# Coercion DA

“Don’t tread on me” – Ike Song

“All taxation is theft” – Billy Blechman

“The power to tax, is the power to destroy” – Magnus Lee

# **1nc**

## shells

### 1nc – the impact

#### Freedom outweighs 🦅 🦅 🦅

Henry 1775 (but a timeless argument)– (Patrick; American politician and orator; 3/23/1775; "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death;" No Publication; <https://academyatthelakes.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/PatrickHenryGiveMeLibertyAddressExcerptsFinal-rev-1-25-16.pdf>, \*edited for gendered language) //

Mr. President, it is natural to ~~man~~ [patriot] to indulge in the illusions of hope. [But] Is this the part of wise ~~men~~ [patriots], engaged in a great struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and, having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.

I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen have been pleased to comfort themselves and the House. Is it that insidious smile with which our petition has been lately received? Trust it not, sir. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a kiss. Ask yourselves, are fleets and armies necessary to a work of love and reconciliation? Let us not deceive ourselves, sir. These are the implements of war and subjugation; the last arguments to which kings resort. I ask gentlemen, sir, Has Great Britain any enemy, in this quarter of the world, to call for all this accumulation of navies and armies? No, sir, she has none. They are meant for us: they can be meant for no other. And what have we to oppose to them?

Shall we try argument? Sir, we have been trying that for the last ten years. Sir, we have done everything that could be done to avert the storm which is now coming on. We have petitioned; we have remonstrated; we have supplicated; we have prostrated ourselves before the throne, and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of Parliament.

Our petitions have been slighted; our remonstrance’s have produced additional violence and insult; our supplications have been disregarded; and we have been spurned, with contempt, from the foot of the throne! In vain, after these things, may we indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation? There is no longer any room for hope. If we wish to be free, we must fight! I repeat it, ~~sir~~ [fellow patriot], we must fight! An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts is all that is left us!

It is in vain, ~~sir~~, to extenuate the matter. The war is actually begun! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!

### 1nc—shell—1 card

#### **the plan’s fiscal redistribution is STATE SANCTIONED THUGGERY – the impact is** *THE DEATH OF FREEDOM!*

Meredith ’21 (Dave Meredith, BA in polisci from John Carroll University & staff writer at *The Carroll News*.), “Progressive Taxes Are Theft,” 2-24-21, *The Carroll News*, <https://carrollnews.org/61716/opinion/progressive-taxes-are-theft> //ike

Over the years, I have concluded that some people simply refuse to fully comprehend the reality of governmental taxation and spending. These individuals don’t seem to realize that **the government is spending our money**. This may sound silly because on its face, these concepts are exceptionally basic. With that said, the advocacy of fiscal policies espoused by some of these individuals are illogical. One such policy is the progressive tax. **The obvious immorality of the progressive tax** system (which is an increase in the tax rate as taxable income increases) **should be the enemy of anyone in search of legitimate freedom**. Progressive taxes essentially seek to redistribute the wealth from one group of people to another. Politicians advocating for increased taxes on higher earners are saying, “Vote for me, and I will use the levers of power to take their money and give it to you!” Over time, **the government has grown exponentially larger and continues to infringe upon our fundamental liberties.** As a society, **we have allowed** this enlarged **government to legalize theft right before our eyes**. When Congress confiscates the dollar of one person to reallocate it to another, nobody raises an eyebrow. If a private citizen carried out this action, we would deem them **guilty of theft**. Earnings are personal property, just like a house or car. You are in no way entitled to the money of others, and **any argument in defense of such a claim is an overt fallacy**. An attack on the personal property of others **is an attack on freedom**. Freedom can hardly be exercised when property is being disproportionately confiscated based on income levels.

### 1nc—shell—long(er)

#### [link]

#### **all taxation is GOVERNMENT COERCION – its ontological evilness scales LINEARLY!**

Birie ‘2k (Madsen Birie, Co-founder & President of the Adam Smith Institute.), “All taxes are immoral,” 3-16-00, *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2000/mar/17/comment> //ike

Herein lies **the immorality of taxation.** **Taxation means compulsion**. Our habit of clothing it in fine words often conceals the brute fact that **taxation is the confiscation of our property** by people who prefer to spend it on their priorities rather than ours. **Higher taxation means more compulsion**. It forces further retreat by individuals from the area of their lives in which they can make decisions and assume responsibilities. At the heart of the debate is the question of whether people are to live by their own values as adult citizens, or made to live according to the values of their government. Hague has opted for the former, and holds out the prospect of a more equal relationship in which citizens meet the government eye to eye and freely contract with it to discharge their obligations. The United States has just seen its annual list of the top 100 lifetime benefactors. In the number one slot is George Soros, who has given away $2.65bn. The list includes Bill and Melinda Gates, rapidly making their way up its ranks, and even the actor Paul Newman, whose supermarket sauces pay every penny to charity. The US can be generous with its private charity because government leaves space for its citizens to do so. It takes 28% of their income each year, as against the 40% which our own treasury takes. Further, US tax laws allow full deduction for charitable gifts. This helps to explain why we give £7 a month, versus the equivalent of £17 given by Americans. It is not just charity which is crowded out by the state. Whenever it undertakes a responsibility, it **denies us the chance to assume it**. If people are less inclined to care for their elderly relatives than before, it is because the state has convinced them that it is its job, not theirs. If people do not save enough to meet their future needs, it is because the state has spent decades telling them that it will take care of them instead. **Wherever government has advanced, individual responsibility has retreated**. Now Hague is telling us it can be rolled back for moral reasons, to create a space in which people can grow. His guarantees are spot on. By pledging that the overall tax burden will diminish, he tells us that we will undertake responsibility for a larger part of our lives. We will have the resources to make better provision for our relatives and for own own future. We will have the means to contribute to charitable causes, and to support those less fortunate than ourselves. **By pledging an end to** stealth **taxes, he is telling us** that **he intends to take away** some of **the cynicism and dishonesty which discredit government**. If we are to pay taxes, he says, let them be open and understood and accepted. Gordon Brown has made it his style to rack up taxes by keeping them concealed and keeping taxpayers confused. William Hague plans to expose taxation, probably in the belief that if people know what they are paying, they will be less tolerant of the high tax culture, and the arrogant assumption that it will plan and organise our lives better than we can do it ourselves.

### 1nc—shell—k version

#### **[link]**

#### **all taxation is GOVERNMENT COERCION – its ontological evilness scales LINEARLY!**

Birie ’2k (Madsen Birie, Co-founder & President of the Adam Smith Institute.), “All taxes are immoral,” 3-16-00, *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2000/mar/17/comment> //ike

Herein lies **the immorality of taxation.** **Taxation means compulsion**. Our habit of clothing it in fine words often conceals the brute fact that **taxation is the confiscation of our property** by people who prefer to spend it on their priorities rather than ours. **Higher taxation means more compulsion**. It forces further retreat by individuals from the area of their lives in which they can make decisions and assume responsibilities. At the heart of the debate is the question of whether people are to live by their own values as adult citizens, or made to live according to the values of their government. Hague has opted for the former, and holds out the prospect of a more equal relationship in which citizens meet the government eye to eye and freely contract with it to discharge their obligations. The United States has just seen its annual list of the top 100 lifetime benefactors. In the number one slot is George Soros, who has given away $2.65bn. The list includes Bill and Melinda Gates, rapidly making their way up its ranks, and even the actor Paul Newman, whose supermarket sauces pay every penny to charity. The US can be generous with its private charity because government leaves space for its citizens to do so. It takes 28% of their income each year, as against the 40% which our own treasury takes. Further, US tax laws allow full deduction for charitable gifts. This helps to explain why we give £7 a month, versus the equivalent of £17 given by Americans. It is not just charity which is crowded out by the state. Whenever it undertakes a responsibility, it **denies us the chance to assume it**. If people are less inclined to care for their elderly relatives than before, it is because the state has convinced them that it is its job, not theirs. If people do not save enough to meet their future needs, it is because the state has spent decades telling them that it will take care of them instead. **Wherever government has advanced, individual responsibility has retreated**. Now Hague is telling us it can be rolled back for moral reasons, to create a space in which people can grow. His guarantees are spot on. By pledging that the overall tax burden will diminish, he tells us that we will undertake responsibility for a larger part of our lives. We will have the resources to make better provision for our relatives and for own own future. We will have the means to contribute to charitable causes, and to support those less fortunate than ourselves. **By pledging an end to** stealth **taxes, he is telling us** that **he intends to take away** some of **the cynicism and dishonesty which discredit government**. If we are to pay taxes, he says, let them be open and understood and accepted. Gordon Brown has made it his style to rack up taxes by keeping them concealed and keeping taxpayers confused. William Hague plans to expose taxation, probably in the belief that if people know what they are paying, they will be less tolerant of the high tax culture, and the arrogant assumption that it will plan and organise our lives better than we can do it ourselves.

#### **the alternative is an unflinching ethic of tax avoidance.**

Worstall ’15 (Tim Worstall, Senior Fellow of the Adam Smith Institute.), “Tax Avoidance And Tax Evasion Are To The Benefit Of Us All,” 1-7-15, *Forbes*, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2015/01/07/tax-avoidance-and-tax-evasion-are-to-the-benefit-of-us-all/#:~:text=If%20people%20will%20avoid%20or,reduces%20the%20overall%20tax%20rate>. //ike

Admittedly, it is possible to take a different view on this matter, but there's a good and entirely reasonable argument that tax avoidance and tax evasion work to the benefit of us all. The crucial point is really how one views the activities of government. And there's two views that seem to be held. One that I regard as hopelessly naive and simplistic, the second something very much closer to reality. That first is that all of the things that government does for us are beneficial to us and that limiting what it does do harms us all. The second is that some parts of what government does are things which both must be done and can only be done by government, but that **a** rather **large part of what it attempts to do shouldn't be done at all**, whether by government or not. Thus, starving the beast by avoiding or evading taxes produces a benefit **because it reduces the size and scope of government**. The trigger for this thought is this excellent piece discussing this very point: Imagine the following world. The only goods that government produces are public goods. Public goods have two characteristics. First, they are non-rival in consumption: one person's consumption of the good does not diminish the amount that others can consume. Second, they are non-excludable: excluding people from benefiting from public goods is prohibitively expensive. National defense and public protection are the standard examples. Government determines what budget these public-good activities require and then levies the most efficient taxes necessary to finance them. Each citizen is charged a tax price lower than his valuation of the public goods (and lower than any alternative way to produce them). In brief, the state finds the optimal level of public-good expenditures and then levies the most efficient taxes to finance them. This is, by and large, the model of orthodox public finance theory. In this model, tax dodging by any individual increases the burden on other taxpayers. As anyone who has ever bothered to observe the sausage making that is government and the legislature this isn't in fact what happens. We all complain about what actually happens. Even those on the left who generally believe in the power of government to do good insist that the special interests (say, the Koch Brothers who are entirely demonic figures to those at places like Alternet and points left) manage to **corrupt what government actually does**. And those on the right have their own examples and proper liberals like myself will happily make use of both sets of failures to make our point. Leading to this being, to my mind, a much more accurate model of what government is and how it works: Public Choice theory, developed in the last half of the 20th century, provides an alternative model, which can be sketched as follows.12 The individuals who run the state—mainly politicians and bureaucrats—are, like ordinary individuals, motivated by self-interest. Their interests are generally served by expanding the power and scope of government. Politicians do this by providing a large number of private goods and privileges for the benefit of supporting clienteles. Bureaucrats expand the size of their bureaus. We thus observe built-in incentives within the state to collect as much revenue as possible given political and other institutional constraints—to charge what the captive "market" will bear—and then to spend the proceeds on things that benefit those in power and the interest groups whose support they need. Government maximizes revenues; it does not levy revenues only to produce genuine public goods. At which point taxdodging has benefits to all of us. Because **by dodging taxes people limit the ability of governments to impose ever higher ones**. If you like, you could say that such tax avoidance is a Laffer Effect. The Laffer Curve itself is really, originally at least, about the effects of taxation levels upon economic growth. It's possible for taxes to be so high that lowering them will increase growth enough to provide more revenue to the government. Here though we're perhaps not talking about growth so much as just resistance to high tax levels. If people will avoid or evade what they regard as high taxation then that reduces the revenue from having said high taxation. And, obviously, if enough people avoid then this will reduce total revenue. At which point we can say that tax dodging is one of the things that reduces the overall tax rate. Sure, it does depend upon one's view of governance. But as I say, I defy any rational adult who has really looked at how the system works to deny that the second explanation is a lot closer to reality than the first. And if it is then tax avoidance and tax evasion does us all a favour: it limits the ability of the politicians to take the money of the law abiding.

### 1nc—shell—procedural

#### interp – affs must NOT tax.

#### violation – [ ]

#### vote neg –

#### 1---limits – taxation allows unpredictable advantage ground and doubles the number of topical affs.

#### 2---ethics – **all taxation is unethical – it’s GOVERNMENT COERCION.**

Birie ’2k (Madsen Birie, Co-founder & President of the Adam Smith Institute.), “All taxes are immoral,” 3-16-00, *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2000/mar/17/comment> //ike

Herein lies **the immorality of taxation.** **Taxation means compulsion**. Our habit of clothing it in fine words often conceals the brute fact that **taxation is the confiscation of our property** by people who prefer to spend it on their priorities rather than ours. **Higher taxation means more compulsion**. It forces further retreat by individuals from the area of their lives in which they can make decisions and assume responsibilities. At the heart of the debate is the question of whether people are to live by their own values as adult citizens, or made to live according to the values of their government. Hague has opted for the former, and holds out the prospect of a more equal relationship in which citizens meet the government eye to eye and freely contract with it to discharge their obligations. The United States has just seen its annual list of the top 100 lifetime benefactors. In the number one slot is George Soros, who has given away $2.65bn. The list includes Bill and Melinda Gates, rapidly making their way up its ranks, and even the actor Paul Newman, whose supermarket sauces pay every penny to charity. The US can be generous with its private charity because government leaves space for its citizens to do so. It takes 28% of their income each year, as against the 40% which our own treasury takes. Further, US tax laws allow full deduction for charitable gifts. This helps to explain why we give £7 a month, versus the equivalent of £17 given by Americans. It is not just charity which is crowded out by the state. Whenever it undertakes a responsibility, it **denies us the chance to assume it**. If people are less inclined to care for their elderly relatives than before, it is because the state has convinced them that it is its job, not theirs. If people do not save enough to meet their future needs, it is because the state has spent decades telling them that it will take care of them instead. **Wherever government has advanced, individual responsibility has retreated**. Now Hague is telling us it can be rolled back for moral reasons, to create a space in which people can grow. His guarantees are spot on. By pledging that the overall tax burden will diminish, he tells us that we will undertake responsibility for a larger part of our lives. We will have the resources to make better provision for our relatives and for own own future. We will have the means to contribute to charitable causes, and to support those less fortunate than ourselves. **By pledging an end to** stealth **taxes, he is telling us** that **he intends to take away** some of **the cynicism and dishonesty which discredit government**. If we are to pay taxes, he says, let them be open and understood and accepted. Gordon Brown has made it his style to rack up taxes by keeping them concealed and keeping taxpayers confused. William Hague plans to expose taxation, probably in the belief that if people know what they are paying, they will be less tolerant of the high tax culture, and the arrogant assumption that it will plan and organise our lives better than we can do it ourselves.

#### it’s unethical to defend immoral positions.

Rivera-Lopez ’15 (Eduardo Rivera-Lopez, PhD in philosophy from Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz.), “Is it Morally Wrong to Defend Unjust Causes as a Lawyer?” May 2015, *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, Vol. 32, No. 2, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26813435> //ike

6. Why should not lawyers have the right and the moral permission to accept immoral causes? Why is it wrong to accept? In order to answer these questions we must first answer the same question posed before with respect to the client: what are the moral reasons that vie in favour of and against accepting. These reasons are certainly prima facie, i.e. defeasible in particular cases. As we shall see, we can always find situations in which these reasons are superseded by others. However, in most cases, there seems to be no moral reason to accept such cases. Instead, there are strong reasons against accepting. The **fundamental reason not to accept representation** for a client **with an immoral purpose is obvious: it is morally wrong to help someone do something wrong**. As we have seen, the client has a right to pursue such a purpose in spite of not having moral permission to do so. If the client’s actions are wrong, contributing specifically, and in full awareness, to the performance of such actions must also be (prima facie) wrong. It must be remembered here that considerations related to the adversarial system or the right of defence are no longer relevant. These considerations are sufficient to support a right to accept, but they do not give a reason. 18 Neither do these considerations override moral reasons against accepting. Suppose I have the right to enter into any (legally permitted) association or club, but I have a moral reason not to enter association P (for instance, P is a racist club). Having a right to become a member of P does not override or diminish my reason against doing so.19 Similarly, having a right to accept a client with a wrong purpose does not affect the moral reason I have for not accepting this client. There are additional reasons against accepting representation for immoral causes. First, the **resources devoted to representing an unjust cause might be assigned to** other, **valuable** (or at least not unjust) **ones**. This is particularly important in countries where legal resources are far from being justly distributed. Second, **in many cases, the representation of an unjust cause** typically **contributes to the success of other** unjust or **immoral causes**, especially when the case is institutionally relevant (appeals to the Supreme Court, cases of public interest, etc.).

## uniqueness

### UQ – Current Tax Rates acceptable

#### American’s are content with status quo tax rates

Galston 17 – William A; American author, academic, and political advisor, holds the Ezra K. Zilkha Chair in Governance Studies and is a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution; 4-14-2017; "Polling Spotlight: America’s shifting attitudes on taxes," *Brookings*, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2017/04/14/polling-spotlight-americas-shifting-attitudes-on-taxes/>; //billy

In an important new book, Brookings’ Vanessa Williamson shows that most Americans regard paying taxes as a civic duty and are offended when they regard others as not doing their part. As lawmakers and the Trump administration begin their push for tax reform, they should pay attention to fresh survey evidence that supports Williamson’s thesis.

A Gallup survey released on April 13 finds that 61 percent of Americans see their own federal income tax obligation as fair, including 69 percent of Democrats, 60 percent of Independents, and 56 percent of Republicans. According to an April 14 report from the Pew Research Center, only 27 percent of Americans are bothered “a lot” by the amount they themselves pay in federal income taxes. Only 35 percent of Republicans, often regarded as allergic to taxes, say they are more than minimally bothered by the taxes they pay. Fifty-four percent of Americans say they pay “about the right amount” in taxes; 49 percent of Republicans agree.

The problem with the current tax code lies elsewhere. The Pew survey found that 62 percent of Americans surveyed are deeply troubled that “some corporations” don’t pay their share. Almost as many Americans—60 percent—report being disturbed that some wealthy people don’t either. By contrast, only 1 in 5 Americans say they are troubled by the failure of poor people to chip in.

As President Donald Trump ponders options for his tax reform proposal, he should consider the views of the voters who put him over the top last November. Only 25 percent of low-income Republicans complain about the amount they themselves pay in taxes; only 26 percent think poor people are shirking their responsibility to help fund the federal government. But 51 percent of these Republicans resent what they see as the failure of some corporations to pay their fair share of the tax burden, and almost as many—45 percent—resent wealthy individuals who don’t do so.

Complicating the president’s task are the very different views of upper-income Republicans, who are far more likely to criticize the complexity of the code and the amount of taxes they pay than to complain about the conduct of corporations and wealthy individuals. Economic class makes a big difference for Republicans, but very little for Democrats: Upper-income Democrats are just as likely as middle- and lower-income Democrats to believe that some corporations and wealthy individuals are shirking their responsibility to help fund the government.

Ever since the advent of supply-side economics, Republicans have emphasized cutting tax rates for corporations and upper-income individuals. Recent research suggests that in 2017, this approach would evoke a negative reaction from the people overall—and from many of their core supporters. The White House would be well advised to focus on broadening the base of the tax code so that lower rates will not reduce the overall tax burden on corporations and wealthy individuals, who are already regarded as not paying their fair share. Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin endorsed this approach some time ago, and the president would be wise to listen to him.

## links

### L—social security

#### Social Security expansion merely expands tyranny

Siems 05 – Thomas F; senior economist and policy advisor at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas. Master's degree and PhD from Southern Methodist University; Fall 2005, "Social Security: Tyranny of the Status Quo," *Journal of Private Enterprise*; <http://journal.apee.org/index.php/Fall2005_9>; //billy

The status quo can be tyrannical when it focuses our thinking into known and familiar ways. Seeing only the absolute power of existing conditions, one is often led to dead-end solutions, producing no real change or way out of the current environment. In fact, it often takes a crisis to produce change, but the actions taken are typically drawn from those ideas that are lying around. So to break free from the tyranny of the status quo, good ideas are needed that are ready for implementation.

More than 40 years ago, Milton Friedman (1962, 182) wrote the following in Capitalism and Freedom: The 'social security' program is one of those things on which the tyranny of the status quo is beginning to work its magic. Despite the controversy that surrounded its inception, it has come to be so much taken for granted that its desirability is hardly questioned any longer. Yet it involves a large-scale invasion into the personal lives of a large fraction of the nation without, so far as I can see, any justification that is at all persuasive, not only on liberal principles, but on almost any other.

Friedman's remarks, made more than 25 years after Social Security's beginnings, still echo true. The current debate on Social Security reform, including proposals to allow for partial privatization, raise some fundamental questions about the proper role of government in administering social programs. Should government direct the collection of contributions and the financing and distribution of benefits for nearly all its citizens, regardless of their need for economic security in old age? Can one defend taxing the general population to subsidize the elderly? Should it be required that annuities be purchased only from the government? And why should the government compel individuals to use current income to purchase annuities to provide for their old age?

Milton Friedman addressed many of these questions in Capitalism and Freedom. As a result, several good ideas to break from Social Security's "tyranny" have been lying around for some time, and, in fact, a few have already been implemented in countries outside of the United States. This paper examines Friedman's thoughts on Social Security reform and why ideas on real change may finally be addressed.

In a sense, today's Social Security system is the antithesis of capitalism and freedom. While the United States has progressed rather nicely—its citizens are better fed, better clothed, better educated, better housed, better transported, better leisured, better etc.—the government has not, for the most part, been responsible for these improvements. To the contrary, the government has likely hindered the progress of individuals cooperating in our free market economy. And, as far as Social Security is concerned, less government involvement and more individual responsibility in planning for one's own old age appears to be the best way to get out of the current quagmire.

But Social Security reform will not happen until we understand why people seem to like the current program. Have they begun to take it for granted? Do they need to be educated about why the current program is unsustainable in the long run and that the usual justifications for the program are not at all persuasive? Or, far worse, do they reject the basic tenets outlined in Capitalism and Freedom?

### L—basic income

#### basic income is MAD EXPENSIVE and would INCREASE TAXES

Doar ’18 (Robert Doar, Morgridge fellow in poverty studies at the American Enterprise Institute.), “Universal Basic Income Would Undermine the Success of Our Safety Net,” Spring 2018, *George W. Bush Institute*, <https://www.bushcenter.org/catalyst/are-we-ready/doar-universal-basic-income#:~:text=Universal%20Basic%20Income%20would%20transfer,national%20debt%20(or%20both)>. //ike

The American safety net is not perfect – not by a long shot – but it does a good job of ensuring that low-income Americans have enough support to meet their basic needs. The data are clear about that: Consumption poverty, which measures the wellbeing of the poor after accounting for safety net assistance provided by the government, declined to an all-time low of 3 percent in 2016. Thanks to a good economy and strong public assistance programs, very few Americans live in deprivation. Universal Basic Income (UBI) would be an unaffordable way to undermine our social safety net’s successes. UBI would transfer money away from those who need it most, change the distinctly American relationship between citizen and government, and sharply raise taxes or the national debt (or both). And critically, it would fail to improve upon our current safety net’s biggest weakness: UBI would destroy – not improve – incentives to work. Universal Basic Income would transfer money away from those who need it most, change the distinctly American relationship between citizen and government, and sharply raise taxes or the national debt (or both). The first problem is the money. A truly universal payment of $10,000 to every citizen every year adds up to a new expense of about $3 trillion, well more than we spend on our social safety net now, and close to the entirety of the tax revenue currently collected by the federal government. If any element of the current safety net is going to be preserved, taxes will have to be raised dramatically, beyond what is politically plausible or economically desirable, or the U.S. would have to borrow even more money than we already do. Proponents of UBI should have to answer: what social programs will be cut to make room for their proposal? Some of the money needed to pay for UBI would have to come from the middle- and lower-middle classes, either in reduced benefits or increased taxes, and they would then see some of their money transferred up to wealthier recipients of UBI. Money that would have been spent on programs for people in the lowest income quintiles would now be distributed universally, including to the uppermost income quintiles. This does not sound much like an anti-poverty program.

### L—job guarantee

#### a job guarantee would necessitate taxation.

Quiggen ’20 (John Quiggen, Economist @ the University of Queensland, Australia.), “Why a Job Guarantee will require higher taxation,” 8-1-20, *Crooked Timber*, https://crookedtimber.org/2020/08/01/why-a-job-guarantee-will-require-higher-taxation //ike

This reframing raises the question: does a Job Guarantee require higher taxation? The answer, using MMT reasoning, is “**Almost certainly, yes**”. Suppose the economy initially has two groups of workers, employed and unemployed. Employed workers produce some quantity of marketed goods and services, as well as freely provided public services. They receive a wage, while unemployed workers get a (low) benefit. As well as workers, there are people receiving profits, interest and so on. Now we introduce a Job Guarantee in which all unemployed workers are hired, at the minimum wage or more, to produce public services (say, extra contact tracing for pandemics), that would otherwise not be provided. The newly employed workers spend their wages (over and above previous benefits) on marketed goods and services. But where are these goods and services to come from? It can only be from reducing the consumption of those who are already receiving wages or other market incomes. **Shifting the consumption to public use is the job of taxation** (alternatively, the government could cut existing services, freeing the workers there to produce market goods and services, but I won’t explore this).

### **L—progressive taxation**

#### **the plan’s progressive taxation is STATE SANCTIONED ROBBERY – disproportionate taxation is *AN ATTACK ON FREEDOM!***

Meredith ’21 (Dave Meredith, BA in polisci from John Carroll University & staff writer at *The Carroll News*.), “Progressive Taxes Are Theft,” 2-24-21, *The Carroll News*, https://carrollnews.org/61716/opinion/progressive-taxes-are-theft //ike

Over the years, I have concluded that some people simply refuse to fully comprehend the reality of governmental taxation and spending. These individuals don’t seem to realize that **the government is spending our money**. This may sound silly because on its face, these concepts are exceptionally basic. With that said, the advocacy of fiscal policies espoused by some of these individuals are illogical. One such policy is the progressive tax. **The obvious immorality of the progressive tax** system (which is an increase in the tax rate as taxable income increases) **should be the enemy of anyone in search of legitimate freedom**. Progressive taxes essentially seek to redistribute the wealth from one group of people to another. Politicians advocating for increased taxes on higher earners are saying, “Vote for me, and I will use the levers of power to take their money and give it to you!” Over time, **the government has grown exponentially larger and continues to infringe upon our fundamental liberties.** As a society, **we have allowed** this enlarged **government to legalize theft right before our eyes**. When Congress confiscates the dollar of one person to reallocate it to another, nobody raises an eyebrow. If a private citizen carried out this action, we would deem them **guilty of theft**. Earnings are personal property, just like a house or car. You are in no way entitled to the money of others, and **any argument in defense of such a claim is an overt fallacy**. An attack on the personal property of others **is an attack on freedom**. Freedom can hardly be exercised when property is being disproportionately confiscated based on income levels.

### L—deficit spending

#### **the plan’s deficit spending is FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT TYRANNY and leads to MORE TAXATION!**

CRFB ’22 (Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, a non-profit public policy organization focused on fiscal policy.), “Risks and Threats From Deficit and Debt,” 6-14-22, *the Committee for a Responsifble Federal Budget*, <https://www.crfb.org/papers/risks-and-threats-deficits-and-debt> //ike

After two decades of uninterrupted borrowing – including three years in which deficits surpassed 10 percent of the economy – the U.S. national debt is higher as a share of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) than at any time since World War II and is on course to breach that record. Yet policymakers have done little to contain our $24 trillion national debt, and most legislation has added to it in recent years. Additionally, there have been numerous claims that “debt doesn’t matter” and the United States should borrow even more than the $16 trillion it is projected to borrow over the coming decade. These claims are problematic and concerning. This does not mean there is no proper time to borrow. In fact, deficit spending helped to prevent an economic catastrophe and support the country through a pandemic in the recent COVID-19 crisis. However, even this justified borrowing comes with some consequence, and much of the recent borrowing before and since the COVID crisis was enacted for political rather than purely economic justification. **Excessively high debt levels are damaging** for many reasons. High debt levels: **Threaten economic vitality**: The recent surge in deficit spending has contributed to rapid near-term inflation and over time will result in higher interest rates, slower economic and income growth, and a small but increased risk of fiscal crisis. Place a strain on the budget: The federal government currently spends as much on interest payments as it does on most of our safety net programs combined, and interest is projected to become the largest government expenditure within the next 30 years. As interest and mandatory spending dominate a greater share of the budget, our government’s ability to invest in new priorities will be limited. **Create geopolitical challenges and risks**: With large portions of our debt held by foreign investors, a substantial share of our national income goes abroad. We are consequentially left with fewer financial tools to manage conflicts with other countries when they have increased leverage over our economy. Make responding to new emergencies more challenging: High deficits and debt – particularly if coupled with high inflation or interest rates – make it harder to borrow in response to a recession, pandemic, war, or other legitimate emergency. Are unfair to younger and future generations: The federal budget already favors consumption on seniors over investment in children. Failing to address rising debt also leaves future generations with an additional fiscal and economic burden. Given these very real threats and risks, **policymakers** should **pursue the appropriate tax** and spending adjustments to bring the fiscal situation under control. The Economic Consequences of Deficits and Debt High and rising debt creates near-term and long-term economic consequences, some of which are playing out in real time through high inflation. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic and economic crisis, policymakers injected more than $5 trillion of fiscal support into the economy. Deficits ballooned from just under $1 trillion in 2019 to an average of $3 trillion per year over the subsequent two years. Much of this borrowing was important for supporting households, securing balance sheets, limiting the depth of the recession, and supporting the economic recovery. However, the total magnitude of fiscal support – particularly support enacted in 2021 – greatly exceeded the needs or capacity of the economy.1 The resulting excess demand has contributed to inflation. The Federal Reserve normally aims for 2 percent inflation as measured by the Personal Consumption Expenditure (PCE) index, the equivalent of roughly 2.3 percent in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Over the past year, the PCE index has risen by 6.3 percent; economists have attributed 2 to 4 percentage points of this rate to the $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan alone.2 CPI inflation has totaled 8.6 percent, the highest in four decades. In response to rising inflation, the Federal Reserve has begun aggressively raising the federal funds interest rate, which reverberates throughout the economy. Similarly, investors generally respond to higher levels of debt issuance by demanding higher rates on Treasury bonds. Box 1: Modern Monetary Theory and the National Debt Over the past few years, Modern Monetary Theory (MMT) – a fringe economic theory that argues the government can, should, and effectively does print money to finance deficits – has gained growing prominence. The basic idea behind MMT is that fiscal policy, rather than monetary policy, should manage the macroeconomy and that there is no reason to worry about debt sustainability. Instead, the theory states, deficit spending should continue until the point that the economy is at capacity and substantial inflation emerges. While MMT is appealing as a political excuse to brush aside the tradeoffs involved in budgeting, it makes little sense either in theory or in practice.3 On the theoretical side, MMT rightly recognizes that economies that borrow and print in their own currency can never be forced into default, but it misunderstands the relationship between borrowing, interest rates, demand, investment, and economic growth. For example, some MMT advocates have theorized that higher interest rates could boost demand for goods and services rather than crowd out investment.4 On the practical side, **MMT implicitly relies on Congress and the President to substantially raise taxes** or cut spending – without help from the Federal Reserve – in order to fight bouts of inflation. There is little evidence of willingness to enact large abrupt tax increases or spending cuts in periods of high inflation.5 In fact, advocates of MMT have offered virtually no fiscal solutions to recent inflation, and in many cases, they have suggested further fiscal expansions.6 MMT has widely been panned by economists on the left and right, ranging from Paul Krugman to John Cochrane.7 Its proponents often articulate a contradictory framework that doesn’t withstand even the most basic scrutiny.8 While MMT does help explain some basic insights about the constraints of an economy’s productive capacity and the technical ability of a government to borrow, it is of little use in understanding how to analyze or manage an economy or government budget.

## impact

### !

#### **all taxation is GOVERNMENT COERCION – its ontological evilness scales LINEARLY!**

Birie ’2k (Madsen Birie, Co-founder & President of the Adam Smith Institute.), “All taxes are immoral,” 3-16-00, *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2000/mar/17/comment> //ike

Herein lies **the immorality of taxation.** **Taxation means compulsion**. Our habit of clothing it in fine words often conceals the brute fact that **taxation is the confiscation of our property** by people who prefer to spend it on their priorities rather than ours. **Higher taxation means more compulsion**. It forces further retreat by individuals from the area of their lives in which they can make decisions and assume responsibilities. At the heart of the debate is the question of whether people are to live by their own values as adult citizens, or made to live according to the values of their government. Hague has opted for the former, and holds out the prospect of a more equal relationship in which citizens meet the government eye to eye and freely contract with it to discharge their obligations. The United States has just seen its annual list of the top 100 lifetime benefactors. In the number one slot is George Soros, who has given away $2.65bn. The list includes Bill and Melinda Gates, rapidly making their way up its ranks, and even the actor Paul Newman, whose supermarket sauces pay every penny to charity. The US can be generous with its private charity because government leaves space for its citizens to do so. It takes 28% of their income each year, as against the 40% which our own treasury takes. Further, US tax laws allow full deduction for charitable gifts. This helps to explain why we give £7 a month, versus the equivalent of £17 given by Americans. It is not just charity which is crowded out by the state. Whenever it undertakes a responsibility, it **denies us the chance to assume it**. If people are less inclined to care for their elderly relatives than before, it is because the state has convinced them that it is its job, not theirs. If people do not save enough to meet their future needs, it is because the state has spent decades telling them that it will take care of them instead. **Wherever government has advanced, individual responsibility has retreated**. Now Hague is telling us it can be rolled back for moral reasons, to create a space in which people can grow. His guarantees are spot on. By pledging that the overall tax burden will diminish, he tells us that we will undertake responsibility for a larger part of our lives. We will have the resources to make better provision for our relatives and for own own future. We will have the means to contribute to charitable causes, and to support those less fortunate than ourselves. **By pledging an end to** stealth **taxes, he is telling us** that **he intends to take away** some of **the cynicism and dishonesty which discredit government**. If we are to pay taxes, he says, let them be open and understood and accepted. Gordon Brown has made it his style to rack up taxes by keeping them concealed and keeping taxpayers confused. William Hague plans to expose taxation, probably in the belief that if people know what they are paying, they will be less tolerant of the high tax culture, and the arrogant assumption that it will plan and organise our lives better than we can do it ourselves.

### !—short

#### ALL TAXATION IS IMMORAL – THEY TRANSFORM US INTO COGS IN THE MACHINE OF GOVERNMENT TYRANNY.

Booth ’16 (Phillip Booth, Senior Academic Fellow @ the Institute of Economic Affairs.), “Morality, taxation, and coercion,” 15-6-16, *Institute of Economic Affairs*, <https://iea.org.uk/blog/morality-taxation-and-coercion> //ike

In many practical ways, **our tax system is morally problematic. It discriminates against family formation** – with results that we see very clearly and, of course, it **discourages work**. A tax system that undermines family and work cannot be thought of as moral. And, of course, when the state is spending nearly half of national income, there can be no general agreement about the morality of the things on which it spends money. In spending over 46 per cent of national income, the state finances all sorts of other things with my money that I think are morally wrong – and probably different things that you think are morally wrong. A tax system in a nation of 65 million people, mediated by a huge bureaucracy controlled by a government called to account in elections every five years, cannot possibly replicate the true personal human compassion and philanthropy that is necessary if we are to provide the poor with genuine help. **The individual**, in this context, **becomes a small cog in a giant wheel** whose right of initiative has, in large part, been taken away and who has been encouraged to delegate his genuine societal responsibilities to those in need to the state. As Pope Benedict has said: solidarity is the responsibility of everyone to everyone and it cannot be delegated to the state.

### !—long(er)

#### FREEDOM is an *ESSENTIAL AMERICAN VALUE* and government intervention is ONTOLOGICALLY EVIL.

Cole ’19 (Tom Cole, U.S. representative for Okhlahoma’s 4th district.), “Freedom is the American Dream,” 5-23-19, <https://cole.house.gov/media-center/weekly-columns/freedom-is-american-dream#:~:text=Ever%20since%20our%20brave%20forebearers,where%20you've%20come%20from> //ike

Ever since our brave forebearers declared America's independence, **the United States has been a beacon of liberty, hope and opportunity**. Indeed, America is still regarded the world over as a land where success can be achieved regardless of where you've come from. And that is because our forebearers trusted free people, free speech and free markets – all of which continue to undergird the "American dream." The American dream never fails to inspire old and young alike, and I believe **its promise will continue to motivate future generations to work hard and innovate**. Because our country has always valued hard work, we seek to achieve and often succeed because opportunity exists here. But it's important to recognize that free markets are fundamental to American opportunity and prosperity. How do free markets contribute to the American dream? The answer rests in the philosophy of freedom so foundational to our nation. Free markets allow consumers and producers to freely participate in mutually beneficial transactions, empowering entrepreneurs and innovators to create the future. While opponents of free markets often criticize corporations for dominating an industry, their proposed solution is typically socialization – which would by definition grant the government an unfettered monopoly in regulation of an industry. The result of such regulation would hold back job creators, including small business owners and would-be entrepreneurs. Unelected bureaucrats should not pick winners and losers in the market. I trust the American people to do that on their own. **Where there is more government regulation, there is always less opportunity to innovate** and allow the market for products and services to follow its natural trend. To illustrate, think back on rental stores like Blockbuster or Hollywood Video. If the government had socialized the movie rental business in the 1990s, Americans would still be driving to the store hoping to borrow the one movie they wanted to watch. However, thanks to free markets, we get to enjoy the benefits of innovation, which in the case of video entertainment has led to popular rental services like Redbox and video streaming services like Netflix and Hulu. Similar examples could be drawn about cell phones, cars, household appliances and just about every other industry.

# toolbox

## framework

### fw—top level

#### interp: the judge should evaluate the debate like a taxpayer.

#### prefer it –

#### a---real world – debate is training for the real world. there is no distinction between “in here” and “out there” – the judge can’t sever their duties as a taxpayer.

Polson 12 [2012, Dana Roe Polson is a Co-Director, teacher, and founder of ConneXions Community Leadership Academy, ““Longing for Theory:” Performance Debate in Action”, <http://gradworks.umi.com/3516242.pdf>] GABE KOO CUT THIS CARD --ike

#### I think that the talented tenth is actually the wrong metaphor for leadership in the performance debate community. Du Bois, later in his life, sharply criticized and disavowed a reliance on the black elite to lead, believing that they were more preoccupied with individual gain than with group struggle, and willing to work within current structures rather than calling for radical change. They were becoming Americanized, Du Bois believed, and deradicalized. This deradicalization “occurs when more privileged African Americans (re) align themselves to function as a middle class interested in individual group gain rather than race leadership for mass development” (James, 1997, p. 24). Instead of his youthful belief in the black elite, “Gradually, black working-class activists surpassed elites in Du Bois’s estimation of political integrity and progressive agency. He democratized his concept of race leaders through the inclusion of the radicalism of nonelites” (James, 1997, p. 21). **The young people who have emerged**, as leaders in the performance debate community were definitely not those Du Bois would have identified as the Talent Tenth in 1903. Du Bois was talking to and about the Black elite, the educated middle class. Earlier in Du Bois’s life, he assumed that those people, college educated, were the natural leaders. My participants who might be seen as potential leaders do not come from such backgrounds. Many **do end up going to college and becoming potential leaders**, but they are privileged through this process rather than prior to it. In addition, their focus is most definitely political as opposed to cultural. Nowhere in my research did I hear a Bill Cosby-esque injunction for black people to shape up and work harder. Instead, the critique is focused on “uplift as group struggle” for continued liberation. Finally, these young leaders are most definitely radicalized as opposed to interested in incremental change that rocks no boats. From CRT and **their open critiques of white supremacy** to their willingness **to call for change openly in debate round**, these young leaders are contentious and bold. Two of my participants, and many of their former debate peers, are involved with a **Baltimore group called Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle** (LBS). The website of the LBS established their identity: We are a dedicated group of Baltimore citizens who want to change the city **through governmental policy action.** Our purpose is to provide tangible, concrete solutions to Baltimore’s problems and to analyze the ways that external forces have contributed to the overall decline of our city. (“Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle”, n.d.) As we see in this statement of identity, then, LBS as one model of leadership is focused on the political and on an analysis of external influences; this focus is very different from a racial uplift position, and their model of leadership very different from the Talented Tenth. LBS has developed platforms regarding jobs, education, incarceration, and many other issues facing Black people in the city. They hold monthly forums for discussion of these topics, inviting guests and discussing the topics themselves. Further, one of the LBS members ran for City Council this year. He lost, but plans to run again. **The training my participants discuss, therefore, is not in the abstract: it is training for the real world,** for their own empowerment and that of their communities. This work is extending into local high schools, as well, and Paul Robeson High School now has students involved in LBS. They attend events and meetings not only to help out but as a form of leadership training

#### b---subjectivity – it’s unethical to defend immoral positions.

Rivera-Lopez ’15 (Eduardo Rivera-Lopez, PhD in philosophy from Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz.), “Is it Morally Wrong to Defend Unjust Causes as a Lawyer?” May 2015, *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, Vol. 32, No. 2, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26813435> //ike

6. Why should not lawyers have the right and the moral permission to accept immoral causes? Why is it wrong to accept? In order to answer these questions we must first answer the same question posed before with respect to the client: what are the moral reasons that vie in favour of and against accepting. These reasons are certainly prima facie, i.e. defeasible in particular cases. As we shall see, we can always find situations in which these reasons are superseded by others. However, in most cases, there seems to be no moral reason to accept such cases. Instead, there are strong reasons against accepting. The **fundamental reason not to accept representation** for a client **with an immoral purpose is obvious: it is morally wrong to help someone do something wrong**. As we have seen, the client has a right to pursue such a purpose in spite of not having moral permission to do so. If the client’s actions are wrong, contributing specifically, and in full awareness, to the performance of such actions must also be (prima facie) wrong. It must be remembered here that considerations related to the adversarial system or the right of defence are no longer relevant. These considerations are sufficient to support a right to accept, but they do not give a reason. 18 Neither do these considerations override moral reasons against accepting. Suppose I have the right to enter into any (legally permitted) association or club, but I have a moral reason not to enter association P (for instance, P is a racist club). Having a right to become a member of P does not override or diminish my reason against doing so.19 Similarly, having a right to accept a client with a wrong purpose does not affect the moral reason I have for not accepting this client. There are additional reasons against accepting representation for immoral causes. First, the **resources devoted to representing an unjust cause might be assigned to** other, **valuable** (or at least not unjust) **ones**. This is particularly important in countries where legal resources are far from being justly distributed. Second, **in many cases, the representation of an unjust cause** typically **contributes to the success of other** unjust or **immoral causes**, especially when the case is institutionally relevant (appeals to the Supreme Court, cases of public interest, etc.).

## impact

### !—framing – deontology

#### evaluate through deontology – theft is always immoral no matter the consequences so vote neg.

Alexander ’07 (Lawrence Alexander, professor of law @ UC San Diego, co-executive director @ the Institute for Law & Religion.), “Deontological Ethics,” 11-21-07, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-deontological/#AdvDeoThe //ike>

Having now briefly taken a look at deontologists’ foil, consequentialist theories of right action, we turn now to examine deontological theories. In contrast to consequentialist theories, deontological theories judge the morality of choices by criteria different from the states of affairs those choices bring about. The most familiar forms of deontology, and also the forms presenting the greatest contrast to consequentialism, hold that some **choices cannot be justified by their effects**—that no matter how morally good their consequences, some choices are morally forbidden. On such familiar deontological accounts of morality, agents cannot make certain wrongful choices even if by doing so the number of those exact kinds of wrongful choices will be minimized (because other agents will be prevented from engaging in similar wrongful choices). For such deontologists, what makes a choice right is its conformity with a moral norm. Such norms are to be simply obeyed by each moral agent; such norm-keepings are not to be maximized by each agent. In this sense, for such deontologists, the Right is said to have priority over the Good. If an act is not in accord with the Right, it may not be undertaken, no matter the Good that it might produce (including even a Good consisting of acts in accordance with the Right).

#### it’s better than util – simpler, more moral, and accountability.

Alexander ’07 (Lawrence Alexander, professor of law @ UC San Diego, co-executive director @ the Institute for Law & Religion.), “Deontological Ethics,” 11-21-07, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-deontological/#AdvDeoThe //ike

The Advantages of Deontological Theories Having canvassed the two main types of deontological theories (together with a contractualist variation of each), it is time to assess deontological morality more generally. On the one hand, deontological morality, in contrast to consequentialism, leaves space for agents to give special concern to their families, friends, and projects. At least that is so if the deontological morality contains no strong duty of general beneficence, or, if it does, it places a cap on that duty’s demands. **Deontological morality**, therefore, **avoids the overly demanding and alienating aspects of consequentialism** and accords more with conventional notions of our moral duties. Likewise, deontological moralities, unlike most views of consequentialism, leave space for the supererogatory. **A deontologist can do more that is morally praiseworthy** than morality demands. A consequentialist cannot, assuming none of the consequentialists’ defensive maneuvers earlier referenced work. For such a pure or simple consequentialist, if one’s act is not morally demanded, it is morally wrong and forbidden. Whereas for the deontologist, there are acts that are neither morally wrong nor demanded, some—but only some—of which are morally praiseworthy. As we have seen, deontological theories all possess the strong advantage of **being able to account for strong, widely shared moral intuitions** about our duties better than can consequentialism. The contrasting reactions to Trolley, Fat Man, Transplant, and other examples earlier given, are illustrative of this. Finally, deontological theories, unlike consequentialist ones, have the potential for explaining why certain people have moral standing to complain about and **hold to account those who breach moral duties**. For the moral duties typically thought to be deontological in character—unlike, say, duties regarding the environment—are duties to particular people, not duties to bring about states of affairs that no particular person has an individual right to have realized.

### !—framing – at: util – occam’s razor

#### occams’s razor DA to util – the simpler thing is always right so obviously util is wrong

Duignan ‘ND (Brian Duignan, editor @ Britannica.), “Occam’s Razor” 1996, *Britannica*, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Occams-razor //ike

Occam’s razor, also spelled Ockham’s razor, also called law of economy or law of parsimony, principle stated by the Scholastic philosopher William of Ockham (1285–1347/49) that pluralitas non est ponenda sine necessitate, “plurality should not be posited without necessity.” The principle gives precedence to simplicity: **of two competing theories, the simpler explanation** of an entity **is to be preferred**. The principle is also expressed as “Entities are not to be multiplied beyond necessity.”

### !—at: extinction

#### 1---dont care

Alexander ’07 (Lawrence Alexander, professor of law @ UC San Diego, co-executive director @ the Institute for Law & Religion.), “Deontological Ethics,” 11-21-07, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-deontological/#AdvDeoThe //ike>

\*\*[~~edited~~] for gendered language

This first response to “moral catastrophes,” which is to ignore them, might be further justified by denying that moral catastrophes, such as a million deaths, are really a million times more catastrophic than one death. This is the so-called “**aggregation” problem**, which we alluded to in section 2.2 in discussing the paradox of deontological constraints. John Taurek famously argued that **it is a mistake to assume harms to two persons are twice as bad as** a comparable harm to **one person**. For each of the two suffers only ~~his~~ [their] own harm and not the harm of the other (Taurek 1977). Taurek’s argument can be employed to deny the existence of moral catastrophes and thus the worry about them that deontologists would otherwise have. Robert Nozick also stresses the separateness of persons and therefore urges that there is no entity that suffers double the harm when each of two persons is harmed (Nozick 1974). (Of course, Nozick, perhaps inconsistently, also acknowledges the existence of moral catastrophes.) **Most deontologists** reject Taurek’s radical conclusion that we need not be morally more obligated to avert harm to the many than to avert harm to the few; but they do **accept the notion** that **harms should not be aggregated**. Deontologists’ approaches to the nonaggregation problem when the choice is between saving the many and saving the few are: (1) save the many so as to acknowledge the importance of each of the extra persons; (2) conduct a weighted coin flip; (3) flip a coin; or (4) save anyone you want (a denial of moral catastrophes) (Broome 1998; Doggett 2013; Doucet 2013; Dougherty 2013; Halstead 2016: Henning 2015; Hirose 2007, 2015; Hsieh et al. 2006; Huseby 2011; Kamm 1993; Rasmussen 2012; Saunders 2009; Scanlon 2003; Suikkanen 2004; Timmerman 2004; Wasserman and Strudler 2003).

#### 2---freedom outweighs

Patterson ’19 (ORLANDO PATTERSON, like the SOCIAL DEATH AUTHOR guy [Harvard University Sociology Department].), “Stability and change in americans’ perception of freedom,” Summer 2019, *Contexts Magazine*, https://contexts.org/articles/stability-and-change-in-americans-perception-of-freedom //ike

**Freedom is** one of **America’s most cherished value**s. The cognitive scientist George Lakoff considers it **the nation’s “most important idea**… at the center of all other important ideas.” Likewise, in his studies of American values in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the social psychologist Milton Rokeach found that **freedom was by far America’s most important political value**, ranked behind only world peace and familial security in the nation’s hierarchy of values. Behind this commonplace agreement on the centrality of freedom in American life, however, lurk three fundamental questions.

**3---tyranny turns their impact.**

Pirkowski ’17 (Matthew Pirkowski, tech bro, BA in psychology from Yale.), “Emergent Tyranny: The Seed of Human Suffering Within Us All,” 10-23-17, <https://medium.com/swlh/emergent-tyranny-the-seed-of-human-suffering-within-us-all-72583cfd6bb1> //ike

**Humanity’s capacity for tyranny**, and its tendency to emerge —**bringing with it a devouring and insatiable appetite for suffering** — **appears universal throughout human societies and across time**. Yet the more I try to isolate its origins and understand its psychological contours, the more I’ve come to see this demonic element of our species as **inextricably entwined with elements of humanity** — typically portrayed positively — like love, compassion, and safety. Tyranny isn’t devoid of such ideals; it’s a strategy for pursuing them in the face of uncertainty. In fact it may represent humanity’s oldest strategy for doing so. Yet it’s an incomplete strategy, and one accompanied by a host of undesirable — **often murderous** — side-effects. So how do we avoid it? It’s my belief that by understanding and controlling the emergence of tyranny within ourselves, we build a world absent the fertile soil in which tyranny’s “evil spirits” plant their strangling vines at larger scales. To that end, I’d like to address the following questions: What forces precipitate the psychological roots of tyranny? Why does tyrannical behavior emerge at increasing scales of human behavior? How can one combat these self — and world — destroying tendencies? To understand and act upon the following is to take responsibility for one’s own life and to spare the lives of those one might otherwise tyrannize; it’s to fully own one’s personal responsibility for tyranny’s emergence, and to play one’s part in freeing our world from its clutches. The Psychological Roots of Tyranny For our purposes, let’s define tyranny as: “The cruel, unreasonable, or arbitrary use of power or control.” From where does this tendency emerge? It’s easy to imagine those who exercise such methods of power or control as a breed apart from the rest; unlike us, they are heartless monsters out to impose their tyrannical will upon the innocent. But of course that’s a caricature. It’s a caricature we create — as a shield — to protect ourselves from the nagging suspicion that the **tendency toward tyranny lurks deep within our own soul**. But unfortunately for all, lurk it does. Given the often disastrous repercussions of exercising such a tendency, why would it exist within us all? The theory I find most compelling, explored at length in Dr. Jordan Peterson’s seminal work Maps of Meaning, posits that the capacity for tyranny resides within us as a strategy for preventing the intrusion of uncertainty into our otherwise stable psychological environment. In other words, tyranny is a psychological shield we use to protect ourselves from unwanted exposure to negative emotional states, a tool for preempting painful change and justifying the use of outdated models of the world. Or as Peterson puts it:

human tyranny is evil

Ahkin 10 [Mélanie, Monash University, “Human Centrism, Animist Materialism, and the Critique of Rationalism in Val. Plumwood’s Critical Ecological Feminism,” Emergent Australasian Philosophers, 2010, Issue 3, <http://www.eap.philosophy-australia.com/issue_3/EAP3_AHKIN_Human_Centrism.pdf>]

These five features provide the basis for hegemonic centrism insofar as they promote certain conceptual and perceptual distortions of reality which universalise and naturalise the standpoint of the superior relata as primary or centre, and deny and subordinate the standpoints of inferiorised others as secondary or derivative. Using standpoint theory analysis, Plumwood’s reconceptualisation of human chauvinist frameworks locates and dissects these logical characteristics of dualism, and the conceptual and perceptual distortions of reality common to centric structures, as follows. Radical exclusion is found in the rationalist emphasis on differences between humans and non-human nature, its valourisation of a human rationality conceived as exclusionary of nature, and its minimisation of similarities between the two realms. Homogenisation and stereotyping occur especially in the rationalist denial of consciousness to nature, and its denial of the diversity of mental characteristics found within its many different constituents, facilitating a perception of nature as homogeneous and of its members as interchangeable and replaceable resources. This definition of nature in terms of its lack of human rationality and consciousness means that its identity remains relative to that of the dominant human group, and its difference is marked as deficiency, permitting its inferiorisation. Backgrounding and denial may be observed in the conception of nature as extraneous and inessential background to the foreground of human culture, in the human denial of dependency on the natural environment, and denial of the ethical and political constraints which the unrecognised ends and needs of non-human nature might otherwise place on human behaviour. These features together create an ethical discontinuity between humans and non-human nature which denies nature’s value and agency, and thereby promote its instrumentalisation and exploitation for the benefit of humans.11 This dualistic logic helps to universalise the human centric standpoint, making invisible and seemingly inevitable the conceptual and perceptual distortions of reality and oppression of non-human nature it enjoins. The alternative standpoints and perspectives of members of the inferiorised class of nature are denied legitimacy and subordinated to that of the class of humans, ultimately becoming invisible once this master standpoint becomes part of the very structure of thought.12 Such an anthropocentric framework creates a variety of serious injustices and prudential risks, making it highly ecologically irrational.13 The hierarchical value prescriptions and epistemic distortions responsible for its biased, reductive conceptualisation of nature strips the non-human natural realm of non- instrumental value, and impedes the fair and impartial treatment of its members. Similarly, anthropocentrism creates distributive injustices by restricting ethical concern to humans, admitting partisan distributive relationships with non-human nature in the forms of commodification and instrumentalisation. The prudential risks and blindspots created by anthropocentrism are problematic for nature and humans alike and are of especial concern within our current context of radical human dependence on an irreplaceable and increasingly degraded natural environment. These prudential risks are in large part consequences of the centric structure's promotion of illusory human disembeddedness, self-enclosure and insensitivity to the significance and survival needs of non-human nature: Within the context of human-nature relationships, such a logic must inevitably lead to failure, either through the catastrophic extinction of our natural environment and the consequent collapse of our species, or more hopefully by the abandonment and transformation of the human centric framework.15 Whilst acknowledging the importance of prudential concerns for the motivation of practical change, Plumwood emphasises the weightier task of acknowledging injustices to non-humans in order to bring about adequate dispositional change. The model of enlightened self-interest implicit in prudentially motivated action is inadequate to this task insofar as it remains within the framework of human centrism. Although it acknowledges the possibility of relational interests, it rests on a fundamental equivocation between instrumental and relational forms of concern for others. Indeed it motivates action either by appeal to humans' ultimate self-interest, thus failing to truly acknowledge injustices caused to non-human others, remaining caught within the prudentially risky framework of anthropocentrism, or else it accepts that others' interests count as reasons for action- enabling recognition of injustices- but it does so in a manner which treats the intersection of others' needs with more fully-considered human interests as contingent and transient. Given this analysis, it is clear that environmental concern must be based on a deeper recognition of injustice, in addition to that of prudence, if it is to overcome illusions of human disembeddedness and self-enclosure and have a genuine and lasting effect

vote neg to reject tyranny and oppression.

Paul '16 (Paul Watson, environmental activist, founder of the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society.), "Human Lives Are Not More Important Than Animal Lives," 5-08-16, *The Outdoor Journal*, outdoorjournal.com/slider/human-lives-are-not-more-important-than-animal-lives/ //ike

\*\*[~~edited~~] for offensive language

Is a human life worth more than a gorilla, a whale or any other species? I’m going to tread on some very sensitive toes with this commentary but I think it needs to be said. My perspective is biocentric, whereas most of humanity looks on reality from an anthropocentric point of view. I do not expect the anthropocentric mind to understand my position. My position is that **a human life is not more important than the life of a gorilla or a whale**. This is is going to make some people angry as hell, but that does not concern me. What concerns me is the reality of our relationship with the natural world. Columnist Dave Bry recently wrote in The Guardian: As much as I love animals – and I love them very much – the idea that the life of a cat or a dog or a lion or a gorilla is as important as the life of a human is a terrible one, a wrong one, an insulting one. [There] are powerful, important things about being a human being … Yes, I would save the life of Ted Kaczynski, Idi Amin or Donald Trump over any animal you could name. (Yes, even my beloved childhood pets: the cats Love and Honey, the dog, Yvette. Sorry, guys, RIP.) Personally **I think this statement** by Bry **is asinine**, insensitive and absurd. Idi Amin was a mass murderer. His life was not worth the life of a mosquito and if someone had shot the ~~bastard~~ [unpatriotic individual], thousands of people’s lives would have been spared not to mention the slaughter of African wildlife under his authority. Would Bry say the same about Hitler, and if not, why not, how is he any different than a mass murdering dictator like Idi Amin? So I think Brys’ position has not been thought out, and if it has, it is he who holds a terrible idea with a wrong position and insulting to every person who was slaughtered in WWII or in Africa under Amin. Bry is saying his cats and his dog are expendable but a vicious dictator is not, simply on the basis of being a member of the human species. The reality is that **some human lives are simply not worth more** than other humans and also not more important **than many animals**.

### !—at: murphy & nagel

#### murphy and nagel are big government shills that don’t believe in property rights – TAXES ARE THEFT

Gordon ’19 (David Gordon, Senior Fellow @ the Mises Institute & editor of the *Mises Review*,) “Yes, Taxation is Theft,” 11-15-19, *Mises Wire*, https://mises.org/wire/yes-taxation-theft //ike

Libertarians think that **taxation is theft**. The government takes away part of your income and property by force. Your payments aren’t voluntary. If you think they are, try to withhold payment and see what happens. An influential book by Liam Murphy and Thomas Nagel, The Myth of Ownership, tries to show that this view of taxation is wrong. Many people, they say, foolishly resent taxes. By what right does the government take away part of what we own? Isn’t this legalized theft? **The government may claim** that **it needs the funds to provide essential social services**: are the poor to be left to starve? But **these assertions do not justify its policy of forcible seizure**. Isn’t it up to each owner of property to decide what, if anything, he wishes to donate to charity and other good causes? You might guess that the authors will respond, along conventional leftist lines, with a denial that property rights are absolute: you do not have the right to keep all that you own, if the government’s exactions are devoted to a good purpose. Quite the contrary, they adopt a much more radical stance. You are not giving away anything at all to the government when you pay taxes, since you own only what the laws say you do. Our authors are nothing if not direct on this point: "If there is a dominant theme that runs through our discussion, it is this: Private property is a legal convention, defined in part by the tax system; therefore, the tax system cannot be evaluated by looking at its impact on private property, conceived as something that has independent existence and validity. Taxes must be evaluated as part of the overall system of property rights that they help to create. . . . The conventional nature of property rights is both perfectly obvious and remarkably easy to forget . . . We cannot start by taking as given . . . some initial allocation of possessions— what people own, what is theirs, prior to government interference." An example quickly discloses the authors’ fallacy. Suppose that the government banned advocacy of libertarian property rights. Against those who claimed that this interfered with free speech, advocates of the new measure replied in this way: "Don’t you see the obvious conceptual error that underlies your protest? ‘Free speech’ is a legal category. People have no independent liberty of speech, apart from what a particular legal system grants them. Your opposition is absurd: away with you!" I doubt that Murphy and Nagel would display much patience for this sophistry. Legal rights indeed depend on the specifications of a particular legal system; but it is perfectly in order to say that people have moral rights, not created by the legal system, that the law ought to respect. In like fashion, opponents of taxation are guiltless of the conceptual error Murphy and Nagel impute to them. They maintain that people possess property rights that the government ought to recognize. Why is the falsity of this view "perfectly obvious"? It is rather Murphy and Nagel who have lapsed into grievous error: they confuse legal with moral rights. The authors at one place acknowledge the point at issue: "[D]eontological theories hold that property rights are in part determined by our individual sovereignty over ourselves. . . . On a deontological approach, there is likely to be a presumption of some form of natural entitlement that determines what is yours or mine and what isn’t, and this prima facie presumption has to be overridden by other considerations if appropriation by taxes is to be justified. On a consequentialist approach, by contrast, the tax system is simply part of the design of any sophisticated modern system of property rights." Our authors of course reject the entitlement view, but they have here made a crucial admission. Given that this theory exists, is it not evident that their earlier account is false? **The** alleged **error that opponents of taxation commit is present only if the conventionalist theory is true**. Supporters of Lockean entitlements to property may be incorrect, but they at least have a theory: they stand acquitted of simply failing to grasp a conceptual point, the charge that Murphy and Nagel bring against them. Do they think the Lockean account obviously incoherent? They say nothing against it but instead go on interminably to accuse opponents of their view of confusion. The conventionalist theory they support leads quickly to disaster. Isn’t it "perfectly obvious" that it makes us all slaves of the government? Once more, Murphy and Nagel acknowledge the objection. Their view "is likely to arouse strong resistance" because it "sounds too much like the claim that the entire social product really belongs to the government, and that all after-tax income should be seen as a kind of dole that each of us receives from the government, if it chooses to look on us with favor" They fail to see that their admission gives away the game. If, as they admit, individual rights require some degree of private property, then the government cannot morally tax away this property. If so, there are moral limits to the taxing power, and it is not "a matter of logic" that there cannot be a pre-tax income over which persons retain full control Murphy and Nagel are pure conventionalists about property when this enables them to attack libertarians, but they shrink from the full implications of the position. How is this tension in their presentation to be resolved? I suspect that in practice **they would not deviate very far from the total subordination of property rights to the state**. They consider endowment taxation, in which people are taxed, not just on their income, but rather on their potential to generate revenue. Someone who abandoned a multi-million-dollar business career in order to become a Trappist monk might on the endowment account be taxed as if he continued to receive his former high income. Our authors eventually reject this monstrous proposal, though not on the grounds that it compels people to work. To reject the proposal because it compelled people to work would put them suspiciously close to a famous argument, advanced very effectively by Robert Nozick, that income taxes are akin to forced labor. Of course our authors cannot accept so libertarian a view; "we may assume that this argument is not dispositive against taxation of earnings." Since taxation is acceptable—this we know a priori—no argument that holds it illegitimate is right. But then we cannot reject endowment taxation if we reason in a way that would also condemn the income tax. "[T]here is no intrinsic moral objection to taxing people who don’t earn wages" (p. 124). We can, then, maintain that endowment taxation is "too radical" an interference with autonomy; but we cannot in principle reject it. If you affirm a “conventionalist” account of property, you will wind up in dark waters. **Taxation is indeed theft**.