuse when the voluntarist solution is so attractive? It is clear that the public use requirement precludes this transaction, even if it must allow many others. Rightly understood, the function of this requirement is to allow the state to supply public goods when the transaction costs of voluntary arrangements among multiple parties are prohibitive.¶ Second, the individual whom the state coerces must receive compensation that leaves him at least as well off by his own lights as he was before the forced exchange was undertaken. The point here is that coercion is justified not by some abstract appeal to the good of the community at large, but only by a specific showing that it causes no harm (or perhaps even works some net benefit) to the very individual who bears the brunt of that coercion. The requirement here raises obvious questions of valuation, but the reference to “his own lights” is intended to highlight the role of subjective value in the context of coerced transactions as another barrier against the abuse of state power. This requirement raises, in turn, some serious issues of measurement that cannot be escaped once any forced exchanges are allowed as legitimate.¶ Third, the transaction should work to the net benefit of those individuals who acquire the property in question. This condition will be easy to satisfy when ordinary individuals are able to use the coercive power of the state for their own advantage. They will only initiate transactions from which they hope to benefit. But the requirement is much more demanding in those cases when government agents act for the benefit of the community (against one of its members), using revenues that they have obtained through coercive means, for example, taxation. In one sense this position seems to be in tension with the view that all government coercion should be exercised for the benefit of those to whom it is directed. But in fact that condition is not violated here, because the willingness to provide full compensation means that the state power is only used to prevent a single individual or group from making a disproportionate exaction from the population as a whole. So understood, this third condition reveals the two-sided nature of the question of political legitimacy. Taken in connection with the second condition, it changes the view of the world from one of dominant reliance on the ideas of property and consent to reliance on the idea of making Pareto improvements, that is, bringing about new states of the world in which at least one person is better off and no one is worse off than before. This test is a “social” test insofar as it requires the welfare of each individual within the group to be taken into account before comparing two social states of affairs with each other. Voluntary transactions routinely generate Pareto improvements because no one will enter into them if they expect to be left worse off than before. Indeed, in virtually all voluntary, or win-win, situations, the transaction satisfies an even stronger condition in that all players regard themselves as better off with the deal than without it. Although the drafters of the Fifth Amendment adopted the “just compensation” standard before the formulation of the Pareto principle more than a century later, their views mirrored what that principle requires. We count as a social improvement any change that benefits each and every member of the society against whom coercion has been exercised. For these purposes, it does not matter whether that coercion has been exercised by general taxation and regulation or by the specific taking of particular pieces of property.¶ Fourth, in many cases it is desirable and feasible to have not only gains shared by all individuals in the group, but also a pro rata division of gain, so that no individual gains from public action more than any other. Stated otherwise, the ideal is that each person should get the same rateof return on his investment in collective activities as anyone else. Thus, in a simple three-person society in which A, B, and C are forced to contribute respectively (say by a tax on real property) 100, 200, and 300, then ideally, if A receives a 10 return (for a total of 110) on his contribution, B should receive 20 (for a total of 220), and C should receive 30 (for a total of 330). This is the same distribution that they would receive in any voluntary joint venture, and the coercive venture should follow the voluntary one in choosing this stable baseline in order to prevent a dissipation of surplus by factional intrigue. This fourth condition is needed because the simple just compensation requirement under conditions two and three is intended only to ensure that no individual loses from the use of state coercion. It does not speak about the distribution of the gain across other members of society. The Pareto test is satisfied if A ends up with property and public benefit worth 101 or more, B ends up with 201 or more, and C with 301 or more. The full 60 units of gain in the hypothetical example could be the focal point of factional struggles, or rent-seeking, that could wholly dissipate its amount. The highly stringent test of pro rata division is hard to satisfy in practice, but the point of this requirement is to prevent any two members of this three-party group from ganging up on the third in order to gobble up the lion's share of the surplus, even if the just compensation test has been met. The principles here, moreover, are easily expandable to any number of individuals. If the pro rata standard can be met, the level of political intrigue can be kept low. This is one argument for the flat or proportionate tax, whose form eliminates partisan battles over the steepness of any progressive tax. In making this argument, I do not mean to gloss over the serious measurement problems that are raised when voluntary transactions are not available to determine the value that each person attaches to some collective good such as law and order. There can be no doubt that these are highly variable in different contexts, and in practice we often assume that the benefit achieved from any given transaction is proportionate to the stake that individuals have in society, even when it is unlikely that this is the case in reality. Stated otherwise, there is nothing in this (or any other) model of governance that constrains public debate over whether to wage war or to make peace with foreign nations. But this is a problem that dogs any theory of collective action, even for the devotees of the minimal state.

### A2 Wasteful Spending --- Aff Ans

#### ---Wasteful spending and resource mismanagement claims are unwarranted and exaggerated --- Best studies indicate less than 2% of government spending is wasted.

Amy 7

(Douglas J. Amy is a Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College. 2007. Governmentisgood.com. “A Guide to Rebutting Right-Wing Criticisms of Government” <http://www.governmentisgood.com/feature.php?fid=14>) Sherman

We think we know government, but we really do not. As¶ Americans we have come to view government primarily through a set of negative stereotypes – such as “government is wasteful,” “big government impinges on our freedoms,” “government undermines business,” and “most government programs fail.” These negative images are being constantly promoted by conservative politicians and pundits who are trying to justify their campaign to drastically reduce government. But it turns out that these popular images of government are only tenuously rooted in reality. If we take a careful look at these typical conservative criticisms of government, we find that most of them are actually exaggerated, misleading, or often simply wrong. For example, many Americans have come to believe that the government wastes forty-eight cents of every tax dollar. In reality, studies show that the amount of waste is more like two cents for every dollar – hardly an alarming figure.¶ Many of the articles on this website take on and refute these misleading stereotypes about government. What follows is a brief guide to the common right-wing criticisms of government and why they are largely off the mark. The left hand column contains the complaint, and the right hand column contains a brief rebuttal and a link to the article that explains more fully why the complaint is flawed. As you make your way through these issues, I think you may find that much of what you think is wrong with government – and what conservatives keep telling you is wrong – is simply mistaken. This is not to say that there is nothing wrong with this government – only that it is not what conservatives say it is.