

OBJECTIVISM

1NC – OBJ (/)	5
1NC (/)	6
1NC	7
1NC	8
2NC LINK – AMERICAN INDIANS	9
2NC LINK – AMERICAN INDIANS (HEALTHCARE)	10
2NC LINK – ANIMAL RIGHTS	11
2NC LINK – CHILDREN	12
2NC LINK – ENVIRONMENT	13
2NC LINK – ENVIRONMENT	14
2NC LINK – FARM AID	15
2NC LINK – FEDERALISM	16
2NC LINK – IMMIGRANTS	17
2NC LINK – KATRINA ASSISTANCE	18
2NC LINK – MARRIAGE PROMOTION	19
2NC LINK – SMOKING	20
2NC LINK – STATE ECONOMY	21
2NC LINK – TANF	22
2NC LINK – TAXATION	23
2NC LINK – TERRORISM	24
2NC LINK – A2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT	25
2NC LINK – A2 NO SPECIFIC LINK	26
2NC LINK – A2 SMALL INSTANCE	27
2NC LINK – A2 STATE SERVICES NOT COERCIVE	28
2NC IMPACT – VALUE TO LIFE	29
2NC IMPACT – NO SOLVENCY (GENERAL)	30
2NC IMPACT – NO SOLVENCY (WELFARE)	31
2NC IMPACT – NO SOLVENCY (HOMELESSNESS)	32
2NC IMPACT – A2 CASE OUTWEIGHS	33
2NC IMPACT – A2 DEMOCRACY	35

2NC IMPACT – A2 ENVIRONMENT	36
2NC IMPACT – A2 ENVIRONMENT	37
2NC IMPACT – A2 HEGEMONY.....	38
2NC IMPACT – A2 LIFE > VALUES	39
2NC IMPACT – A2 TIMEFRAME.....	40
2NC IMPACT – A2 SECURITY THREATS.....	41
2NC FRAMEWORK – A2 POLITICS GOOD/A2 PERM	42
2NC PERMUTATION – A2 DO BOTH	43
2NC PERMUTATION – A2 DO BOTH	44
2NC ETHICS – REJECTION KEY	45
2NC ETHICS – TURN THUMPERS	46
2NC ETHICS – A2 ALTRUISM GOOD	48
2NC IMPACT – A2 LITTLE IMPACTS OUTWEIGH.....	49
2NC ETHICS – A2 SERVICES KEY TO X.....	50
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 CONSUMERISM/MATERIALISM BAD.....	51
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 DOGMA/OBJ IS COLLECTIVIST.....	52
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 DON'T HELP THE POOR.....	53
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 DROPPED ARGUMENTS	54
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 ECON CRISIS = ALT FAILS	55
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 FEMINISM.....	56
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 FUTURE GENERATIONS.....	57
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 HETERONORMATIVE	58
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 OBJECTIVE TRUTH => NAZIS	59
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 NO RATIONAL SUBJECT.....	60
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 NO RATIONAL SUBJECT.....	61
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 NON UNIQUE.....	62
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 RACISM	63
2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 UTILITARIANISM	64
AFF	66
AFF—NO LINK TO TAXES.....	67
AFF—POSITIVE/NEGATIVE RIGHTS WRONG.....	68
AFF—COLLECTIVISM K TO RIGHTS.....	69

<u>AFF—FREE MARKET BAD FOR POVERTY.....</u>	<u>70</u>
<u>AFF—TAXES JUSTIFIED</u>	<u>71</u>
<u>AFF—PRIVATE SS FAIL.....</u>	<u>72</u>
<u>AFF—PERM EV</u>	<u>72</u>
<u>AFF—DOGMATIC.....</u>	<u>74</u>
<u>AFF—VALUE TO LIFE</u>	<u>75</u>
<u>AFF—OBJ = RACISM</u>	<u>76</u>
<u>AFF—ALT CAUSES DEHUMANIZATION.....</u>	<u>77</u>
<u>AFF—UTIL OUTWEIGHS</u>	<u>78</u>

1NC – OBJ (/)

**THE AFFIRMATIVE IS IMMORAL – GOVERNMENT WELFARE CREATES
DEPENDENCY AND IS PAID FOR IN STOLEN CAPITAL.****HAZLITT, 2007**

Henry, founding board member of the Mises Institute and Journalist for *The Wall Street Journal*, Can the State Reduce Poverty? <http://www.mises.org/story/2526>

From the beginning of history, sincere reformers as well as demagogues have sought to abolish or at least to alleviate poverty through state action. In most cases their proposed remedies have only served to make the **problem worse**. **The most frequent** and popular of these proposed **remedies has been the simple one of seizing from the rich to give to the poor**. This remedy has taken a thousand different forms, but they all come down to this. The wealth is to be "shared," to be "redistributed," to be "equalized." In fact, in the minds of many reformers it is not poverty that is the chief evil but inequality. **All schemes for redistributing** or equalizing incomes or wealth **must** undermine or destroy incentives at both ends of the economic scale. They must reduce or **abolish the incentives of the unskilled** or shiftless **to improve their condition by their own efforts**; and even the able and industrious will see little point in earning anything beyond what they are allowed to keep. These redistribution schemes must inevitably reduce the size of the pie to be redistributed. They can only level down. Their long-run effect must be to reduce production and lead toward national impoverishment.

1NC – OBJ (/)

THE AFFIRMATIVE BASES THEIR ACTION ON A FALSE ASSUMPTION OF OMNIPOTENCE THAT BELIEVES, THROUGH A CENTRALIZED KNOWLEDGE STRUCTURE, IT IS POSSIBLE TO KNOW AND MEASURE THE STATE OF SATISFACTION ATTAINED BY VARIOUS INDIVIDUALS. THESE FALSE PROPHECIES ARE BASED ON ARBITRARY JUDGMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS AND REDUCE HUMANITY TO INTERCHANGEABLE PARTS WITHIN THE HERD.

VON MISES, 1949

Ludwig, dean of the Austrian School, “The Scope and Method of Catallactics” excerpted from chapter 14 of Human Action. Posted on 7/5/2008 on Mises.org

Some economists believe that it is the task of economics to establish how in the whole of society the greatest possible satisfaction of all people or of the greatest number could be attained. They do not realize that there is no method which would allow us to measure the state of satisfaction attained by various individuals. They misconstrue the character of judgments which are based on the comparison between various people's happiness. While expressing arbitrary value judgments, they believe themselves to be establishing facts. One may call it just to rob the rich in order to make presents to the poor. However, to call something fair or unfair is always a subjective value judgment and as such purely personal and not liable to any verification or falsification. Economics is not intent upon pronouncing value judgments. It aims at a cognition of the consequences of certain modes of acting. It has been asserted that the physiological needs of all men are of the same kind and that this equality provides a standard for the measurement of the degree of their objective satisfaction. In expressing such opinions and in recommending the use of such criteria to guide the government's policy, one proposes to deal with men [sic] as the breeder deals with his cattle. But the reformers fail to realize that there is no universal principle of alimentation valid for all men. Which one of the various principles one chooses depends entirely on the aims one wants to attain. The cattle breeder does not feed his cows in order to make them happy, but in order to attain the ends which he has assigned to them in his own plans. He may prefer more milk or more meat or something else. What type of men do the man breeders want to rear — athletes or mathematicians? Warriors or factory hands? He who would make man the material of a purposeful system of breeding and feeding would arrogate to himself despotic powers and would use his fellow citizens as means for the attainment of his own ends, which differ from those they themselves are aiming at.

[GENDERED LANGUAGE SAID IN CONTEXT]

1NC (I)

MORALITY IS OBJECTIVE – INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IS THE FOUNDATION FOR ALL VALUE.

RAND, 1964

Ayn, Philosopher – The Virtue of Selfishness. p. 17

It is only an ultimate goal, an end in itself, that makes the existence of values possible. Metaphysically, life is the only phenomenon that is an end in itself: a value gained and kept by a constant process of action. Epistemologically, the concept of “value” is genetically dependent upon and derived from the antecedent concept of “life.” To speak of “value” as apart from “life” is worse than a contradiction in terms. “It is only the concept of ‘Life’ that makes the concept of ‘Value’ possible.” In answer to those philosophers who claim that no relation can be established between ultimate ends or values and the facts of reality, let me stress that the fact that living entities exist and function necessitates the existence of values and of an ultimate value which for any given living entity is its own life. Thus the validation of value judgments is to be achieved by reference to the facts of reality. The fact that a living entity is, determines what it ought to do. So much for the issue of the relation between “is” and “ought.” Now in what manner does a human being discover the concept of “value”? By what means does he first become aware of the issue of “good or evil” in its simplest form? By means of the physical sensations of pleasure or pain. Just as sensations are the first step of the development of a human consciousness in the realm of cognition, so they are its first step in the realm of evaluation. The capacity to experience pleasure or pain is innate in a man’s body; it is part of his nature, part of the kind of entity he is. He has no choice about it, and he has no choice about the standard that determines what will make him experience the physical sensation of pleasure or of pain. What is that standard? His life.

1NC**REJECT ALTRUISM – AN OBLIGATION TO THE COLLECTIVE WILL END IN BLOODY DICTATORSHIP AND NUCLEAR WAR.****RAND, 1966**

Ayn, Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal, p80

Consider the plunder, the destruction, the starvation, the **brutality**, the slave-labor camps, the torture chambers, the wholesale slaughter **perpetrated by dictatorships**. **Yet this is what today's alleged peace-lovers are willing to advocate** or tolerate—**in the name of love for humanity**. It is obvious that **the ideological root of** statism (or **collectivism**) **is the** tribal **premise of** primordial **savages who**, unable to conceive of individual rights, **believed that the tribe is a supreme**, omnipotent ruler, **that it owns the lives of its members and may sacrifice them whenever it pleases** to whatever it deems to be its own "good."

Unable to conceive of any social principles, save the rule to brute force, they believed that the tribe's wishes are limited only by its physical power and that other tribes are its natural prey, to be conquered, looted, enslaved, or annihilated. **This history of all primitive peoples is a succession of tribal wars and intertribal slaughter**. **That this savage ideology now rules nations armed with nuclear weapons, should give pause to anyone concerned with mankind's survival**. Statism is a system of institutionalized violence and perpetual civil war. It leaves men no choice but the right to seize political power—to rob or be robbed, to kill or be killed. When brute force is the only criterion of social conduct, and unresisting surrender to destruction is the only alternative, even the lowest of men, even an animal—even a cornered rat—will fight. There can be no peace within an enslaved nation.

1NC

ERR NEGATIVE – EVEN IF THE AID HAS POSITIVE ASPECTS, COERCION MUST BE REJECTED.

MACHAN, 1995

Tibor, Professor of philosophy, Auburn University, PRIVATE RIGHTS AND PUBLIC ILLUSIONS, p.121-122

The analogy with the jungle makes it appear that in human societies those who are losers do not deserve their fate, because the jungle houses dumb animals who are victims of their fate-their genes, the environment, the comparative physical advantage of their fellow beasts, and so forth. But among human beings another factor needs to be considered. Human beings are capable of making good and bad choices in their conduct, and they are not helpless when they make the bad ones or the good ones. While no doubt some are unfortunate, indeed totally unprepared-for example, those who are severely crippled, utterly deprived, or abjectly mistreated (sometimes by fellow citizens, sometimes by family, sometimes by the government itself) -most others are probably better regarded as capable of making the effort needed for a good showing in "the struggle for survival." Those who can make the effort but fail to do so do not deserve the compassion Keynes seems to believe everyone who fails to succeed deserves. Third, even if it is true that some who fail are helpless and it is the moral responsibility of others to help them, there are serious moral objections against requiring that assistance be given under the threat of force. In morality it is not generally possible that any act of compassion, kindness, generosity, honesty, decency, and so forth be undertaken involuntarily or under coercion. Rather, moral conduct must be undertaken as a matter of conscience and free choice; otherwise the act loses its moral worth. A society that forces its citizens, under the threat of punishment, to, help the less fortunate, is less, not more, compassionate. Even granting, then (in concert with Keynes), that compassion is a noble human trait, it does not follow that coercive regulation of human behavior fosters its development. Indeed, just the opposite conclusion should be reached.

2NC LINK – AMERICAN INDIANS

SOCIAL SERVICES TOWARDS AMERICAN INDIANS ARE COERCIVE AND CAUSE POVERTY.

ANDERSON, 2006

William L., an adjunct scholar of the Mises Institute, teaches economics at Frostburg State University, Living on the Reservation, <http://mises.org/story/2324>

When we speak of Indian reservations, we are dealing with areas of land set aside where American Indians live, areas that supposedly have "self-government," but are ultimately subject to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service of the US Department of the Interior. **Because of their location and because of the fact that they are the ultimate welfare state, Indian reservations tend to be places where people simply exist on whatever subsidies the government provides, and little else.** As Wikipedia notes: Some Indian reservations offer a quality of life that's among the poorest to be found in the United States. Shannon County, South Dakota, home of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, is routinely described as one of the poorest counties in the nation. While Pine Ridge is located far from any major metropolitan area, one could be describing inner-city Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New Orleans. Instead of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the residents of these metropolitan areas deal with Medicaid, the US Department of Health and Human Services, the US Department of Transportation, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the various Housing Authorities, and other alphabet soup entities which make many of the choices that govern the lives of those who live in these areas. **People who live in these urban reservations, and who depend upon the state for nearly all of their personal and financial support, are the ones who are having the most difficult time readjusting to the post-storm atmosphere. Granted, the slow recovery is not simply limited to people who might have lived in the hellish projects. Homeowners or people who lived in single-family houses in poorer sections of the New Orleans also find themselves waiting for Godot, or at least for someone from FEMA to write a check and tell them what to do next.**

2NC LINK – AMERICAN INDIANS (HEALTHCARE)

Government control of health care for Native Americans is the ultimate form of coercion.

Wichita Liberty, 2009

(Kansas newspaper, "Government-run health care focus of May 24 demonstration", May 17, <http://wichitaliberty.org/politics/government-run-health-care-focus-of-may-24-demonstration/>)

What are the dangers of government-run health care? Indian (native American) health care is totally funded and run by the United States Government. This is what health care for everyone else will look like if we don't speak up to prevent it. It took 10 years to get one bill to the floor in Congress for debate — just one bill to try to make improvements in Indian health care. If you think nationalized health care will be run any better you're fooling yourself. Dick Morris described the irreversible nature of implementing Obama's "Health Care Reform:" "The other radical changes Obama is bringing about in our nation can always be reversed. New taxes can be repealed or lowered. That which was nationalized can be privatized. Government which has grown can be cut. But once the health care system is extended to cover everyone, with no commensurate increase in the resources available, the change will be forever. The vicious cycle of cuts in medical resources and in the number of doctors and nurses will doom health care in this country. This wanton destruction will not be reversible by any bill or program. A crucial part of our quality of life — the best health care in the world — will be gone forever."

2NC LINK – ANIMAL RIGHTS

ANIMAL RIGHTS WOULD CAUSE EXTINCTION—SURVIVAL IS BASED ON NON HUMAN EXPLOITATION.

BROOK, Executive director of the Ayn Rand Institute, 2001

Yaron, The Evil of Animal "Rights", The Ayn Rand Foundation, 5/19/2001, <http://www.aynrand.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5211>

There is no question that animal testing is absolutely necessary for the development of life-saving drugs and medical procedures. Millions of people will die unnecessarily if it is not permitted. Animal rights activists know this, but still demand that animal testing be prohibited. Chris De Rose, director of Last Chance for Animals writes: "If the death of one rat cured all diseases, it wouldn't make any difference to me. This is pure man-hatred. It is common to write off terrorist activity and the vicious statements of animal rights leaders as "extremist," while maintaining that the majority of people in the animal rights movement have benevolent intentions. But man-hatred is not limited to a few leaders, it is inherent in the very notion of animal "rights." According to PETA, the basic principle of animal rights is: "animals are not ours to eat, wear, experiment on, or use for entertainment." To abide by this principle, we must leave animals free--to overrun and destroy our property, to eat our food, even to kill our children. As Michael Fox, vice president of The Humane Society explains, "The life of an ant and that of my child should be granted equal consideration." This is a formula for human extinction since human survival and progress depend on our ability to kill animals when they endanger us, eat them when we need food, run tests on them when we fight disease. Without horses for transportation and oxen for plowing, without furs to keep us warm and meat to sustain us, mankind's ascent from the cave to civilization would have been impossible. Today, animal rights advocates want to make the progress of medical science impossible--so that rats may live. The only goal of a doctrine that demands such a sacrifice of man to animals can be the annihilation of man. To attribute rights to animals is to ignore the purpose and justification of rights--to protect the interests of man. Rights make it possible for individuals to coexist peacefully, trade and produce, provide for their own lives, and pursue their own happiness, free from the threat of violence. Animal "rights"--which demand man's destruction--are the antithesis of rights. By attempting to destroy the essential, life-preserving medical testing industry, SHAC and their allies reveal the man-hatred contained in the notion of animal "rights." Our lives depend on rejecting this evil idea.

2NC LINK – CHILDREN

TRACINSKI, June 17th 1998

Robert W., senior writer for the Ayn Rand Institute between 1997 and 2004, Children of the Damned, http://www.aynrand.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5373&news_iv_ctrl=1021

Communism has collapsed, but this spirit of senseless sacrifice persists today in the form of the most innocuous-sounding, uncontroversial bromide mouthed by today's politicians: **the crusade to "save our children."** **Under the cover of this irresistible slogan who wants to be seen as being against children?** President Clinton and others have proposed a host of government controls. The list is practically endless: nationalized health care, expanded welfare for single mothers, censorship of TV and the Internet, volunteerism, massive new tobacco regulations all of these are justified by appealing to the health and welfare of the nation's children. Yet the actual effect of these measures is to deprive our children of the one thing they will need most when they reach adulthood: freedom. And without freedom the freedom as adults to make their own choices and pursue their own happiness all of the other benefits that we are supposed to be providing for them are impossible. **In the ideal society of the self-appointed child-protectors**, if we believe their claims, **all children would be raised in a nurturing, protected environment**. Their bodies, in this view, would be healthy, since free health care would be provided by the government. Their minds would be innocent; all violence would be banished from TV, and all "indecency" from the Internet. They would be raised with the minute attention of adult "mentors" rounded up by "volunteerism" campaigns. And, of course, their lungs would be spotlessly clean, because tobacco would be outlawed. In reality, **the promised gains are impossible. How are our children supposed to enjoy the benefits of "free" health care, when government controls are destroying the quality of medicine?** How are they supposed to learn or be entertained and inspired, when the nation's intellectual life is being ruled by the enforcers of an undefined and undefinable "decency"? **How are they supposed to prepare for their futures when they are ordered not to pursue their own education, but to "volunteer," sacrificing their time and energy to others? And how, when they are adults, are they supposed to enjoy the benefit of healthy lungs, when their paternalistic government refuses to acknowledge their right to make their own decisions about what is best for their health?** The vicious contradiction behind the "save our children" crusade is the attempt to ensure the health and happiness of our children by ensuring that they will grow up to be servants of the state. Our children are supposed to be "saved" by forcing them once they reach adulthood, or even before not to attain their own goals and achieve their own happiness, but to give up their freedom and sacrifice their individual interests. Starting in high school, they will be drafted to "volunteer" in slums, rather than prepare themselves for their own future. When they get sick, they will be banned from selecting a doctor or treatment not approved by their state-sponsored HMO. And when they grow up, they will be barred from seeking information on censored Web sites, and will be taxed unmercifully to support a vast welfare state. In short, they will be coerced, restricted, and bled dry for what? To "save our children." **Parents should have the right to make the decisions on how to raise their own children and good parents realize that the purpose of child-rearing is to prepare young people to live independent lives, in pursuit of their own values. But the government wants to take away that choice and turn child-rearing into a process for training the next generation of serfs, a generation indentured to the service of their children.**

2NC LINK – ENVIRONMENT

PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT ASSUMES NATURE POSSESSES INTRINSIC VALUE – DEMANDING SACRIFICE FOR SUCH ARBITRARY ASSERTIONS ARE THE FOUNDATION OF TOTALITARIANISM.

REISMAN, 1992

George, Professor of Economics at Pepperdine University's School of Business and Management in Los Angeles. – September, The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty Vol. 42 No. 9 "The Toxicity of Environmentalism"

It is important to realize that when the environmentalists talk about destruction of the "environment" as the result of economic activity, their claims are permeated by the doctrine of intrinsic value. Thus, what they actually mean to a very great extent is merely the destruction of alleged intrinsic values in nature such as jungles, deserts, rock formations, and animal species which are either of no value to man or hostile to man. That is their concept of the "environment." If, in contrast to the environmentalists, one means by "environment" the surroundings of man—the external material conditions of human life—then it becomes clear that all of man's productive activities have the inherent tendency to improve his environment indeed, that that is their essential purpose. This becomes obvious if one realizes that the entire world physically consists of nothing but chemical elements. These elements are never destroyed. They simply reappear in different combinations, in different proportions, in different places. Apart from what has been lost in a few rockets, the quantity of every chemical element in the world today is the same as it was before the Industrial Revolution. The only difference is that, because of the Industrial Revolution, instead of lying dormant, out of man's control, the chemical elements have been moved about as never before, in such a way as to improve human life and well-being. For instance, some part of the world's iron and copper has been moved from the interior of the earth, where it was useless, to construct buildings, bridges, automobiles, and a million and one other things of benefit to human life. Some part of the world's carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen has been separated from certain compounds and recombined in others, in the process releasing energy to heat and light homes, power industrial machinery, fuel automobiles, airplanes, ships, and trains, and in countless other ways serve human life. It follows that insofar as man's environment consists of the chemical elements iron, copper, carbon, oxygen, and hydrogen, and his productive activity makes them useful to himself in these ways, his environment is correspondingly improved. All that all of man's productive activities fundamentally consist of is in the rearrangement of nature-given chemical elements for the purpose of making them stand in a more useful relationship to himself—that is, for the purpose of improving his environment. Consider further examples. To live, man needs to be able to move his person and his goods from place to place. If an untamed forest stands in his way, such movement is difficult or impossible. It represents an improvement in his environment, therefore, when man moves the chemical elements that constitute some of the trees of the forest somewhere else and lays down the chemical elements brought from somewhere else to constitute a road. It is an improvement in his environment when man builds bridges, digs canals, opens mines, clears land, constructs factories and houses, or does anything else that represents an improvement in the external, material conditions of his life. All of these things represent an improvement in man's material surroundings—his environment. All of them represent the rearrangement of nature's elements in a way that makes them stand in a more useful relationship to human life and well-being. Thus, all economic activity has as its sole purpose the improvement of the environment—it aims exclusively at the improvement of the external, material conditions of human life. Production and economic activity are precisely the means by which man adapts his environment to himself and thereby improves it. So much for the environmentalists' claims about man's destruction of the environment. Only from the perspective of the alleged intrinsic value of nature and the nonvalue of man can man's improvement of his environment be termed destruction of the environment. The environmentalists' recent claims about the impending destruction of the "planet" are entirely the result of the influence of the intrinsic-value doctrine. What the environmentalists are actually afraid of is not that the planet or its ability to support human life will be destroyed, but that the increase in its ability to support human life will destroy its still extensively existing "wildness." They cannot bear the thought of the earth's becoming fully subject to man's control, with its jungles and deserts replaced by farms, pastures, and forests planted by man, as man wills. They cannot bear the thought of the earth's becoming man's garden. In the words of McKibben, "The problem is that nature, the independent force that has surrounded us since our earliest days, cannot coexist with our numbers and our habits. We may well be able to create a world that can support our numbers and our habits, but it will be an artificial world . . ." (italics supplied).[8]

2NC LINK – ENVIRONMENT

PRIORITIZING BIODIVERSITY BECOMES A BASIS FOR NEW COLLECTIVISM AND ENDS IN GLOBAL EXTINCTION.

WOICESHYN, 2001

Glenn, senior writer for the Ayn Rand Institute, "Man: The Real Endangered Species" http://www.aynrand.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5301&news_iv_ctrl=2457

What motivates environmentalists to protect "endangered" species with so much zeal that they are oblivious to the harm inflicted on people? **Some environmentalists assert that "species diversity" is extremely beneficial** to man. **But** environmentalists are the staunchest opponents of genetic engineering--which has vast potential for creating new species. Some environmentalists assert that an endangered species could possess medical secrets beneficial to man. But, in 1991, when taxol--processed from the Pacific yew tree--was discovered to be highly effective in treating certain forms of cancer, environmentalists blocked harvesting of the yew tree. Whenever man's needs conflict with the "interests of nature," environmentalists take the side of nature. **The real motive** behind environmentalism **is** stated by David Graber (a biologist with the U.S. National Park Service): "We are not interested in the utility of a particular species, or free-flowing river, or ecosystem to mankind. They have intrinsic value, more value--to me--than another human body, or a billion of them." **This "intrinsic value" ethic** means **that** man must value nature--not for any benefit to man, but because **nature is somehow a value in and of itself**. Hence, nature must be kept pristine despite the harm this causes man. **We must halt activities beneficial to us, such as farming**, forestry, and the treatment of cancer, **in order to safeguard** fish, **birds**, trees, **and rats**. **Throughout history, people were told to sacrifice their lives to God**, the community, **the state, or the Fuhrer--all with deadly consequences**. **Now we are being told to sacrifice our lives to nature**. And current environmental legislation, such as the ESA, provides government with massive powers to enforce such sacrifices. **What disasters could such power lead to?** Some environmentalists have expressed their wish. "Until such time as Homo sapiens should decide to rejoin nature," writes biologist Graber, "some of us can only hope for the right virus to come along." City University of New York philosophy professor Paul Taylor adds: "[T]he ending of the human epoch on Earth would most likely be greeted with a hearty 'Good Riddance.'"

While extreme, these **anti-human sentiments are** logically **consistent with** environmentalism's **"intrinsic value"** philosophy: **Since man [sic] survives only by conquering nature, man [sic] is an inherent threat** to the "intrinsic value" of nature **and must therefore be eliminated**. **Environmentalism makes man [sic] the endangered species.** [gendered language said in context]

2NC LINK – FARM AID

FARM AID IS PAID FOR WITH STOLEN CAPITAL.

HOLCBERG, MAY 27TH 2008

David, Taxpayers Shouldn't Be Forced to Subsidize Farmers, Los Angeles Times, http://www.aynrand.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=16338&news_iv_ctrl=2598

Taxpayers shouldn't be forced to subsidize farmers or anyone else. The idea that one person's needs are a moral claim on the assets of others has been used to justify countless redistribution schemes, from farm subsidies to welfare handouts to foreign aid. But this idea is unjust. Individuals have a moral right to what they earn--not to what others earn. The government should protect our property from those who would steal it--not steal it from us and give it to those who did not earn it.

2NC LINK – FEDERALISM

**THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE SPENDING IS IRRELEVANT
– ALL FORMS OF COERCIVE TAXATION ARE COERCIVE AND MUST BE
REJECTED.**

ANGELO, March 6th 2007

In Conversation with Stephan Kinsella, Objectivism and Federalism, Mises Economic Blog, <http://blog.mises.org/archives/006345.asp>

Seems like it's just the expedient use of the term government to avoid having to say both state and federal government. After all, invasions of property rights by either is criminal. If using the Constitution was helpful in reducing the state from doing these things (I believe it isn't for the reasons people such as Lysander Spooner and Murray Rothbard have noted), then the author of the article is consistent to call for the Constitution to ban government power in certain areas. **State or federal power is still criminal and still power.** It's almost as if Kinsella is endorsing the Constitution here (which I realize he isn't). I would point out that the Constitution is a criminal document and invalid in the first place. Rothbard's criticisms of Calhoun's advocacy for state as opposed to federal power are relevant here, I think. Whether on a smaller scale, which tends to be better than larger scale, or not, state power is still evil. **Ceding that states are somehow justified in having violent powers over the federal government is like saying getting hit in the head with a hammer two times is better than three.**

2NC LINK – IMMIGRANTS

Government support for immigrants violates rights and creates a police state.

REISMAN, 2006

George, Professor Emeritus of Economics at Pepperdine University and author of *Capitalism: A Treatise on Economics* (1996) Ludwig von Mises Institute, Mises Daily, "Immigration Plus Welfare State Equal Police State," April 10, 2006, <http://blog.mises.org/archives/004891.asp>)

Illegal immigrants are overwhelming the resources of the Welfare State: government-funded hospital emergency rooms are filled with them; public schools are filled with their children. On the basis of such complaints, many people are angry and want to close the border to new illegal immigrants and deport those who are already here. They want to keep new illegal immigrants out with fences along the border. It is not clear whether the fences would contain intermittent watchtowers with searchlights and machine guns. The illegal immigrants who are already here would be ferreted out by threatening anyone who employed them with severe penalties and making it a criminal offense not to report them. This is a classic illustration of Mises's principle that prior government intervention into the economic system breeds later intervention. Here the application of his principle is, start with the Welfare State, end with the Police State. A police state is what is required effectively to stop substantial illegal immigration that has become a major burden because of the Welfare State. The philosophy of individual rights and capitalism implies that foreigners have a right to come and to live and work here, i.e., to immigrate into the United States. The land of the United States is owned by individuals and voluntary associations of individuals, such as private business firms. It is not owned by the United States government or by the American people acting as a collective; indeed many of the owners of land in the United States are not Americans, but foreign nationals, including foreign investors.

The private owners of land have the right to use or sell or rent their land for any peaceful purpose. This includes employing immigrants and selling them food and clothing and all other goods, and selling or renting housing to them. If individual private landowners are willing to accept the presence of immigrants on their property as employees, customers, or tenants, that should be all that is required for the immigrants to be present. Anyone else who attempts to determine the presence or absence of immigrants is simply an interfering busybody ready to use a gun or club to impose his will. At the same time, however, the philosophy of individual rights and capitalism implies that the immigrants do not have a right to be supported at public expense, which is a violation of the rights of the taxpayers. Of course, it is no less a violation of the rights of the taxpayers when native-born individuals are supported at public expense. The immigrants are singled out for criticism based on the allegation that they in particular are making the burden intolerable.

The implementation of the rights both of the immigrants and of the taxpayers requires the abolition of the Welfare State. Ending the Welfare State will end any problem of immigrants being a public burden.

Of course, ending the Welfare State is much easier said than done, and it is almost certainly not going to be eliminated even in order to avoid the environment of a police state. But the burdens of the Welfare State and the consequent resentment against immigrants could at the very least be substantially reduced by means of some relatively simple, common-sense reforms in the direction of greater economic freedom.

2NC LINK – KATRINA ASSISTANCE

ASSISTANCE TO HURRICANE KATRINA VICTIMS IS COERCIVE AND SETS UP FURTHER DISASTERS.

BOWDEN, MAY 1ST 2008

Thomas A., How Government Makes Disasters More Disastrous, http://www.aynrand.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=17647&news_iv_ctrl=1021

The Katrina tragedy should have called into question the so-called safety net composed of government policies that actually encourage people to embrace risks they would otherwise shun--to build in defiance of historically obvious dangers, secure in the knowledge that innocent others will be forced to share the costs when the worst happens. Without blaming the victims for having followed their own government's lead, it is time to question whether those policies should continue. The first strands of today's safety net were spun in the nineteenth century, as the Army Corps of Engineers shouldered the burden of constructing and maintaining levees and other flood controls along the Mississippi River. From then to now, Congress and the states have responded to each new flood by installing newer, higher, and stronger barriers at public expense, as if the preservation of a city like New Orleans in its historical location were a self-evident necessity. Throughout the twentieth century, new strands were woven into the safety net, first in the form of loans to disaster victims, then by direct grants, infrastructure repairs, loan guarantees, job training, subsidized investments, health care, debris removal, and a host of similar rehabilitative measures. In 1968, the National Flood Insurance Program began supplying subsidized coverage for structures and their contents in flood-prone areas. Similar state-subsidized insurance programs arose for hurricanes in Florida and earthquakes in California. In 1978, the Federal Emergency Management Agency was created to coordinate the increasingly complex job of government disaster response. At each juncture, more aid was funneled to disaster victims without serious challenge to the wisdom of encouraging people to occupy vulnerable locations. In response to Mississippi floods, Florida hurricanes, and California earthquakes, the number of major disaster declarations almost doubled from the 1980s to the 1990s, from an annual average of 24 up to 46. At century's end, Congress was paying an average of \$3.7 billion a year in supplemental disaster aid, with state taxpayers contributing many millions more. As of August 2007, Katrina relief alone had cost federal taxpayers \$114 billion. By gradual steps, this disaster safety net became part of the legal landscape, taken for granted by private investors and owners deciding to undertake new projects or rebuild storm-damaged areas. Relief programs--by minimizing, disguising, and shifting the real risks of defying natural hazards--became an active force distorting private decision-making and inviting even worse future tragedies. Thus if a pre-Katrina Mississippian asked himself, "Should I build my house 10 feet above sea level, a quarter-mile from the Gulf Coast?" the answer came back: "Sure, why not? The government will look after me if disaster strikes." This entitlement mentality ensured that each new tragedy would generate fresh demands to expand the safety net. In Katrina's aftermath, those demands centered on State Farm, which dared to deny certain claims under homeowners policies that covered wind damage but expressly excluded floods. Mississippi's attorney general immediately sued to void flood exclusion clauses as "unconscionable" and "contrary to public policy" and even launched a criminal investigation of State Farm's claims adjusting practices.

2NC LINK – MARRIAGE PROMOTION

USING PUBLIC FUNDS FOR MARRIAGE PROMOTION IS COERCIVE.

OLSON, 2005

Sarah, independent journalist, contributing reporter for Free Speech Radio News and the National Radio Project's "Making Contact.", "Marriage Promotion, Reproductive Injustice, and the War Against Poor Women of Color" <<http://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/2005/0105olson.html>> Jan/Feb 05. Accessed 7/10/09. WBTA

Another criticism of marriage promotion comes from survivors of domestic violence and their advocates. Studies consistently show that between 50% and 60%--in some studies up to 80%--of women on welfare have suffered some form of domestic violence, compared to 22% of the general population. In addition, between 3.3 and 10 million children witness domestic violence each year. Domestic violence survivors say their abuse was often a barrier to work, and many have reported being harassed or abused while at work. Most survivors needed welfare to escape the relationship and the violence. Any policy that provides incentives for women to become and stay married is in effect coercing poor women into marriage. Many women on welfare, like Renita Pitts, say that their marriages, rather than helping them out of poverty, set up overwhelming barriers to building their own autonomous and productive lives. According to Kaaryn Gustafson, associate professor of law at the University of Connecticut, policies that attempt to look out for women's safety by restricting or coercing their activities are paternalistic and misguided. "The patriarchal model is really troubling. The gist is that if there isn't a man in the house there isn't a family. The studies of family well-being are all very problematic because you cannot parse out the issues of education, socioeconomic status, and other emotional and psychological issues that are tied up in who gets married and who doesn't."

2NC LINK – SMOKING

THE WAR ON SMOKING IS PATERNALISTIC.

WATKINS, March 6th 2009

Don, writer and research specialist at the Ayn Rand Center for Individual Rights, Anti-Smoking Paternalism: A Cancer on American Liberty

Implicit in the war on smoking, however, is the view that the government must dictate the individual's decisions with regard to smoking, because he is incapable of making them rationally. To the extent the anti-smoking movement succeeds in wielding the power of government coercion to impose on Americans its blanket opposition to smoking, it is entrenching paternalism: the view that individuals are incompetent to run their own lives, and thus require a nanny-state to control every aspect of those lives This state is well on its way: from trans-fat bans to bicycle helmet laws to prohibitions on gambling, the government is increasingly abridging our freedom on the grounds that we are not competent to make rational decisions in these areas--just as it has long done by paternalistically dictating how we plan for retirement (Social Security) or what medicines we may take (the FDA). Indeed, one of the main arguments used to bolster the anti-smoking agenda is the claim that smokers impose "social costs" on non-smokers, such as smoking-related medical expenses--an argument that perversely uses an injustice created by paternalism to support its expansion. The only reason non-smokers today are forced to foot the medical bills of smokers is that our government has virtually taken over the field of medicine, in order to relieve us inept Americans of the freedom to manage our own health care, and bear the costs of our own choices.

2NC LINK – STATE ECONOMY

BAILING OUT STATE ECONOMIES ONCE ENSURES FURTHER AND GREATER SPENDING LATER.

RIGHT WING NEWS, MAY 20th 2009

McQ, Will The Federal Government Bail Out California?, http://www.rightwingnews.com/mt331/2009/05/will_the_federal_government_ba.php

If the government does bail out the muni bond market, how should it go about things? The initial assumption is that they'll only guarantee existing debt. Otherwise, it would be like handing the keys to the treasury to every mayor, county board, and state legislature, and telling them to go to town. But once the treasury has bailed out a single state, there will be a strongly implied guarantee on all such debt. So you don't give them the keys to the vaults, but you do leave a window open, point out where the money's kept, and casually mention that you've given the armed guards the week off.

Of course the right answer is not to bail out either. Failure is a great teacher. And then there's the moral hazzard angle. But in this day and age, that's approach is almost unthinkable apparently. Government, as we're being told, is the answer to everything.

STATE RECESSIONS CAUSE REFORM AND CUT WASTEFUL SPENDING.

McKenzie and Lee, professors of economics, 1996

Richard B. McKenzie and Dwight R. Lee, Cato Institute, 11-14-96, http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=6261, accessed 7-11-09, AN

The recession has hit state governments nearly as hard as it has depleted federal revenues. However, it is during bad economic times that state and local governments often have the best opportunity for reforming costly programs and righting their financial problems. And, indeed there are problems: The net operating surplus for state and local governments fell into negative territory in 2008 to -\$81.7 billion. That is down from an operating surplus of \$10 billion in 2007. States will likely produce negative operating balances through the end of fiscal year 2012: -\$75 billion in FY 2009, -\$35 billion in FY 2010, -\$34 billion in FY 2011, and -\$25 billion in FY 2012. Given that states must balance their budgets each year, these operating deficits mean that state and local governments must manage their programs more efficiently and carefully examine their spending priorities. For example, education outlays constitute a major portion of every state and local government's budget. However, these governments often cannot innovate and reform their education programs due to federal education guidelines. One thing the federal government could do is to grant emergency powers to states to allow them to get more value out of their education spending. Education spending has risen rapidly over the last decade with little improvement to student scores. However, in states like Florida, where continuous educational innovation has been a high priority, improvements have been dramatic. Medicaid outlays are the largest federally mandated spending program at the state level. Similar freedom to innovate is desperately needed here, particularly in creating a customer status for patients and permitting more competition in the provision of low-cost insurance for Medicaid eligible individuals.

2NC LINK – TANF

TANF coerces workers to spend their incomes immediately in order to qualify for more benefits, ultimately draining out retirement funds.

WILKINSON, 2005

Will, Cato Institute scholar, and NPR Marketplace contributor, "Noble Lies, Liberal Purposes, and Personal Retirement Accounts," June 28, SSP N. 34, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/ssp/ssp34.pdf>

Yes, it is true that the old Aid to Families with Dependent Children program attracted plenty of conservative ire, but AFDC lacked strong public support because of well-founded concerns about its perverse effects of encouraging dependence and illegitimacy. The program was in many ways too generous in terms of eligibility and benefits, as is now acknowledged by those who agree that the mid-1990s welfare reform has been a great success. But total means-tested non-AFDC/ TANF welfare spending has increased significantly since the advent of Clinton's plan to "end welfare as we know it."⁶⁶ Despite worries that means-tested assistance for the elderly poor would be underfunded, there is at least as much reason to believe that such programs would be overfunded. The political power of groups like the AARP, high voter turnout among the elderly, the desire of middle-aged workers not to be burdened by their parents' financial woes in retirement, and general sentimentality about the elderly poor could result in high benefit levels that would create perverse incentives for savings and retirement planning. A system of personal retirement accounts would minimize problems of perverse incentives by virtue of the fact that a means-tested safety net would serve only as an adjunct to the main retirement system based on mandatory private savings. Absent a requirement to set aside money in personal accounts, a means-tested benefits program for retirees would create a "moral hazard" problem: workers would have an incentive to "game" the system and consume their incomes earlier rather than save sufficiently for retirement. Well-designed personal retirement accounts funded over workers' careers, however, would simultaneously reduce the moral hazard problem and, by ensuring that workers have accumulated assets, diminish the likelihood that retirees would require assistance in old age. There are further economic grounds for believing that moving to a means-tested retirement program—and eliminating the churning of tax and transfer dollars within income brackets—would result in a more generous allowance for the elderly poor. As Feldstein observes, optimal tax theory predicts that the heavy taxes needed to sustain the current churning exert downward pressure on means-tested programs generally: The deadweight burden of an extra dollar of taxes increases with the share of income taken in taxes. The high level of taxes that is needed to finance middle class social insurance programs therefore increases the deadweight burden of any incremental taxes that would be used to finance means tested poverty programs. The large social insurance programs thus reduce the optimal size of means tested poverty programs. If Feldstein is right, then defenders of the status quo who think they are protecting the poor have got matters completely backwards. Showering money on the rich and poor alike, far from being a favor to the poor, may in fact result in less money for the poor. As empirical support for this proposition, the fact that 10 percent of Americans over 65 live below the poverty line indicates that the status quo is hardly a bonanza for the elderly poor.

2NC LINK – TAXATION

TAXATION IS COERCIVE.

WATNER, Professor of philosophy, 1982

Carl, THE JOURNAL OF LIBERTARIAN STUDIES, 1982, p. 304

Taxation, whether is be of land or services, or in any other form, is the equivalent of robbery, because a just proprietor is being deprived of his money or goods against his will. The fact that the government is offering goods and services in exchange for tax revenues makes no difference. Government violates the rights of selfowners when it conscripts their services in the form of personal labor or when it seizes their material wealth.

2NC LINK – TERRORISM

THE NEGATIVES INVOCATION OF THE DANGERS OF TERRORISM IS AN EMPTY THREAT USED TO CONDITION SUBSERVIENCE TO THE STATE. .

SHAFFER, SEPTEMBER 12TH 06

Butler, teaches at the Southwestern University School of Law, The Bogeyman Industry, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer143.html>

We are told, on a daily basis, that our lives are under constant threat of attack from terrorists. But if this is so, where are these supposed terrorists? President Bush and his defenders have been bleating that their expanded police and surveillance powers are keeping terrorists out of the country, a proposition that is rendered laughable by the daily influx of immigrants from Central America! If it has been so easy for millions of people to enter this country in spite of determined government efforts to prevent it, what efficacious mechanisms has the Bush administration put in place to keep out terrorists? Nor does the government's performance in New Orleans suggest to any thoughtful person that it is capable of making an effective response to any alleged danger. The so-called "war on terror" is just another of the many state-run rackets designed to benefit governmental, media, and various business interests, all of whom profit from state-induced fears of others. Greater power and more tax dollars flow to political systems; the media enjoys an increase in viewers and readers; while untold numbers of government contractors, along with suppliers of goods and services for a market of frightened people, profit from this protection racket. In threatening to expand the war to other countries, the state increases hostilities from its targeted enemies, thus engendering more fears from Americans who demand "protection." If physicians could figure out ways to inject people with deadly viruses that they could then treat with expensive tests, drugs, and medical advice, their profession would precisely correlate with the methods of the state! President Bush and other politicians – along with the agents of disinformation in the media – spent many hours exploiting the fifth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks. Mr. Bush went to the World Trade Center site ostensibly to honor the victims of that atrocity, but in fact his purpose was to take advantage of that event in order to reinforce the mindset of fear upon which the state depends for the continuing expansion of its power over our lives. Fear is a condition the state cannot allow to enervate; it must be constantly revitalized. Like a morsel of food to Pavlov's dogs, Mr. Bush's memorial wreath served – like Memorial Day ceremonies – to reinforce the conditioning that is the state's power source.

2NC LINK – A2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT

ALL GOVERNMENT HAS A TENDENCY TOWARDS AUTHORITARIANISM – NOT EVEN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS CAN TAX WITHOUT COERCION.

FEDAKO, August 3rd 2007

Jim, Government Laws Are Not Contracts, Mises Daily <http://mises.org/story/2484>

Despite what you were taught in school, governance is ugly; in all forms, and at all times. Don't believe me? Attend a meeting of a local governing entity. You will find the council — omnipotent by vote, omniscient by delusion — seated before you at the table. All night long, they'll bicker and battle all the while proposing and dissecting plans and schemes with shouts and pounding shoes; Khrushchev moments indeed. This is the reality of man lording over man, and it's been that way for eons. Ugly, just plain ugly. And it doesn't matter the span or purpose of the governing entity. This ugly reality holds equally true for the fist-fighting Taiwanese legislator as for the insult-hurling band booster. Power corrupts at all levels.

2NC LINK – A2 NO SPECIFIC LINK

**WE DON'T NEED A SPECIFIC LINK – IF WE PROVE YOUR POLICY IS
INCOMPATIBLE WITH OUR ETHICAL THEORY THEN WE WIN THE ROUND.**

ADAMS, Clinical Psychologist and Researcher, 2006

Dr S. J., [Nonsacrificial Help to Others: Questions and Answers](http://roguepsych.blogspot.com/post.mhtml?post_id=232848), http://roguepsych.blogspot.com/post.mhtml?post_id=232848

On the third comment, I agree it's rational to invest in others or prepare for storms, etc. However, I know politicians use these exact terms when promoting (and usually passing) some kind of socialist bill that forcibly takes taxpayer money to fund a social program. So, at a personal, voluntary level, I'm all for it, but against it as a political system (and I know you are, too). Also, just to clarify one thing, my answer to that scenario was really to point out the value of "philosophical detection." Specifically, if someone proposes some outlandish and unreal situation to try and support or refute some position, then it isn't necessary to go through all the mental effort and emotional strain of answering it. It's invalid from the get-go, so why bother with it? I think one of the best examples of this was in the "Letters of Ayn Rand," in which someone tries to argue with her that one form of christianity (or maybe another religion) was better than another, and she should read about it, and so on. Her response was that, philosophically, she only needed to deal with fundamentals. If the basic premises of an argument or religion are false, then one doesn't need to mine the details for some kind of ideological gold. One doesn't have to study every single religion and it's mass of variants to refute the supernatural base of ALL religion. That some religions have a number of good ideas taken in isolation doesn't redeem or validate the religion. In fact, one has to take those ideas out of their mystical context to give them value. So, all that is just to clarify why it's not necessary to deal with an argument of that kind on its own terms. But your point in the comment is valid and true.

2NC LINK – A2 SMALL INSTANCE

SMALL INSTANCES OF COERCION ARE SIGNIFICANT BECAUSE THEY ARE USED TO LEGITIMIZE WORSE VIOLATIONS.

MACHAN, 1983

Tibor R., professor emeritus of philosophy at Auburn University, and holds the R. C. Hoiles Endowed Chair in Business Ethics and Free Enterprise at the Argyros School of Business & Economics, Chapman University. Rights and Regulations: Legitimacy of Regulation: The Petty Tyranny of Regulation pg 275

These and related **consequences of government regulatory decisions for individuals vary enormously.** Most **such decisions will appear on first sight to have but the mildest impact on the lives of the regulated**—mild, that is, in comparison to the more blatantly tyrannical policies of governments such as expropriation of land for purposes of building freeways, or the interning of Japanese-American citizens because there is a specious suspicion that they will cooperate with citizens of their ancestors' country in time of war. **Nonetheless, these mild forms of tyranny—although petty—are bona fide tyrannies. They impose the sort of undeserved burdens on individuals and groups that would rightly be considered unjust if used for protecting ourselves from criminals.**

2NC LINK – A2 STATE SERVICES NOT COERCIVE

GIVING FEDERAL AID TO STATES IS DOUBLY COERCIVE BECAUSE IT ENABLES THE STATES TO EFFECTIVELY TAX INDIVIDUALS TWICE.

RIEDL, October 30th 2008

Brian, Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs at The Heritage Foundation, DON'T BAIL OUT THE STATES, http://www.nypost.com/seven/10302008/postopinion/opedcolumnists/dont_bail_out_the_states_135972.htm

For starters, it's a shell game. Sending federal aid to states wouldn't save taxpayers a dime because state taxpayers are also federal taxpayers. Hiking federal taxes to keep state taxes from rising is like running up your Visa card to keep the Mastercard balance from rising. Either way, you'll pay. All that changes is where you send your payment.

2NC IMPACT – VALUE TO LIFE

Political coercion destroys the meaning and value of human life

SHAFFER, NOVEMBER 1ST 2003

Butler, teaches at the Southwestern University School of Law, A Passion for Life, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer55.html>

Political systems do far more than diminish the material quality of our lives or deprive us of our liberties. To the degree of their power over us, they help to **deplete the passion for living that gives meaning to our experiences** here on earth. **One sees a reflection of this inner emptiness in the zombie-like behavior of men and women** who have long been accustomed to tyrannical regimes, or in the looks of detachment in the eyes of concentration camp prisoners. We have all seen newsreel footage of persons **being liberated from Nazi imprisonment**. One would think that being freed from months or years of dehumanized captivity would have brought looks of joy into their faces. Instead, **we saw expressions of the deeper costs of tyranny that go far beyond the calculation of the dead: the breaking of the human spirit.**

Statists do not want us to think in terms of how their practices erode our sense of being human. While they are not comfortable with our awareness that their systems resulted in the deaths of some two hundred million persons in the twentieth century alone, they can live with such information. After all, these are only collective statistics, abstractions which, like references to "gross domestic product," "rates of unemployment," or the "Dow-Jones industrial average," cloud the costs individuals always pay at the hands of the state. Such information may be an embarrassment to statists, but it poses no significant threat, for it is too disconnected from personal experience to rouse individual souls from their slumbers. **To speak of the dehumanization or spiritual depletion** of the lives of individuals **is so alien** to most of us **that few can even begin to envision the meaning of such concerns.** Our institutional masters have trained us to regard the depletion of our income, or savings, or other material factors as the only "costs" to which we ought to devote our attentions. Sadly, even many of my free-market, libertarian friends seem stuck on the proposition that a laissez-faire economic system would be sufficient for a free, peaceful, and productive life. To be free to make decisions regarding our own lives and property, and to be able to enter into voluntary agreements with others is, of course, essential to an individually meaningful life. Having a daily supply of food and water is equally essential to our lives, but hardly sufficient for living well. I shall forever recall George Orwell's description of the institutionalized "tinny stew" fed to the humanoids in his 1984, as exemplary of the ways in which the state feeds – but does not nourish – its conscripts. How reminiscent is this of the cafeteria offerings in government schools, prisons, or military establishments? Can one find any correlation between being adequately fed – so as to sustain the conscripts' usefulness to the state – and the pursuit of a meaningful life as a human being? The problems we experience at the hands of the institutions to which we subject ourselves do not derive from the malevolence or ambitions of power of those purporting to be "authorities" over us. Rather, they are the consequences of our acknowledging them to have such authority! Most of our problems originate within our own minds, and we are generally too frightened of the specters we might discover therein to want to search out the root cause of our difficulties. **Like the man who searched beneath a streetlight for the car keys he lost a block away "because the light's better here," most of us opt for the quick-and-easy explanations that target institutional flaws.** It is so much easier for us to think of ourselves as victims of the state, than as having suffered the consequences of our own thinking. So many of us live dispirited lives because we have given up on ourselves, and look for direction and meaning in life by attaching ourselves to external agencies or purposes. In the course of doing so, we emasculate our emotions and feelings as hindrances to the sense of "responsibility" we believe we have to such external forces. We repress our inner voices with drugs, alcohol, or programs to help us "adjust" or "adapt" to our servitude. Not wanting our children to be left out of the system, we accede to their being labeled "hyperactive" or suffering from "attention deficit disorder," when their only offense has been to pursue the self-directed exploration that is the essence of life. Like their parents before them, children must learn to become serviceable to their masters and to live according to agendas set by others. Dispositions for autonomous thinking or behavior must be smothered, whether by fear, intimidation, or the on-campus drugs against which school systems are not at war! **The institutional order** – particularly the state – **requires us to live externalized lives,** in which our attentions are drawn to the pursuit of values beyond ourselves: wealth, fame, status, power, or the approval of others. **To be an externally-directed person is to give up on one's sense of being; to admit to the unworthiness of one's very soul;** to seek meaning in others rather than oneself. Ultimately, it is to embrace the mass-mindedness that inheres in every collectivist system. The contest between collectivism and individualism has always been, at its core, a struggle for the human soul.

2NC IMPACT – NO SOLVENCY (GENERAL)

URNS THE CASE – AID PROGRAMS WILL BE CO-OPTED BY COERCIVE BUREAUCRACY; EVEN IF YOUR PLAN IS GOOD IN THE ABSTRACT, IT'LL BE CIRCUMVENTED IN IMPLEMENTATION. PREFER OUR EVIDENCE WHICH SPEAKS TO THE DISCONNECT BETWEEN IMAGINED POLICIES AND REAL WORLD POLICY CREATION.

BROWNE, Former libertarian Presidential candidate and Director of Public Policy for the DownsizeDC.org, 1995

Harry, "Why Government Doesn't Work", p. 20-21

Government grows also because well-meaning people like you and me believe it should do certain things that seem beyond controversy—find a cure for cancer, stop air pollution, keep violence off television, hold back an aggressor in the Middle East—something that everyone seems to agree should be done. Whatever the goal, it's easy to imagine that a single-minded government could achieve it. I call this The Dictator Syndrome. **You see suffering or danger, and in your imagination you see a government program eliminating it. But in the real world the program would operate as you expect only if you were an absolute dictator**—having at your disposal all of government's power to compel everyone to do things your way. Just for a moment, think about something you wish the government would do and that nearly everyone would like to see happen—provide swifter and surer punishment for criminals, teach children right and wrong, furnish health care to those who don't have it, bring peace to Bosnia, or whatever. Imagine a goal so important that it seems to justify using government's power to coerce. And now, **consider what will actually happen to your program**. To get it enacted **you'll need political allies**, since alone you have only limited influence. **But other people will support your plan** and work for it **only if you modify it in dozens of ways that further their goals** and satisfy their opinions. Suppose you make the necessary compromises and amass enough support to pressure the politicians to vote for your revised program. Who will write the actual law? You? Of course not. **It will be written by the same legislators and aides who created all the laws, programs, and problems you object to now**. Each of them will compromise your program still further to satisfy his political supporters. And if the law passes, who will administer it? You? Of course not. **It will be implemented by bureaucrats—many of whom will use it to pursue goals quite different from what you had in mind**. They won't care what your purpose was. It's their law now, and they'll use it to suit their objectives. And, lastly, the new law probably will generate many disputes—cases that must be settled in a courtroom. Who will decide those cases? You? Of course not. It will be the same judges who today rule according to their own beliefs, rather than by reference to the written law. A judge may even rule that your law means exactly the opposite of what you had intended. **By the time your program has run this gauntlet, it will be far bigger and far more expensive** (in money and disrupted lives) than you had imagined. And **it will have been twisted to satisfy many factions**. In fact, **your program may end up being the opposite of what you had intended**. In any case, you will have provided a new tool by which others can use government for their own ends.

2NC IMPACT – NO SOLVENCY (WELFARE)

SUCCESSFUL WELFARE PROGRAMS REQUIRE PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP

PAYNE, 1998

James L., taught political science at Yale, Wesleyan, Johns Hopkins, and Texas A&M University. Since 1985, he has been an independent scholar and consultant, What Works against the Welfare State? http://www.objectivistcenter.org/cth--75-What_Works_against_Welfare_State.aspx

Furthermore, any process of genuine uplift requires detailed knowledge about the needy person, the kind of knowledge that a close personal friend would acquire. But it would be offensive snooping for the state to try to learn about such intimate details. The old AFDC "man in the house" rule ran into this problem. The requirement made sense: the state should not aid a woman who was living with a man who could support her. But to implement it, welfare officials had to make surprise raids and look under beds-a procedure even civil libertarians found repugnant. As Kelley puts it, "As the agency of coercion, the government of a free country must also refrain from intruding into the personal dimensions of life." Welfare reformers have not yet recognized that the state, by its very nature, is ill suited to social assistance. But the underlying contradictions are bedeviling their efforts to restructure government programs nevertheless. When they attempt to apply discretion, they are met with protests and lawsuits that-quite rightly-call this flexibility a violation of the rule of law. As a result of this pressure, in the long run-as centuries of experience with government aid has demonstrated-government programs abandon intricate, tough-love systems of uplift and become inflexible, dependency-causing handouts.

2NC IMPACT – NO SOLVENCY (HOMELESSNESS)

Anti-poverty programs cause homelessness

Johnson, 07 – Writer and Analyst for The Freeman – The flagship publication of the Foundation for Economic Education (Charles, December 2007, “Scratching By: How Government Creates Poverty as We Know It”, December 2007, Volume 57, Issue 10, www.thefreemanonline.org//MDP)

Progressives routinely deplore the “affordable housing crisis” in American cities. In cities such as New York and Los Angeles, about 20 to 25 percent of low-income renters are spending more than half their incomes just on housing. But it is the very laws that Progressives favor—land-use policies, zoning codes, and building codes—that ratchet up housing costs, stand in the way of alternative housing options, and confine poor people to ghetto neighborhoods. Historically, when they have been free to do so, poor people have happily disregarded the ideals of political humanitarians and found their own ways to cut housing costs, even in bustling cities with tight housing markets. One way was to get other families, or friends, or strangers, to move in and split the rent. Depending on the number of people sharing a home, this might mean a less-comfortable living situation; it might even mean one that is unhealthy. But decisions about health and comfort are best made by the individual people who bear the costs and reap the benefits. Unfortunately today the decisions are made ahead of time by city governments through zoning laws that prohibit or restrict sharing a home among people not related by blood or marriage, and building codes that limit the number of residents in a building. Those who cannot make enough money to cover the rent on their own, and cannot split the rent enough due to zoning and building codes, are priced out of the housing market entirely. Once homeless, they are left exposed not only to the elements, but also to harassment or arrest by the police for “loitering” or “vagrancy,” even on public property, in efforts to force them into overcrowded and dangerous institutional shelters. But while government laws make living on the streets even harder than it already is, government intervention also blocks homeless people’s efforts to find themselves shelter outside the conventional housing market. One of the oldest and commonest survival strategies practiced by the urban poor is to find wild or abandoned land and build shanties on it out of salvageable scrap materials. Scrap materials are plentiful, and large portions of land in ghetto neighborhoods are typically left unused as condemned buildings or vacant lots. Formal title is very often seized by the city government or by quasi-governmental “development” corporations through the use of eminent domain. Lots are held out of use, often for years at a time, while they await government public-works projects or developers willing to buy up the land for large-scale building.

2NC IMPACT – A2 CASE OUTWEIGHS

Harry **Binswanger** - taught philosophy at the City University of New York, Hunter College, from 1972 to 1979, and has been professor of philosophy at the Objectivist Academic Center since 1994 - April 2, 2006
"The Moral and Practical Case for Open Immigration" <http://www.capmag.com/open-immigration/index.htm> [nfb]

This question is invalid on its face. It shows a failure to understand the nature of rights, and of moral principles generally. **Rational moral principles reflect** a recognition of the basic nature of man, his nature as a specific kind of living organism, having a specific means of survival. Questions of what is practical, what is to one's self-interest, can be answered only in that context. **It is neither practical nor to one's interest to attempt to live and act in defiance of one's nature as a human being.**

Yet that is the meaning of the moral-practical dichotomy. **When one claims, "It is immoral but practical," one is maintaining, "It cripples my nature as a human being, but it is beneficial to me"--which is a contradiction.**

Rights, in particular, are not something pulled from the sky or decreed by societal whim. Rights are moral principles, established by reference to the needs inherent in man's nature qua man. "Rights are conditions of existence required by man's nature for his proper survival." (Ayn Rand)

Every organism has a basic means of survival; for man, that means is: reason. Man is the rational animal, **homo sapiens**. Rights are moral principles that **spell out the terms of social interaction required** for a rational being to **survive** and flourish. **Since the reasoning mind cannot function under physical coercion, the basic social requirement of man's survival is: freedom.** Rights prescribe freedom by proscribing coercion.

"If man is to live on earth, it is right for him to use his mind, it is right to act on his own free judgment, it is right to work for his values and to keep the product of his work." (Ayn Rand)

Rights reflect the fundamental alternative of voluntary consent or brute force. The reign of force is in no one's interest; the system of **voluntary cooperation** by mutual consent **is the precondition of anyone achieving his actual interests.**

C. Peter **Timmer** – senior research scholar at the Center for Global Development – 2004 "Adding Value through Policy-Oriented Research: Reflections of a Scholar-Practitioner" in *What's Economics Worth? Valuing Policy Research* eds. Philip J. Pardey and Vincent H. Smith. Johns Hopkins University Press p. 140-141 [nfb]

Politics is frequently invoked as the reason why good economic policies cannot be adopted. Sometimes this means that a broad, popular opposition to a policy can jeopardize even elected governments. Sometimes politics means that narrow vested interests will be harmed by the policies proposed and they can be expected to use their influence on policymakers to prevent the change. For example, unions or the military often oppose increases in food prices or devaluations of a country's currency. Sometimes politics just means that the minister does not think a change in policy is a good idea. In addition, when officials are criticized for a lack of political will to implement needed policy reforms, it is forgotten that virtually all changes in agricultural price policy hurt someone's interests, vested or not.

In some political environments, policy analysis based on economics is irrelevant because a political constraint is binding. Such systems tend to be dominated by an individual personality or a powerful ideology, rather than by an orientation to economic growth or a complex amalgam of rent-seeking interest groups. **But societies do change from one type of political system to another, often in astonishingly short periods of time, and policy analysts who are irrelevant under one regime may be essential under the next. A society that can train and preserve its analytical talent even when that talent has no influence on policy can avoid the long and painful process of rebuilding this capacity.** China's anti-analytical ideology in the early 1970s nearly destroyed its indigenous capacity to evaluate policy trade-offs in a more market-oriented rural economy. By comparison, the growth-oriented politics of Indonesia introduced after the termination of the personal and ideological politics of Sukarno placed a cadre of economists in the cabinet and made the country more conducive to effective policy analysis. However, the influence of these economists waned in the early 1990s as President Suharto's children became increasingly influential players in both economics and politics, reducing the potential for policy analysis to identify and deal with policy problems (Grindle and Thomas 1991).

For good reasons or bad, **the political constraint is always important. The task of the policy analyst, however, is not to incorporate the constraints into the analysis,** thus hoping to design policies **that are acceptable. Rather, analysts need to determine which dimension of a policy is objectionable, to whom, and to what degree. The analyst must ask whether it is possible to design compensating programs or an information campaign to clarify exactly who gains and loses under the new policy.** This approach can be risky, especially when the vested interests in question are close to power, or are simply powerful. **Sometimes** policy analysis can be a feeble instrument for inducing change; at other times, **courage and simple facts bring surprising results.**

2NC IMPACT – A2 DEMOCRACY

DEMOCRACIES ENCOURAGE WARS OF TOTAL ANNIHILATION.

HOPPE, distinguished fellow at the Ludwig von Mises Institute and professor of economics

@ U of Nevada, 2K6

Hans-Hermann, Reflections on State and War, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/hoppe/hoppe17.html>

In blurring the distinction between the rulers and the ruled ("we all rule ourselves"), democracy strengthened the identification of the public with a particular state. Rather than dynastic property disputes which could be resolved through conquest and occupation, democratic wars became ideological battles: clashes of civilizations, which could only be resolved through cultural, linguistic, or religious domination, subjugation and, if necessary, extermination. It became increasingly difficult for members of the public to extricate themselves from personal involvement in war. Resistance against higher taxes to fund a war was considered treasonous. Because the democratic state, unlike a monarchy, was "owned" by all, conscription became the rule rather than the exception. And with mass armies of cheap and hence easily disposable conscripts fighting for national goals and ideals, backed by the economic resources of the entire nation, all distinctions between combatants and noncombatants fell by the wayside. Collateral damage was no longer an unintended side-effect but became an integral part of warfare. "Once the state ceased to be regarded as 'property' of dynastic princes," Michael Howard noted, and became instead the instrument of powerful forces dedicated to such abstract concepts as Liberty, or Nationality, or Revolution, which enabled large numbers of the population to see in that state the embodiment of some absolute Good for which no price was too high, no sacrifice too great to pay; then the 'temperate and indecisive contests' of the rococo age appeared as absurd anachronisms. [*ibid.* 75–76]

CAPITALISM IS BETTER FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE—RECENT STUDIES CONCLUDE.

BANDOW, Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute, 2K5

Doug, The Cato Institute, Spreading Capitalism Is Good for Peace, November 12, 2005, http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5193

But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states. Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of *Economic Freedom in the World*, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." Capitalism is by far the more important factor. 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. Positive economic trends are not enough to prevent war, but then, neither is democracy. It long has been obvious that democracies are willing to fight, just usually not each other. Contends Gartzke, "liberal political systems, in and of themselves, have no impact on whether states fight." In particular, poorer democracies perform like non-democracies. He explains: "Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels."

2NC IMPACT – A2 ENVIRONMENT

NO INCENTIVE TO POLLUTE YOUR OWN PROPERTY—SCOTLAND PROVES. CAPITALISM DOT ORG, NO DATE

“Environmentalism and capitalism”, <http://www.capitalism.org/faq/environment.htm>

Doesn't capitalism destroy the environment? No. **Capitalism** is the system of individual rights. It **is the greatest protector of man's environment**' (as opposed to the protection of the environment at the expense of man's wellbeing). How is this possible? **Under capitalism all property is privately owned. If you pollute your own property that is your business (but in doing so you reduce the property value which would not be in your selfinterest).** However, **the minute your pollution spreads to another person's property, and causes objectively provable damage, the owners of that property can sue you as a matter of right. The right to property is not the privilege to damage or pollute the property of others. Witness that the privately owned locks and streams of Scotland are far cleaner than the government owned cesspools of socialist India. What is the solution to pollution?** As for the disposing of the pollution of factories, this is **a technological solution -- and capitalism, as the system of technological progress, is the only system that can provide such a solution.**

CAPITALISM IS NECESSARY FOR THE PROSPERITY REQUIRED FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT.

TAYLOR, director of natural resource studies at the Cato Institute, 2K3

Jerry, The Cato Institute, Happy Earth Day? Thank Capitalism, 4/23/2003, http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3073

Indeed, we wouldn't even have environmentalists in our midst were it not for capitalism. Environmental **amenities**, after all, **are luxury goods**. America -- like much of the Third World today -- had no environmental movement to speak of until living standards rose sufficiently so that we could turn our attention from simply providing for food, shelter, and a reasonable education to higher "quality of life" issues. **The richer you are, the more likely you are to be an environmentalist. And people wouldn't be rich without capitalism. Wealth not only breeds environmentalists, it begets environmental quality. There are dozens of studies showing that, as per capita income initially rises from subsistence levels, air and water pollution increases correspondingly. But once per capita income hits between \$3,500 and \$15,000 (dependent upon the pollutant), the ambient concentration of pollutants begins to decline just as rapidly as it had previously increased. This relationship is found for virtually every significant pollutant in every single region of the planet.** It is an iron law. Given that wealthier societies use more resources than poorer societies, such findings are indeed counterintuitive. But the data don't lie. How do we explain this? The obvious answer -- that wealthier societies are willing to trade-off the economic costs of government regulation for environmental improvements and that poorer societies are not -- is only partially correct. In the United States, pollution declines generally predated the passage of laws mandating pollution controls. In fact, for most pollutants, declines were greater before the federal government passed its panoply of environmental regulations than after the EPA came upon the scene. Much of this had to do with individual demands for environmental quality. People who could afford cleaner-burning furnaces, for instance, bought them. People who wanted recreational services spent their money accordingly, creating profit opportunities for the provision of untrammelled nature. Property values rose in cleaner areas and declined in more polluted areas, shifting capital from Brown to Green investments. Market agents will supply whatever it is that people are willing to spend money on. And when people are willing to spend money on environmental quality, the market will provide it. Meanwhile, **capitalism rewards efficiency and punishes waste. Profit-hungry companies found ingenious ways to reduce the natural resource inputs necessary to produce all kinds of goods, which in turn reduced environmental demands on the land and the amount of waste that flowed through smokestacks and water pipes. As we learned to do more and more with a given unit of resources, the waste involved** (which manifests itself in the form of pollution) **shrank.**

2NC IMPACT – A2 ENVIRONMENT

Maximization of freedoms under capitalism protects the environment

BAST, 1994

Joseph, president, Heartland Institute, ECO-SANITY, p. 193. (DRGOC/E319)

It is time to update our attitudes toward capitalism, and particularly our understanding of how it puts “a proper price on environmental resources.” Capitalism is based on a system of markets and private property rights. **When rights are correctly defined and enforced, capitalism will protect the environment for four reasons: It creates incentives to do the right things; It generates and distributes needed information; It enables people to trade things or rights in order to solve problems** that otherwise can’t be solved; **and It enables property rights to evolve over time. The free-enterprise system creates wealth, rewards efficiency, and protects the environment better than any other system yet devised by man.** The tireless campaign against this system by some quarters of the environmental movement is wrong-headed and counterproductive.

2NC IMPACT – A2 HEGEMONY

ALTRUISM DESTROYS WAR FIGHTING – WASTES KEY RESOURCES ON HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS AND EMBOLDENS OUR ENEMIES.

LEWIS, 2K6

John, The Military Doctrine of Altruism, Capitalism Magazine, <http://www.capmag.com/article.asp?ID=4812>

Since altruism provides no specific goals for war—it says only that, whatever our goals, they must be good for others and not self-interested—a lack of purpose is the inevitable result of the new military doctrine. The decline of civilian support in America for the Iraq war is a consequence of the inability to understand why one American should die for the Iraqis. And the contempt for America in the Middle East is the result of our unwillingness to assert ourselves or to destroy those spreading anti-American propaganda in the region. What American altruists see as virtuous deference to the needs of others, our enemies overseas take as weakness of will and submission. Some commentators have praised this new military doctrine, while whitewashing its implications. Counter-insurgency war is not about victory or defeat, runs one argument; democracy for others is our purpose and will be the "final stage" of the war. We should fight on until the enemy establishes an electoral "Vote for Liberty!" campaign, blanking out the fact that "liberty" has a specific meaning, that people who do not understand it cannot be expected to defend it, and that any moral standard which requires us to sacrifice our liberty for theirs is a repudiation of liberty at its root. The real problem, say others, is "leftists" who want to "cut and run"—evading the fact that the New Left political and economic agenda has been adopted lock, stock, and barrel by the New Conservatives. "Peace without Victors" was the call of liberal Woodrow Wilson in 1918 and is the call of conservatives today. Just War Theory itself is a leftist construct that has been embraced by conservative leaders, in many cases for its Christian overtones. Mr. Cheney may chide Mr. Kerry—but the Bush administration has taken the democrat's advice. Military experts are warning that we do not have enough resources to continue "fighting" this way. Since the military's job is now to "counter" an endless "insurgency," we would need as many army squads as there are buildings and street corners in the Middle East. Proponents claim that such a war may take fifteen years for Iraq alone—without considering the support flowing in from surrounding areas or the increasing threats to America from other parts of the world. The doctrine is a prescription for a stream of American body-bags, with no end in sight because no victory is being pursued.

2NC IMPACT – A2 LIFE > VALUES

Objectivist values outweigh pure biological life claims – freedom makes life worth living

RAND, MARCH 1964

Ayn, Playboy Interview: Ayn Rand, <http://www.playboy.com/articles/ayn-rand-playboy-interview/index.html>

PLAYBOY: Would you be willing to die for your cause, and should your followers be willing to die for it? And for the truly nonsacrificial Objectivist, is any cause worth dying for?

RAND: The answer to this is made plain in my book. In *Atlas Shrugged* I explain that a man has to live for, and when necessary, fight for, his values—because the whole process of living consists of the achievement of values. Man does not survive automatically. He must live like a rational being and accept nothing less. He cannot survive as a brute. Even the simplest value, such as food, has to be created by man, has to be planted, has to be produced. The same is true of his more interesting, more important achievements. All values have to be gained and kept by man, and, if they are threatened, he has to be willing to fight and die, if necessary, for his right to live like a rational being. You ask me, would I be willing to die for Objectivism? I would. But what is more important, I am willing to live for it—which is much more difficult.

2NC IMPACT – A2 TIMEFRAME

Their inflated impact scenarios are used as fear mongering to extort property and liberty

Thomas Sowell, Rose and Milton Friedman Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, 1998

“Who Says the Globe Is Warming?” *Hoover Digest*, <http://www.hooverdigest.org/982/sowell.html>

One tip-off on the shakiness of the evidence behind this latest drive to expand big government controls in the name of "global warming" is that its advocates are saying "we can't wait" to be sure. That argument proves too much. Why couldn't we wait to be sure when global cooling was the hysteria of the day back in the 1970s? **If we are going to let Washington grab more of our money and expand their power over our lives every time they can throw a scare into us, then look for a lot of people to be saying "Boo!" about a lot of things.**

2NC IMPACT – A2 SECURITY THREATS

Security threats are used to bolster a repressive racketeer state

TILLY, 1985

Charles, War Making and State Making as Organized Crime, From Brining the State Back In, pg 171

Apologists for particular governments and for government in general commonly argue, precisely, that they offer protection from local and external violence. They claim that the prices they charge barely cover the costs of protection. They call people who complain about price of protection “anarchists,” “subversives,” or both at once. But consider the definition of a racketeer as someone who creates a threat and then charges for its reduction. Governments’ provision of protection, by this standard, often qualifies as racketeering. To the extent that the threats against which a given government protects its citizens are imaginary or are consequences of its own activities, the government has organized a protection racket. Since governments themselves commonly simulate, stimulate, or even fabricate threats of external war and since the repressive and extractive activities of governments often constitute the largest current threats to the livelihoods of their own citizens, many governments operate in essentially the same ways as racketeers. There is, of course, a difference: Racketeers, by the conventional definition, operate without the sanctity of governments.

2NC FRAMEWORK – A2 POLITICS GOOD/A2 PERM

Statist political calculations violate our framework – freedom can never be compromised

SHAFFER, November 14th 2000

Butler, teaches at the Southwestern University School of Law, Why I Do Not Vote, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/shaffer1.html>

One of the sadder comments that I heard, just prior to the recent election, was from a radio talk show host whose thoughtful and analytical mind I generally respect. In response to a caller who complained that Gov. Bush was philosophically inconsistent upon some issue, he declared that "politics is the art of compromise," and that if one wanted principled consistency, one could find it "only in a religion." It is this attitude upon which I wish to focus, for I believe that the conflicts we experience – both within ourselves as individuals and socially – derive from a sense of division. The attitude that one's philosophic principles are nothing more than interesting "ideas" that have no relevance to how we behave with others – an attitude that is implicit in this talk show host's remarks – is what is destroying us, both individually and societally. It derives from the same sentiment, articulated in the actions of Bill Clinton, that truth-telling is simply one of a number of strategies available in efforts to reach political "compromise"; that a lie is as good as the truth if you can get others to believe it. It **is the notion that principles are nothing more than fungible commodities** – to be traded according to the prices dictated by prevailing fashion – that now directs the seemingly endless cycle of vote recounts in Florida. As Groucho Marx put it: "Those are my principles. If you don't like them, I have others." I have long found nourishment in the words of Richard Weaver: "**ideas have consequences.**" **If I am of the view that politics** is destroying our world – and let us not forget that politics **managed to kill off some 200,000,000 of our fellow humans in the 20th century alone – am I prepared to direct my energies into such a destructive system?** If I answer "yes," which I would do if I voted, then do my philosophic principles have any real-world meaning to them, or are they simply amusing ideas to be talked about, debated, or dispersed across cyberspace? **If I cannot end the division within myself by living with integrity** (i.e., **by having my behavior and my principles integrated into a coherent whole**) **then what hope is there for the rest** of mankind doing so? I am mankind, as are you, and as Carl Jung so eloquently put it: "if the individual is not truly regenerated in spirit, society cannot be either"; that **the individual must realize "that he is the one important factor and that the salvation of the world consists in the salvation of the individual soul."** **To participate in politics is to consciously devote one's energies to mass-mindedness; to the statist proposition that collective thinking and collective behavior preempt the will of the individual.**

2NC PERMUTATION – A2 DO BOTH

Our moral framework cannot be compromised – the perm only masks the affirmatives dangerous ideology

Ludwig von Mises - dean of the Austrian School – 1949

“The Role of Ideas” from chapter 9 of *Human Action* <http://mises.org/story/2841> [nfb]

A critical examination of the philosophical systems constructed by mankind's great thinkers has very often revealed fissures and flaws in the impressive structure of those seemingly consistent and coherent bodies of comprehensive thought. Even the genius in drafting a worldview sometimes fails to avoid contradictions and fallacious syllogisms. The ideologies accepted by public opinion are still more infected by the shortcomings of the human mind. They are mostly an eclectic juxtaposition of ideas utterly incompatible with one another. They cannot stand a logical examination of their content. Their inconsistencies are irreparable and defy any attempt to combine their various parts into a system of ideas compatible with one another. Some authors try to justify the contradictions of generally accepted ideologies by pointing out the alleged advantages of a compromise, however unsatisfactory from the logical point of view, for the smooth functioning of interhuman relations. They refer to the popular fallacy that life and reality are "not logical"; they contend that a contradictory system may prove its expediency or even its truth by working satisfactorily while a logically consistent system would result in disaster. There is no need to refute anew such popular errors. Logical thinking and real life are not two separate orbits. Logic is for man the only means to master the problems of reality. What is contradictory in theory, is no less contradictory in reality. No ideological inconsistency can provide a satisfactory, i.e., working, solution for the problems offered by the facts of the world. The only effect of contradictory ideologies is to conceal the real problems and thus to prevent people from finding in time an appropriate policy for solving them. Inconsistent ideologies may sometimes postpone the emergence of a manifest conflict. But they certainly aggravate the evils which they mask and render a final solution more difficult. They multiply the agonies, they intensify the hatreds, and make peaceful settlement impossible. It is a serious blunder to consider ideological contradictions harmless or even beneficial. The main objective of praxeology and economics is to substitute consistent, correct ideologies for the contradictory tenets of popular eclecticism. There is no other means of preventing social disintegration and of safeguarding the steady improvement of human conditions than those provided by reason. Men must try to think through all the problems involved up to the point beyond which a human mind cannot proceed farther. They must never acquiesce in any solutions conveyed by older generations, they must always question anew every theory and every theorem, they must never relax in their endeavors to brush away fallacies and to find the best possible cognition. They must fight error by unmasking spurious doctrines and by expounding truth.

The permutation leads to moral confusion

Rothbard, Dean of Austrian School, Head of Mises Institute, 73

Murray N., For A New Liberty, The Libertarian Manifesto, <http://www.mises.org/rothbard/newlibertywhole.asp#p263>

Thus, the libertarian must never allow him (or her)self to be trapped into any sort of proposal for "positive" governmental action; in his perspective, the role of government should only be to remove itself from all spheres of society just as rapidly as it can be pressured to do so. Neither should there be any contradictions in rhetoric. The libertarian should not indulge in any rhetoric, let alone any policy recommendations, which would work against the eventual goal. Thus, suppose that a libertarian is asked to give his views on a specific tax cut. Even if he does not feel that he can at the moment call loudly for tax abolition, the one thing that he (or she) must not do is add to his support of a tax cut such unprincipled rhetoric as, "Well, of course, some taxation is essential . . .," etc. Only harm to the ultimate objective can be achieved by rhetorical flourishes which confuse the public and contradict and violate principle.

2NC PERMUTATION – A2 DO BOTH

COMPROMISING OUR ETHIC WITH THE PERMUTATION ENDS IN TYRANNY.

RAND, 1967

Ayn, The Virtue of Selfishness, page 86

There can be no compromise between a property owner and a burglar; offering the burglar a single teaspoon of one's silverware would not be a compromise but a total surrender – the recognition of his right to one's property. What value or concession did the burglar offer in return? And once the principle of unilateral concessions is accepted as the base of a relationship for both parties, it is only a matter of time before the burglar would seize the rest. As an example of this process, observe the present foreign policy of the United States. There can be no compromise between freedom and government controls; to accept just a few controls is to surrender the principle of inalienable rights and to substitute for it the principle of the government's unlimited, arbitrary power, thus delivering oneself into gradual enslavement. As an example of this process, observe the present domestic policy of the United States. There can be no compromise on basic principles or on fundamental issues. What would you regard as a "compromise between life and death? Or between truth and falsehood? Or between reason and irrationality?

2NC ETHICS – REJECTION KEY

The Government is ultimately coercive-the first step is to reject the affirmative.

LEWIS, 2009

Dr. John David, Dept. of Social Science Duke University, Duke University, 4/15/09, <http://www.classicalideals.com/CharlotteTeaPartySpeechWord.doc>, accessed on 7/11/09, M.E

If we are going to challenge this monstrosity, if we are going to expunge this cancer, then this is what we must reject. We need to regain the vision of ourselves held by the American Founders. We need to stand up, and assert ourselves as autonomous moral beings, with the right to our own life, liberty and the pursuit of our own happiness. We need to reject the claim that we are weak and dependent beggars, and to assert our own competence to run our own lives. It is going to take as great a commitment to destroy this cancer as it took to build it. We're going to have to be strong, we're going to have to be independent in our thinking, and we are going to have to reject handouts when they are offered to us. And we're going to have to speak out. At its heart, the economic and political crisis is a deeper problem—a moral problem. The cause of the crisis today is the worship of need, and the view of man as too stupid to act for his own sake, and worthy of being milked of all his values, to provide for others. This is what we must reject. Do you think that this is a conspiracy to seize your wealth? It is far worse than that. As Ayn Rand wrote, "It is not your wealth that they're after. Theirs is a conspiracy against the mind, which means: against life and man."

2NC ETHICS – TURN THUMPERS

ALL YOUR ‘PEOPLE WILL EXPLOIT A LACK OF GOVERNMENTAL REGULATIONS’ ARGUMENTS PROVE THE INEVITABLE CIRCUMVENTION OF GOVERNMENTAL REFORMS.

MACHAN, Professor of philosophy, Auburn University, 1995

Tibor, PRIVATE RIGHTS AND PUBLIC ILLUSIONS, 1995, p. 131-2

In response it might be claimed that people are selfish and greedy, erecting an economic system run by "the profit motive" merely plays into the hands of selfishness and greed, with the predictable result that an unregulated market will violate many more rights than a government-regulated economy. For example, greed is likely to engender recklessness, negligence, even cruelty and callousness. What is called the public interest or the common good is also threatened by such a system, and individuals rights as conceived by Kelman and Claybrook will be violated with abandon. But this defense of regulations dies by its own hands. If people are selfish and greedy, as this defense contends, then their selfishness and greed will merely show up at a different place in a regulated market - namely, in the offices of politicians and special interest groups. If persons are selfish and greedy as a general, persistent trait (instead of merely not and then, off and on, depending in goodwill that is just as probable as its opposite), it does not appear that this could be eradicated by passing regulatory statutes and by creating government agencies. Indeed, the law and economic and public choice schools of economic analysis makes exactly this point: Starting with their assumption that all human beings are essentially maximizers, they show that this implies that in the public sector people carry on just as they would in the private sector--aiming to fulfill their own desires or vested interests. And that certainly undermines the view that such persons would guard the marketplace instead of seek whatever economic advantage they could get by their role as such guardians.

BIG GOVERNMENTS ARE MORE VIOLENT THAN PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS.

UYL, Professor of philosophy, Bellerme College, 1984

Douglas, The Philosophic Thought of Ayn Rand, p. 178-179

Rand adopts the essential Weberian view that government possess a monopoly of the legal use of physical force. The monopoly status of government means that the government possess great potential to violate rights. The strictures on government action are, therefore, the same as the strictures placed upon individuals - actions that initiate force must not be taken. Moreover, since the government possesses a monopoly on the legal use of force, the potential consequences of its violation of rights is more serious than the criminal's violation of rights (even if we collectively aggregate the potential consequences of all criminals at any time). These potential consequences of governmental abuse require that specific limitations be placed upon government. The regimes of Stalin, Hitler, and Mao are constant reminders that the violations of rights is more often and to a greater degree perpetrated by government than by criminals.

YOUR TURNS ARE ONLY DESCRIPTIVE OF PARTIAL EGOISM – AN ETHIC THAT DEFENDS THE INDIVIDUAL WOULD AVOID YOUR TURNS.

CLEVELAND, Professor of Business Administration and Economics at Birmingham-Southern College, 2K2

Paul A., The Failure of Utilitarian Ethics in Political Economy, *The Journal of Private Enterprise*, <http://www.independent.org/publications/article.asp?id=1602>

Another point that Rothbard made in his critique is that positive and negative externalities are not symmetric when viewed from a property rights perspective that embraces a more traditional view of ethics. In fact, from this perspective the two are radically different events. In the case of a negative externality, the failure that has taken place is not a failure of the market, but a failure of the governing authority to adequately protect the property rights of all the participants of the market. In this case, issues of pollution are the result of a violation of the property rights of some people by others in order to garner greater benefits. Alternatively, no such violation of property rights can be asserted in the case of positive externalities. Rather, any attempt on the part of government to extend such benefits could only be had by violating the underlying property rights of the person whose actions happen to give rise to external benefits. Nevertheless, as Rothbard pointed out, proponents of government action will invariably attempt to make their case using two lines of attack. First, those who favor government action complain that a person engaged in an activity that benefits others does too little of it. In this case, the proposition put forward is that such gifts to the community are too small.

2NC ETHICS – A2 ALTRUISM GOOD

FIRST, ALTRUISM CREATES SOCIOPATHS – MAKES THE OTHER AN ENEMY TO THE SELF. ALL GOOD BECOMES NOT ONLY IMPOSSIBLE BUT UNDESIRABLE. GENDERED LANGUAGE IN CONTEXT.

RAND, 1964

(Ayn, *The Virtue of Selfishness*, pg47)

By elevating the issue of helping others into the central and primary issue of ethics, altruism has destroyed the concept of any authentic benevolence or good will among men. It has indoctrinated men with the idea that to value another human being is an act of selflessness, thus implying that a man can have no personal interest in others—that any love, respect or admiration a man may feel for others is not and cannot be a source of his own enjoyment, but is a threat to his existence, a sacrificial blank check signed over to his loved ones The men who accept that dichotomy but choose its other side, the ultimate products of altruism's dehumanizing influence, are those psychopaths who do not challenge altruism's basic premise, but proclaim their rebellion against self-sacrifice by announcing that they are totally indifferent to anything living and would not lift a finger to help a man or a dog left mangled by a hit-and-run driver who is usually one of their own kind.

SECOND, ALTRUISM ASSUMES A MALEVOLENT UNIVERSE THAT CREATES PARALYSIS.

ADAMS, Clinical Psychologist and Researcher, 2K7

DR. S. J., [Altruism and Mental Illness: Self-Sacrifice is Mind Sacrifice](http://www.fireflysun.com/AltruismandMentalIllness.htm), <http://www.fireflysun.com/AltruismandMentalIllness.htm>

A Nightmare View of Existence: More deeply, altruism is based on and reinforces, as Ayn Rand indicates, a “malevolent universe” premise. That is, it's not just one's fellow man for whom one has no respect; it is the world, even the universe, in which we all live that he condemns. If altruism requires that one be on constant lookout for misery in man, then he must also seek out places where misery exists, especially misery caused by acts of nature. Events like hurricane Katrina are, to committed altruists, the essence of life on earth. Such disasters are the normal, the to-be-expected in life. To them, man is doomed because the world is doomed. We can't escape and the destructive path of the world cannot be changed. Therefore, give up and give in. Give yourself over. Submit. Obey. A Hopelessly Cynical Amoralism: Upon reaching this point, one gives up on ethics altogether. Why bother pursuing any values or using any virtues if one lives in a world that is doomed to destruction and is surrounded by miserable little losers who can't help themselves? Why not “go along to get along?” Why not give up? Isn't it the meek who shall inherit the earth?

2NC IMPACT – A2 LITTLE IMPACTS OUTWEIGH

THIRD, YOUR ETHICS ARE A WORSE FORM OF OURS – YOUR OBLIGATION TO THE OTHER QUICKLY BECOMES NOTHING BUT A NEW VERSION OF THE WHITE MANS BURDEN.

ZIZEK, professor at the Institute for Sociology, Ljubljana, 2K6

Slavoj, Smashing the Neighbor's Face, <http://www.lacan.com/zizsmash.htm>

The relationship between Judaism as a formal "spiritual" structure and Jews as its empirical bearers is difficult to conceptualize. The problem is how to avoid the deadlock of the dilemma: either Jews are privileged as an empirical group (which means their spirituality, inaccessible to others, is also ultimately of no relevance to them), or Jews are a contingent bearer of a universal structure - in this case, the dangerous conclusion is at hand that, precisely in order to isolate and assert this formal structure, the "principle" of Jewishness, one has to eliminate, erase, the "empirical" Jews. Furthermore, the problem with those who emphasize how Jews are not simple a nation, an ethnic group, like others, side by side to others, is that, in this very claim, they define Jews in contrast to other "normal" groups, as their constitutive exception. The more standard answer to Levinas's ethic of radical responsibility would have been that one can truly love others only if one loves oneself. However, at a more radical level, is there not something inherently FALSE in such a link between the responsibility for/to the other and questioning one's own right to exist? Although Levinas asserts this asymmetry as universal (everyone of us is in the position of primordial responsibility towards others), does this asymmetry not effectively end up in privileging ONE particular group which assumes responsibility for all others, which embodies in a privileged way this responsibility, directly stands for it - in this case, of course, Jews, so that, again, one is ironically tempted to speak of the "Jewish man's (ethical) burden"? The idea of a chosen people must not be taken as a sign of pride. It does not involve being aware of exceptional rights, but of exceptional duties. It is the prerogative of a moral consciousness itself. It knows itself at the centre of the world and for it the world is not homogeneous: for I am always alone in being able to answer the call, I am irreplaceable in my assumption of responsibility. (DF, 176-177) In other words, do we not get here - in a homology with Marx's forms of the expression of value - a necessary passage from simple and developed form (I am responsible for you, for all of you) to the general equivalent and then its reversal (I am the privileged site of responsibility for all of you, which is why you are all effectively responsible to me...)? And is this not the "truth" of such an ethical stance, thereby confirming the old Hegelian suspicion that every self-denigration secretly asserts its contrary? **It is like the proverbial white man's excessive Political Correctness of the Western white male who questions his own right to assert his cultural identity, while celebrating the exotic identity of others, thereby asserting his privileged status of the universal-neutral medium of recognizing other's identities... Self-questioning is always by definition the obverse of self-privileging; there is always something false about respect for others which is based on questioning of one's own right to exist.**

2NC ETHICS – A2 SERVICES KEY TO X

Social services in and of themselves may not be bad; government coercion makes it bad

John Hospers, USC Professor of Philosophy, 1971,

Libertarianism: A Political Philosophy for Tomorrow, p 300

"Higher taxes? That's good! I don't like it, but we need them! I'm a registered Democrat and I believe in these social services!" The libertarian would say to him, "The social services you speak of may or may not be fine—we would have to analyze them separately. But they should not be handled by the coercive activity of government. Whether you or I or Jonet want to support them should be up to us. If we don't believe in one, we shouldn't have to support it. If you do believe in it, nothing prevents you from paying toward its support yourself, and banding together with other individuals who will do the same. But by voting to make everybody help pay for your pet cause, you are voting for coercing them into spending their money for something they may not believe in, need, or want." "But shouldn't some income be guaranteed?" How can it be? The manufacturer's income and the businessman's income are not guaranteed; indeed, nothing is guaranteed on the free market. If he does not anticipate next year's market, and allocate his materials and employment accordingly, he won't have any income at all next year, or he may lose the whole company. His income depends on a thousand factors which he will have to predict and control with success; otherwise, disaster faces him, and the loss of years of time and effort and money. How, then, if the income of the maker and supplier of the goods is not guaranteed, can the income of the man who lives off of him be guaranteed. If he and his lose their income, there is nothing left to supply the incomes of those who live off of his earnings. You cannot distribute when the barrel is empty. And the more of his income you distribute now, the nearer to empty the barrel will become. The history of every welfare state is a living example of this.²³

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 CONSUMERISM/MATERIALISM BAD

Objectivism allows us to move beyond materialism while maximizing freedom

O'NEILL, October 9th 2007

Ben, researcher at the Australian National University and a political advisor in the Liberal Party of Australia, Does Capitalism Make Us More Materialistic? <http://mises.org/story/2697>

If we suppose that both alienable and inalienable goods are subject to diminishing marginal returns, it follows that, *ceteris paribus*, an increase in one kind of good will lead us to shift effort and time to the acquisition of the other kinds of goods. Thus, if we have more money, so that we can acquire additional alienable goods, then we will derive less marginal satisfaction from further additional alienable goods than we otherwise would. In this case, we will shift some of our effort and time away from acquiring alienable goods and towards acquiring inalienable goods. This is indeed what happens in a free-market economy when people rationally pursue their desires. Rothbard observes that It is nonsense to place the blame on "money" for the tendencies of some people to value exchangeable [alienable] goods highly as compared to some nonexchangeable [inalienable] goods. There is no force in the existence of the money economy that compels men to make such choices; money simply enables men to expand enormously their acquisition of exchangeable goods. ... As a matter of fact, the existence of the money economy has the reverse effect. ... The very fact that exchangeable consumers' goods are more abundant enables each individual to enjoy more of the nonexchangeable ones.[4] He further observes that an advancing market economy satisfies more and more of people's desires for exchangeable goods. As a result, the marginal utility of exchangeable goods tends to decline over time, while the marginal utility of nonexchangeable goods increases. In short, the greater satisfaction of "exchangeable" values confers a much greater marginal significance on the "nonexchangeable" values. Rather than foster "material" values, then, advancing capitalism does just the opposite.[5] From this analysis, we see that the increase in wealth that obtains in the free market leads to a greater diversion of effort to nonmaterial concerns. Thus we see that capitalism, and the gain of material goods it engenders, leads to less "materialism" and "consumerism" — in terms of effort and time — rather than more.

19th century empirically denies

O'NEILL, October 9th 2007

Ben, researcher at the Australian National University and a political advisor in the Liberal Party of Australia, Does Capitalism Make Us More Materialistic? <http://mises.org/story/2697>

Moreover, this same phenomenon can be seen on a larger scale historically, with the rise of antimaterialism accompanying the age of classical liberalism. Mises has observed the fallacy of criticisms of "materialism" that arose during this period: It is a purposeful distortion of facts to blame the age of [classical] liberalism for an alleged materialism. The nineteenth century was not only a century of unprecedented improvement in technical methods of production and in the material well-being of the masses. It did much more than extend the average length of human life. Its scientific and artistic accomplishments are imperishable. It was an age of immortal musicians, writers, poets, painters, and sculptors; it revolutionized philosophy, economics, mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology. And, for the first time in history, it made the great works and the great thought accessible to the common man.[7] Indeed, the 19th century was an age of musicians, writers, poets, painters, and sculptors precisely because it was an age of large advances in freedom and wealth. Poets and painters who chose to exercise their creative drive — even where their talents would not lead them to fortune — did so because it made them happier than if they had not. And it made them happier, precisely because the alternative — of effort and time employed for greater material wealth — was of less importance than it would have been under the poor conditions that existed centuries earlier.

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 DOGMA/OBJ IS COLLECTIVIST

Objectivism encourages a free human intellect, not dogmatism

RAND, MARCH 1964

Ayn, Playboy Interview: Ayn Rand, <http://www.playboy.com/articles/ayn-rand-playboy-interview/index.html>

PLAYBOY: If widely accepted, couldn't Objectivism harden into a dogma?

RAND: No. I have found that Objectivism is its own protection against people who might attempt to use it as a dogma. Since Objectivism requires the use of one's mind, those who attempt to take broad principles and apply them unthinkingly and indiscriminately to the concretes of their own existence find that it cannot be done. They are then compelled either to reject Objectivism or to apply it. When I say apply, I mean that they have to use their own mind, their own thinking, in order to know how to apply Objectivist principles to the specific problems of their own lives.

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 DON'T HELP THE POOR

Poverty is caused by lack of initiative not the upper class

REED, May 18th 2005

Fred, author of Nekkid in Austin: Drop Your Inner Child Down a Well, Thoughts On Poverty, Lew Rockwell, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/reed/reed64.html>

I now encounter charges that culpability for the usually unimpressive health of the purportedly poor rests with McDonald's, which sells them foods loaded with fat and salt. Indeed McDonald's does. But eating Big Macs is a choice, isn't it? The poor could buy better food at the supermarket. Further, they know they could. They tend to watch a lot of television, with its endless health warnings. They eat fat because they want to eat fat. Is this, in the tiresome phrase, blaming the victim? Absolutely. When the victim is to blame, blame him. If I get drunk and suffer a hangover, is it your fault? Jim Beam's fault? Why? Some will object that the (slight) poverty of the American poor somehow forces them to make bad decisions, which they know to be bad decisions. Well, if the poor have no free will, and haplessly do what their environment ordains, can not the management of McDonald's plead the same? If the poor of America were truly penurious, and forcibly kept so, I would see things differently. The sweated children of New York, the slaves of the South, the virtual slaves of the Industrial Revolution in England – these had a cause for complaint. They suffered greatly, and had no way out. Neither did they have the subsidized housing of today, the welfare, and the leisure consequent to these, nor free medical care, nor public schools which by law they had to attend, nor free libraries, nor the array of special and unearned privilege called "affirmative action." Today's poor do have them. They also live in a society that has begged them, prodded them, enticed them to do something with and for themselves. They haven't. They aren't interested. And neither, any longer, am I.

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 DROPPED ARGUMENTS

OBJECTIVE MORALITY JUSTIFIES DROPPING ILLOGICAL ARGUMENTS – SOME CHALLENGES AREN'T WORTHY OF RESPONSE.

BOUDREAUX, 2006

Donald J., chairman of the economics department of George Mason University and former president of FEE - November 2006 The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty Vol. 56 No. 9 "Thoughts on Freedom ~ On Bad Arguments" <http://www.fee.org/publications/the-freeman/article.asp?aid=6596>

Intellectual skepticism and humility are always necessary. None of us should ever become so confident in his own genius that he refuses to take seriously challenges to his beliefs and arguments. But **not all challenges deserve serious attention. Challenges that are illogical, challenges that display a fundamental absence of clear and logical thought, should be dismissed out of hand. To engage them is to waste time—**illogically.

THE IMPACT IS POLICY EDUCATION – RELYING ON UNCLEAR THINKING IN ARGUMENTATION RISKS POLICY FAILURE.

BOUDREAUX, 2006

Donald J., chairman of the economics department of George Mason University and former president of FEE - November 2006 The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty Vol. 56 No. 9 "Thoughts on Freedom ~ On Bad Arguments" <http://www.fee.org/publications/the-freeman/article.asp?aid=6596>

People who think clearly understand how to **distinguish logical from illogical arguments**. These people also recognize that an argument's relevance is just as important as its logical coherence. I've become more and more convinced that **many** of the **disputes that** typically **rage over** this or that **public-policy issue would disappear** if only **people were better, clearer thinkers**.

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 ECON CRISIS = ALT FAILS

Their evidence does not assume laissez-faire capitalism but the existing Keynesian system – our alternative solves economic crisis

BROOK AND WATKINS, November 13th 2008

Yaron, president of the Ayn Rand Center for Individual Rights and Don, writer at the Ayn Rand Center, Stop Blaming Capitalism for Government Failures, http://www.aynrand.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=21923&news_iv_ctrl=1021

But while capitalism may be a convenient scapegoat, it did not cause any of these problems. Indeed, whatever one wishes to call the unruly mixture of freedom and government controls that made up our economic and political system during the last three decades, one cannot call it capitalism. Take a step back. In the lead up to the “Reagan Revolution,” the explosive growth of government during the ’60s and ’70s had left the American economy in disarray. A crushing tax burden, runaway inflation, brutal unemployment, and economic stagnation had Americans looking for an alternative. That’s what Reagan offered, denouncing big government and promising a new “morning in America.”

Under Reagan, some taxes were reduced, inflation was subdued, a few regulations were relaxed--and the economy roared back to life. But while markets were able to function to a greater degree than in the immediate past, the regulatory and welfare state remained largely untouched, with government spending continuing to increase, as well as some taxes. Later administrations were even worse. Bush Jr., often laughably called a champion of free markets, presided over massive new governmental controls like Sarbanes-Oxley and massive new welfare programs like the prescription drug benefit.

None of this is consistent with capitalism. As the economic system that fully recognizes and protects individual rights, including the right to private property, capitalism means, in Ayn Rand’s words, “the abolition of any and all forms of government intervention in production and trade, the separation of State and Economics, in the same way and for the same reasons as the separation of Church and State.” Laissez-faire means laissez-faire: no welfare state entitlements, no Federal Reserve monetary manipulation, no regulatory bullying, no controls, no government interference in the economy. The government’s job under capitalism is single but crucial: to protect individual rights from violation by force or fraud.

America came closest to this system in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The result was an unprecedented explosion of wealth creation and consequent rise in the standard of living. Even now, when the fading remnants of capitalism are badly crippled by endless controls, we see that the freest countries--those which retain the most capitalist elements--have the highest standard of living.

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 FEMINISM

Objectivism isn't sexist – Treats women as equals

Gladstein, Associate Dean of Liberal Arts at UT El Paso, 99

(Mimi, "Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand," Page 224)

As far as her view of women and of human rights is concerned, Rand's work is entirely compatible with the dominant direction of nineteenth century feminism. Historically, feminism was born as a demand, not for special entitlements provided by means of political coercion, but for equal treatment with men before the law. These feminists did not view men as the enemy, or capitalism, but government. Their battle was with the state – and with the traditional, religious idea of a woman as man's subordinate. These women were individualists who fought to be treated as such: treated as persons. Rand's philosophy, Objectivism, holds that sexism, like racism, is a form of biological collectivism and therefore Objectivism would have entirely supported the demand of nineteenth century feminists for equal rights before the law, such as the right to vote, or to own property in one's own name, or to have legally unimpeded access to the marketplace. In addition, women historically have been taught that self-sacrifice is their noblest duty. Objectivism opposes the entire notion of human sacrifice, whether the sacrifice of self of others to others or others to self. It insists that human beings be treated as ends in themselves, not as means to the ends of others. In upholding an ethics of rational or enlightened self-interest, Objectivism champions a woman's right to live as a free independent entity. Finally, Rand's novels offer powerful role models of autonomous, self-assured, and self-assertive females who have been sources of inspiration to countless women. Looked at from the perspective of nineteenth-century individualist feminism, there is much in Rand to embrace and be enthused about.

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 FUTURE GENERATIONS

They establish a dictatorship of future generations – presentist calculations are the only rational way to ensure survival

Shue, 89 – Professor of Ethics and Public Life at Princeton University (Henry, Nuclear Deterrence and Moral Restraint, p. 64-5)

The issue raises interesting problems about obligations among generations. What obligations do we owe to future generations whose very existence will be affected by our risks? A crude utilitarian calculation would suggest that since the pleasures of future generations may last infinitely (or until the sun burns out), no risk that we take to assure certain values for our generation can compare with almost infinite value in the future. Thus we have no right to take such risks. In effect, such an approach would establish a dictatorship of future generations over the present one. The only permissible role for our generation would be biological procreation. If we care about other values in addition to survival, this crude utilitarian approach produces intolerable consequences for the current generation. Moreover, utility is too crude a concept to support such a calculation. We have little idea of what utility will mean to generations very distant from ours. We think we know something about our children, and perhaps our grandchildren, but what will people value 8,000 years from now? If we do not know, then there is the ironic prospect that something we deny ourselves now for the sake of a future generation may be of little value to them. A more defensible approach to the issue of justice among generations is the principle of equal access. Each generation should have roughly equal access to important values. We must admit that we shall not be certain of the detailed preferences of increasingly distant generations, but we can assume that they will wish equal chances of survival. On the other hand, there is no reason to assume that they would want survival as a sole value any more than the current generation does. On the contrary, if they would wish equal access to other values that give meaning to life, we could infer that they might wish us to take some risks of species extinction in order to provide them equal access to those values. If we have benefited from "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," why should we assume that the next generation would want only life?

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 HETERONORMATIVE

Rand's personal beliefs don't matter – Objectivism isn't heteronormative

Moskovitz, B.A. in philosophy from Harvard, 02

(Damian, "Homosexuality," http://www.objectivistcenter.org/cth-32-392-FAQ_Homosexuality.aspx)

While Ayn Rand did consider homosexuality to be immoral, this was only her personal view. The morality of homosexuality is not a philosophical issue per se, but one can use Objectivist principles to evaluate the morality of homosexuality in any given situation. **The essence of the Objectivist position is this:** Homosexuality can be a moral issue only to the extent that it is a matter of choice. Scientific evidence shows that, in many cases, people don't choose their sexual orientations—it is in their natures to prefer sexual relations with members of the same sex, members of the opposite sex, or both. On the other hand, people can choose whether to act in accordance with their natures, and since sex is essential to man's life and happiness, this is a moral issue. **It is morally right for people to act in accordance with their natures, whether heterosexual, homosexual, or anything in-between.** Objectivism holds that sex is morally important, but not for the traditionally cited reasons. While some believe that sex should be practiced only in order to procreate or only in accordance with the mandates of their religions, Objectivism holds that sex is morally important because it can promote one's life and happiness. Sex is not merely a hedonic process that produces immediate sensory pleasure. Sex, "[t]o a rational man... is an expression of self-esteem—a celebration of himself and of existence" (Ayn Rand, "Of Living Death," *The Objectivist*, Oct. 1968, 2). And for this man (or woman, mutatis mutandis), **sex is properly a physical expression of romantic love, "his response to his own highest values in the person of another"**—an integrated response of mind and body, of love and sexual desire" (ibid., 2). **Celebration of one's own life and of existence is essential to promoting one's happiness; thus, it is moral to make choices that allow oneself this celebration and immoral to deny or negate it.** So according to Objectivism, sex is potentially moral, but what about homosexuality? The few times Ayn Rand spoke publicly about homosexuality, her remarks were disparaging. She said that homosexuality is a manifestation of psychological "flaws, corruptions, errors, [and] unfortunate premises" and that it is both "immoral" and "disgusting" ("The Moratorium on Brains," Ford Hall Forum Lecture [Boston, 1971]). Apparently, she thought that heterosexuality was a universal fact of human nature. "The essence of femininity," she wrote, "is hero worship" (Ayn Rand, "About a Woman President," in *The Voice of Reason*, ed. Leonard Peikoff [New York: Penguin, 1989], 268), the worship of men as producers. It is human nature, she believed, for a woman of self-esteem to want to be ruled, in sexual matters, by a man worthy of ruling her, and for a man of self-esteem to want to rule, in sexual matters, a woman worthy of being ruled. To Rand, the "unfortunate premises" that lead to homosexuality are, presumably, premises that contradict this view of sex roles. (For further discussion and debate on Rand's views on sex, see Mimi Gladstein and Chris Sciabarra, eds., *Feminist Interpretations of Ayn Rand* [University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999].) Current psychobiological research indicates that Rand's conception of sex roles is, in part, mistaken. Biological factors such as genetics and prenatal development play substantial roles in determining sexual orientation. While the developmental mechanisms are not yet fully understood, it is known that many, if not most, homosexuals are attracted to members of the same sex by no choice of their own. Moreover, to the extent that homosexuality is not a product of choice, it is not a moral issue. As Ayn Rand wrote in *Atlas Shrugged* (New York: Penguin, 1957), "a sin without volition is a slap at morality and an insolent contradiction in terms: that which is outside the possibility of choice is outside the province of morality" (938). While sexual orientations may not be chosen, in many cases, what behaviors people exhibit in response to their orientations are chosen, and such behaviors can be evaluated morally. A person who by nature, rather than by choice, is more attracted to members of the same sex than the opposite sex still has the choice to recognize and act in accordance with this fact or to repress or act against it. If a person wishes to achieve happiness and promote his life, then he must, in a realm as morally important as sex, act in accordance with his nature. For example, it is morally right for a woman whose nature it is to be sexually attracted to women rather than men to become romantically involved with a woman she loves and desires. In contrast, it is morally wrong for a man whose nature it is to be sexually attracted to women rather than men to become romantically involved with a man rather than seeking out a woman. So there are contexts in which homosexual behavior is immoral (just as there are contexts in which heterosexual behavior is immoral), but there is nothing immoral about homosexuality per se. However, this moral fact has no political implications. While many conservatives believe that homosexuality should be outlawed and many liberals believe that homosexuals should be given special rights, **Objectivism holds that as long as no force is involved, people have the right to do as they please in sexual matters, whether or not their behavior is considered by others to be or is in fact moral. And since individual rights are grounded in the nature of human beings as human beings, homosexuals do not deserve any more or less rights than heterosexuals.**

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 OBJECTIVE TRUTH => NAZIS

Objective truth claims do not cause genocide

REISMAN, January 11th, 2004

George, author of *Capitalism: A Treatise on Economics* (Ottawa, Illinois: Jameson Books, 1996) and is the translator of Ludwig von Mises's *Epistemological Problems of Economics*, *Is Laissez-Faire a Threat to Freedom? An Answer to George Soros*

As to the alleged evil that laissez-faire capitalism is supposed to share with communism and Nazism, namely, its claim to "ultimate truth," Soros appears to be unaware of the fact that communism and Nazism were philosophically incompatible with claims to truth of any kind, ultimate or otherwise. Both rested on variants of the doctrine of determinism and denied the universal validity of the laws of logic. According to Marxism, an individual's ideas were not the result of his consideration of matters of true or false, but were automatically determined by his membership in an economic class and reflected the economic interests of that class. Thus, proletarians allegedly had one set of ideas based on alleged proletarian logic and the alleged class interests of proletarians, and their class enemies, the bourgeoisie, allegedly had another set of ideas based on alleged bourgeois logic and the alleged class interests of the bourgeoisie. According to Nazism, the "interests" and "logics" were along the lines of racial membership rather than membership in an economic class. Thus, the Nazis held that the ideas of an Aryan were based on "Aryan logic" and the interests of the Aryan Race, while the ideas of their enemies, such as the Jews, were based on "Jewish logic" and the interests of the Jewish Race. Obviously, the alleged science of Marxism is without any rational basis. Along with, and underlying, its doctrines of polylogism and class warfare is the labor theory of value carried to the point of utter absurdity, including the notion that the value of labor itself is determined by the quantity of labor required to produce it--i.e., by the quantity of labor required to produce the wage earner's minimum subsistence. It is on this nonsensical basis that Marxism develops the substance of its claim that profits are based on the exploitation of labor and that the impoverishment of the masses grows progressively worse under capitalism. So too any alleged scientific basis of Nazism is without rational foundation. This is the case not only because of Nazism's polylogism and doctrine of irreconcilable racial and national conflicts, and its viewing the human race from the perspective of an animal breeder, but also because of its socialism (effected through price and wage controls) and accompanying claims to be able to practice national economic planning, which would require the direction of the economic system by nothing less than an omniscient deity. (Nazism, it should never be forgotten stands for *Nazional Sozialismus*. Soros seems to be unaware of almost all of the serious, fundamental criticisms to be made of Marxism and Nazism. In fact, beyond his negative reference to doctrines of racial purity, the only other thing he says on the subject is, "One of Popper's accomplishments was to show that a theory like Marxism does not qualify as science"--as though Popper, rather than von Mises and Böhm-Bawerk had demonstrated this. (Karl Popper is Soros's main philosophical influence.) Soros appears almost entirely lacking in familiarity with procapitalist, antisocialist economic theory and political philosophy subsequent to Adam Smith and David Ricardo. The closest he comes to displaying any such familiarity is his characterization of F.A. Hayek as "one of the apostles of laissez-faire," which, unfortunately, is mistaken, inasmuch as Hayek was an advocate of major aspects of the welfare state, such as social security. Nowhere does Soros give evidence of having read anything by Ludwig von Mises or Ayn Rand, by far the two most important advocates of laissez-faire capitalism in the twentieth century. His lack of knowledge concerning the subject of his essay is made further evident in his attempt to deny the scientific basis of laissez-faire capitalism, which he correctly recognizes as economic theory. He writes: "One cannot simply equate market economics with Marxist economics." But in his very next sentence, he does so equate it: "Yet laissez-faire ideology, I contend, is just as much a perversion of supposedly scientific verities as Marxism-Leninism is." His basis for this outlandish claim is his assumption that what underlies the laissez-faire ideology is economic theory insofar as it is based on the doctrine of pure competition and perfect knowledge--a doctrine that the leading advocates of laissez-faire capitalism not only do not hold, but regard as utterly nonsensical. For example, a leading conclusion of the doctrine of pure competition is that rivalry is the opposite of competition. (For a full exposition and critique of this doctrine, see my book *Capitalism*, pp. 425-437.)

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 NO RATIONAL SUBJECT

Praxeology doesn't rely on the rational ideal, just that people seek to better their situation – they don't have to be infallible

G.A. Selgin - Professor of Economics at the University of Georgia – 1988 The Review of Austrian Economics Vol. 2 Num. 2 “Praxeology and Understanding: An Analysis of the Controversy in Austrian Economics” [nfb]

Praxeology does not make use of the neoclassical construct that Shackle calls "the rational ideal." Its fundamental basis is a different idea of rationality. According to Mises, this "fundamental thesis of rationalism" is not only consistent with reality but "unassailable": Man is a rational being; that is, his actions are guided by reason. The proposition: Man acts, is tantamount to the proposition: Man is eager to substitute a state of affairs that suits him better for a state of affairs that suits him less. In order to achieve this, he must employ suitable means. It is reason that enables him to find out what is a suitable means for attaining his chosen end and what is not. [all sic] 49 There is no presumption of perfect knowledge in this doctrine whatsoever. It does not require us to assume that people are infallible. Whether they are or not is a historical problem, not a praxeological one. Despite these considerations, some Austrian economists are inclined to believe that the criticisms in Shackle's weak thesis apply to praxeology and not just to neoclassical general equilibrium economics. Thus, Lachmann has accused Mises of omitting uncertainty and expectations from his analytical framework. [gendered language said in context]

We don't say individuals are isolated egos, market demands are produced through interactions with others

Murray N. **Rothbard** - dean of Austrian School of economics, author of 25 books - 1997 “Praxeology: The Methodology of Austrian Economics” in *The Logic of Action One: Method, Money, and the Austrian School* pp. 58-77 online [nfb]

Praxeology, as well as the sound aspects of the other social sciences, **rests on methodological individualism**, on the fact that only individuals feel, value, think, and act. **Individualism has always been charged by its critics**—and always **incorrectly—with the assumption that each individual is a hermetically sealed "atom,"** cut off from, and uninfluenced by, other persons. This absurd misreading of methodological individualism is at the root of J.K. Galbraith's triumphant demonstration in *The Affluent Society* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958) that the values and choices of individuals are influenced by other persons, **and therefore supposedly that economic theory is invalid.** Galbraith also concluded from his demonstration that these choices, because influenced, are artificial and illegitimate. The fact that praxeological economic theory rests on the universal fact of individual values and choices means, to repeat Dorfman's summary of Davenport's thought, that economic theory does "not need to investigate the origin of choices." **Economic theory is not based on the absurd assumption that each individual arrives at his values and choices in a vacuum,** sealed off from human influence. **Obviously, individuals are continually learning from and influencing each other.** As F.A. Hayek wrote in his justly famous critique of Galbraith, "The Non Sequitur of the 'Dependence Effect'": Professor Galbraith's argument could be easily employed, without any change of the essential terms, to demonstrate the worthlessness of literature or any other form of art. **Surely an individual's want for literature is not original with himself in the sense that he [sic] would experience it if literature were not produced. Does this then mean that the production of literature cannot be defended as satisfying a want because it is only the production which provokes the demand?** [gendered language said in context]

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 NO RATIONAL SUBJECT

Praxeology doesn't rely on perfectly rational individuals, it's theorized on laws of social interaction that are universal

G.A. Selgin - Professor of Economics at the University of Georgia – 1988 The Review of Austrian Economics Vol. 2 Num. 2 "Praxeology and Understanding: An Analysis of the Controversy in Austrian Economics" [nfb]

Ideal Types and "Exact Laws" Praxeological theories, as understood by Mises, are independent of the particular psychological makeup of individuals. Praxeology does not address the content of individual preferences or the particular motives that give rise to those preferences. It is concerned with the pure logic of choice. **Concrete individual ends and values have historical but not theoretical significance**; that is, **they** are relevant to all applications of pure theory to particular, historical circumstances, but **enter only as auxiliary assumptions in constructing theory itself**. Individual ends and calculations undergo continuous inexplicable change and cannot be the subject of anything like "exact laws." In the words of Frank Knight, a non-Austrian defender of the praxeological method, "There are no laws regarding the content of economic behavior, but there are laws universally valid as to its form. **There is an abstract rationale of all conduct which is rational at all, and a rationale of social relations arising through the organization of rational activity.**"²² To distinguish its universally valid content from history, praxeology had to show that its most fundamental theoretical conclusions—its theoretical "hard core"—was not based upon the imputation of some "typical" motivations or values to acting people. For this reason, Mises, while adopting many of Max Weber's methodological prescriptions, regarded the latter's "ideal-type" constructs as unnecessary to the development of pure theory. For Mises, the **laws of praxeology did not refer to ideal-typical "rational" or "economic" people, but to acting people as such. Only in this way could those laws be universal or, in Menger's word, "exact."**

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 NON UNIQUE

COERCION IS MAINTAINED THROUGH SMALL RESTRICTIONS—THESE ARE THE BIGGEST THREAT TO LIBERTY.

MARTINO, Professor of Economics, University of Rome, 1997

Antonio, THE LIBERTARIAN READER, 1997, p. 358

Another threat comes from the enormous variety of "small" restrictions on our personal freedoms that are continuously being introduced in the name of safety, health, and other lofty ideals. Each of them, taken by itself, seems trivial. Taken together, they amount to a wholesale attack on our independence.

IT'S AN ETHICAL QUESTION—EVERY INFRINGEMENT OF LIBERTY IS UNIQUELY BAD.

PETRO, Professor of Law @ Wake Forest, 1974 (Toledo LR)

It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once. Thus it is acceptable 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 roads leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism and the end of all human aspiration. Every invasion of freedom must be empathetically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 RACISM

Objectivism values individuals – Only collectivism propagates racist views

Rand 63

(Ayn, creator of objectivism and baller, "Racism," The Objectivist Newsletter <http://freedomkeys.com/ar-racism.htm>)

Even if it were proved -- which it is not -- that the incidence of men of potentially superior brain power is greater among the members of certain races than among the members of others, it would still tell us nothing about any given individual and it would be irrelevant to one's judgment of him. **A genius is a genius, regardless of the number of morons who belong to the same race -- and a moron is a moron, regardless of the number of geniuses who share his racial origin.** It is hard to say which is the more outrageous injustice: the claim of Southern racists that a Negro genius should be treated as inferior because his race has "produced" some brutes -- or the claim of a German brute to the status of a superior because his race has "produced" Goethe, Schiller and Brahms. These are not two different claims, of course, but two applications of the same basic premise. The question of whether one alleges the superiority or the inferiority of any given race is irrelevant; **racism has only one psychological root: the racist's sense of his own inferiority**

Like every other form of collectivism, racism is a quest for the unearned. It is a quest for automatic knowledge -- for an automatic evaluation of men's characters that bypasses the responsibility of exercising rational or moral judgment -- and, above all, a quest for an automatic self-esteem (or pseudo-self-esteem).

To ascribe one's virtues to one's racial origin, is to confess that one has no knowledge of the process by which virtues are acquired and, most often, that one has failed to acquire them. The overwhelming majority of racists are men who have earned no sense of personal identity, who can claim no individual achievement or distinction, and who seek the illusion of a "tribal self-esteem" by alleging the inferiority of some other tribe. Observe the hysterical intensity of the Southern racists; observe also that racism is much more prevalent among the poor white trash than among their intellectual betters.

Historically, racism has always risen or fallen with the rise or fall of collectivism. Collectivism holds that the individual has no rights, that his life and work belong to the group (to "society," to the tribe, the state, the nation) and that the group may sacrifice him at its own whim to its own interests. The only way to implement a doctrine of that kind is by means of brute force -- and statism has always been the political corollary of collectivism.

The absolute state is merely an institutionalized form of gang rule, regardless of which particular gang seizes power. And -- since there is no rational justification for such rule, since none has ever been or can ever be offered -- the mystique of racism is a crucial element in every variant of the absolute state. The relationship is reciprocal: statism rises out of prehistorical tribal warfare, out of the notion that the men of one tribe are the natural prey for the men of another -- and establishes its own internal sub-categories of racism, a system of castes determined by a man's birth, such as inherited titles of nobility or inherited serfdom.

The racism of Nazi Germany -- where men had to fill questionnaires about their ancestry for generations back, in order to prove their "Aryan" descent -- has its counterpart in Soviet Russia, where men had to fill similar questionnaires to show that their ancestors had owned no property and thus to prove their "proletarian" descent. The Soviet ideology rests on the notion that men can be conditioned to communism genetically -- that is, that a few generations conditioned by dictatorship will transmit communist ideology to their descendants, who will be communists at birth. The persecution of racial minorities in Soviet Russia, according to the racial descent and whim of any given commissar, is a matter of record; anti-semitism is particularly prevalent -- only the official pogroms are now called "political purges."

There is only one antidote to racism: the philosophy of individualism and its politico-economic corollary, laissez-faire capitalism.

Individualism regards man -- every man -- as an independent, sovereign entity who possesses an inalienable right to his own life, a right derived from his nature as a rational being. Individualism holds that a civilized society, or any form of association, cooperation or peaceful co-existence among men, can be achieved only on the basis of the recognition of individual rights -- and that a group, as such, has no rights other than the individual rights of its members.

2NC ANS TO ANS – A2 UTILITARIANISM

A REJECTION OF COLLECTIVISM REQUIRES ABANDONMENT OF UTILITY. THE UTILITARIAN VISION OF THE ‘GREATEST HAPPINESS’ MAKES THE MURDER OF MILLIONS A GRIM NECESSITY.

CLEVELAND, Professor of Business Administration and Economics at Birmingham-Southern College, 2

Paul A., The Failure of Utilitarian Ethics in Political Economy, *The Journal of Private Enterprise*, <http://www.independent.org/publications/article.asp?id=1602>

Indeed, the widespread confusion over this point is one of the primary reasons why western market economies have continued to drift towards the ready acceptance of socialist policies. Edmund Opitz has rightly observed that **utilitarianism with its “greatest happiness principle” completely neglects the spiritual dimension of human life.** Rather, **it simply “asserts that men are bound together in societies solely on the basis of a rational calculation of the private advantage to be gained by social cooperation under the division of labor.”** But, as Opitz shows, this perspective gives rise to a serious problem. **Since theft is the first labor saving device, the utilitarian principle will tend to lead to the collective use of government power so as to redistribute income in order to gain the “greatest happiness” in society.** Regrettably, the rent seeking behavior that is spawned as a result of this mind set will prove detrimental to the economy. Nevertheless, this kind of action will be justified as that which is most socially expedient in order to reach the assumed ethical end. **“Utilitarianism, in short, has no logical stopping place short of collectivism.”** If morality is ultimately had by making the individual’s happiness subservient to the organic whole of society, which is what Bentham’s utilitarianism asserts, then **the human rights of the individual may be violated.** That means property rights may be violated if it is assumed to promote the utilitarian end. However, property rights are essential in securing a free market order. **As a result, utilitarianism can then be used to justify some heinous government actions.** For instance, **the murder of millions of human beings can be justified** in the minds of reformers **if it is thought to move us closer to paradise on earth.** **This is precisely the view that was taken by communist revolutionaries as they implemented their grand schemes of remaking society.** All of this is not to say that matters of utility are unimportant in policy decisions, but merely to assert that utilitarian ethics will have the tendency of promoting collectivist policies. This will tend to hold true in most cases except when such collectivism has so thoroughly destroyed the economic enterprise as in the case of the former Soviet Union. In those cases, the very real need of material advancement will lead to reform in the other direction.

****AFF****

AFF—NO LINK TO TAXES

TAXES ARE JUSTIFIED TO SAVE LIVES.

LOCKE, writer for *The American Conservative*, March 14 2K5

Robert, "Marxism of the Right" http://www.amconmag.com/2005_03_14/article1.html

And is society really wrong to protect people against the negative consequences of some of their free choices?

While it is obviously fair to let people enjoy the benefits of their wise choices and suffer the costs of their stupid ones, decent societies set limits on both these outcomes. People are allowed to become millionaires, but they are taxed. They are allowed to go broke, but they are not then forced to starve. They are deprived of the most extreme benefits of freedom in order to spare us the most extreme costs. The libertopian alternative would be perhaps a more glittering society, but also a crueler one.

AFF—POSITIVE/NEGATIVE RIGHTS WRONG

Link Turn – the negative creates a false dichotomy between positive and negative rights- property rights require the public to sacrifice for the few.

Sunstein – Prof. Poli Sci at Princeton – 99 (Stephen, The Cost of Rights: Why Liberty Depends on Taxes)

Conservative anxieties are equally acute, but assume a different hue. Many conservatives cling instinctively to cost-blind approach to the protection of the so-called negative rights of property and contract because staring hard at costs would shatter the libertarian fiction that individuals who exercise their rights, in the classic eighteenth-century sense, are just going about their own business, immaculately independent of the government and the taxpaying community. The public costs of non-welfare rights show among, other things, that private wealth as we know it, exists only because a of government institutions. Those who attack all welfare programs on principle should be encouraged to contemplate the obvious—namely, that the definition, assignment, interpretation, and protection of property rights is a government service that is delivered to those who currently own property, while being funded out of general revenues extracted from the public at large.

AFF—COLLECTIVISM K TO RIGHTS

Turn – Collectivity is intrinsic to rights.

Sunstein – Prof. Poli Sci at Princeton – **99** (Stephen, The Cost of Rights: Why Liberty Depends on Taxes

Those who acclaim rights as trumps sometimes also construe them as barriers defending the most cherished individual interests against a repressive or meddlesome community. Individuals invoke their rights to fend off the majority. Rights protect individuals from mob rule. There is some truth to this antima-joritarian idea. We are all familiar with the lone dissident fighting for his freedom to engage in nonconformist speech and the

religious outsider seeking to practice her religion despite majority bigotry and intolerance. But are rights adequately described as claims that the solitary individual raises against the community in which he or she was born and bred?

The idea that rights are erected against the community is obviously too simple, for rights are interests on which we as a community have bestowed special protection usually because they touch upon "the public interest" that is, because they involve either the interests of the collectivity as a whole or the fair treatment of various members of the community. By recognizing, protecting, and financing rights, the collectivity fosters what are widely construed to be the deeper interests of its members.

AFF—FREE MARKET BAD FOR POVERTY

Free markets result in devastating poverty.

Trainer 95 (Ted Trainer is a professor at the School of Social Work, University of Wales, “The Conserver Society; Alternatives for sustainability”, pg.4)

Only one-fifth of the world's people live affluently. Half of them average a per capita income one-sixtieth of those of the rich countries and more than 1 billion people live in desperate poverty. Deprivation takes the lives of more than 40,000 Third World children every day. 'There are enough resources to provide adequately for all. The appallingly unjust distributions exist because the rich countries take most of the world's resource output by bidding more for it in the global market-place. They also take many of the things produced by Third World land, labor and capital, which should be producing things for impoverished Third World people. Many plantation and mine workers are hungry, while we enjoy the luxuries they produce. The appalling distributions and deprivation are direct consequences of the way the global market economy functions. A market system will always enable the relatively rich to take what they want and to deprive those in most need.

AFF—TAXES JUSTIFIED

Taxes are not theft in the case of public services and goods that benefit everyone, even the Libertarians contributing.

Kangas 99 Graduate student in Political Science, 99

(Steve, "Myth: Taxes are theft," 3/19, <http://www.huppi.com/kangaroo/L-taxestheft.htm>, date accessed: 7/11/08)

Many conservatives and libertarians make the following populist argument: "If you don't pay your taxes, men with guns will come to your house, arrest you, and seize your property." The implication here is that you are being extorted to pay taxes, and this theft amounts to a violation of your rights. Although the events described are technically correct -- you should expect such a response from any crime you commit -- **the implication that the government is aggressing against you is false,** and not a little demagogic. **Taxes are part of a social contract, an agreement between voters and government to exchange money for the government's goods and services. Even libertarians agree that breach of contract legitimates a police response.** So the real question is not whether a crime should be met with "men with guns," but whether or not the social contract is valid, especially to those who don't agree with it or devote their allegiance to it. **Liberals have two lines of argument against those who reject the idea of the social contract. The first is that if they reject it, they should not consume the government's goods and services. How they can avoid this when the very dollar bills that the economy runs on are printed by the government is a good question. Try to imagine participating in the economy without using public roads, publicly funded communication infrastructure, publicly educated employees, publicly funded electricity, water, gas, and other utilities, publicly funded information, technology, research and development -- it's absolutely impossible. The only way to avoid public goods and services is to move out of the country entirely, or at least become such a hermit, living off the fruits of your own labor, that you reduce your consumption of public goods and services to as little as possible.** Although these alternatives may seem unpalatable, they are the only consistent ones in a person who truly wishes to reject the social contract. Any consumption of public goods, no matter how begrudgingly, is implicit agreement of the social contract, just as any consumption of food in a restaurant is implicit agreement to pay the bill. **Many conservatives and libertarians concede the logic of this argument, but point out that taxes do not go exclusively to public goods and services. They also go for welfare payments to the poor who are allegedly doing nothing and getting a free ride from the system.** That, they claim, is theft. But **this argument fails too. Welfare is a form of social insurance. In the private sector we freely accept the validity of life and property insurance. Obviously, the same validity goes for social insurance like unemployment and welfare. The tax money that goes to social insurance buys each one of us a private good: namely, the comfort of being protected in times of adversity.** And it buys us a public good as well (although tax critics are loathe to admit this). If workers were allowed to unnecessarily starve or die in otherwise temporary setbacks, then our economy would be frequently disrupted. **Social insurance allows workers to tide over the rough times, and this establishes a smooth-running economy that benefits us all.**

AFF—PRIVATE SS FAIL

Private social services fail – the government will inevitably gain control

Besharov 03 (Douglas J., the Joseph J. and Violet Jacobs Scholar in Social Welfare Studies at the American Enterprise Institute and a professor at the University of Maryland School Of Public Affairs, “Creating a Marketplace for Social Welfare Services,” 12/12/03, page 18 -19, http://www.aei.org/docLib/20050404_creating_a_marketplace.pdf)

As mentioned above, contracting out for services is often called “privatization.” But top-down funding actually tends to increase government’s influence over private agencies, including those operated by society’s mediating institutions. 53 For, when government chooses the service (or agency) for clients, it tends to prescribe, or at least highly regulate, the nature of the services provided by private agencies. Smith and Lipsky comment, “Instead of shrinking the role of government and making the provision of public services subject to market discipline, contracting has actually diminished and constrained the community sector by government intervention in nonprofit organizations.” Government, of course, has broad power to regulate the activities of mediating structures and other private agencies—even when it is not funding them. Whether through legislative fiat or licensing rules, government can regulate almost all aspects of private agency operations. (In all but a few states, for example, church-based day care is regulated even when no public funds are involved.) Government is much less likely to regulate private agencies, however, if it is not actually arranging for the service. Passing legislation or adopting administrative regulations is often a long, drawn-out process requiring support at the highest levels of the government agency—whose visibility often arouses important political interests. On the other hand, attaching programmatic conditions to a contract or grant is a relatively invisible and low-level process. It also has the special justification that, since public money is involved, it should be spent in accordance with the “public trust.” This heightened level of government control is understandable—after all, the contract is meant to serve a public purpose, not to sustain a private enterprise—but the effect is the same: Distant, government decision makers dictate the shape of local services. “As ‘agents of the state,’” writes Joe Dolan, now executive director of the Achelis and Bodman Foundations in New York, “nonprofits become disconnected from local mediating institutions such as schools, churches, businesses and neighborhood, family or parent-oriented groups.” 55 This is not some abstract or hypothetical concern. In area after area, the conditions attached to government funding have altered the nature of private agency services and raised their costs. Even successful providers are often required to alter their programs if they are to receive government funding. As Smith and Lipsky explain, “[P]rivatization has led to government penetration of the private sector through the regulations, obligations and restrictions that accompany contracts. It has created rules and regulations for private agencies that otherwise would not be subject to government control.” 56 The programmatic requirements imposed by government on the services it funds or purchases tend to increase the cost of the agency’s services, often without improving quality. Government often dictates costly “quality” standards, for example, with less concern about whether such standards actually improve the service than would individuals (who would have to pay for the “improved” service out of their own pockets). No better example of this two-sided dynamic exists than the quality-cost differentials between publicly and privately funded child care.

Private social services inevitably fail – costs inevitably force USFG involvement which crushes private enterprise
Besharov 03 (Douglas J., the Joseph J. and Violet Jacobs Scholar in Social Welfare Studies at the American Enterprise Institute and a professor at the University of Maryland School Of Public Affairs, “Creating a Marketplace for Social Welfare Services,” 12/12/03, page 21-22, http://www.aei.org/docLib/20050404_creating_a_marketplace.pdf)

That is the reason government aid has been called a “fatal embrace.” “Unless that problem is solved,” warn Peter L. Berger of Boston University and Richard John Neuhaus of the Institute on Religion and Public Life, “when such institutions are first ‘discovered’ and then funded by government, the very vitality that originally distinguished the institutions from government agencies is destroyed. Indeed they become government agencies under another name.” 70 As Berger and Neuhaus elaborate, “In the 1970s, we underestimated the degree of corruption that comes with government funding—not, of course, corruption in the sense of criminal misuse of funds (that is a relatively manageable matter), but the much more insidious corruption in which these institutions reshape themselves to continue as beneficiaries of government largesse.” The problem is so great that some thoughtful observers denounce all government assistance to mediating structures. But many elements of the modern social welfare state are simply too expensive to be funded by the private sector alone. (Housing for the poor, residential care for the elderly, health care services generally, and foster care for abused and neglected children come immediately to mind.) According to John DiIulio, writing when he was at Princeton University, “[E]ven if every charitable organization in America gave their entire endowment to social welfare causes, that would cover only one-seventh of what the public sector now spends on social welfare.”

AFF—PERM EV

Perm: helping others is consistent with a framework of rational self interest

Branden, Ph.D in Psychiatry and associate of Ayn Rand, 1984

(Nathaniel, "The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand: A Personal Statement", EKC)

I noted earlier that, when we want to understand a thinker, it's generally useful to understand what that person may be reacting against. I believe that in desire to expose the evil of the notion that self-sacrifice is a virtue and in her indignation at the very idea of treating human beings as objects of sacrifice, she presented her case for rational self-interest or rational selfishness in a way that neglected a very important part of human experience. To be precise, she didn't neglect it totally; but she did not deal with it adequately, did not give it the attention it deserves.

I am referring to the principle of benevolence, mutual helpfulness and mutual aid between human beings. I believe it is a virtue to support life. I believe it is a virtue to assist those who are struggling for life. I believe it is a virtue to seek to alleviate suffering. None of this entails the notion of self-sacrifice. I am not saying that we should place the interests of others above our own. I am not saying that our primary moral obligation is to alleviate the pain of others. I am not saying that we do not have the right to place our own interests first. I am saying that the principle of benevolence and mutual aid is entirely compatible with an ethic of self-interest and more: An ethic of self-interest logically must advocate the principle of benevolence and mutual aid.

Given that we live in society, and given that misfortune or tragedy can strike any one of us, it is clearly in our self-interest to live in a world in which human beings deal with one another in a spirit of mutual benevolence and helpfulness. Could anyone seriously argue that the principle of mutual aid does not have survival value?

AFF—DOGMATIC

They are dogmatic and exclusionary

Branden, Ph.D in Psychiatry and associate of Ayn Rand, 1984

(Nathaniel, "The Benefits and Hazards of the Philosophy of Ayn Rand: A Personal Statement", EKC)

Ayn always insisted that her philosophy was an integrated whole, that it was entirely self-consistent, and that one could not reasonably pick elements of her philosophy and discard others. In effect, she declared, "It's all or nothing." Now this is a rather curious view, if you think about it. What she was saying, translated into simple English, is: Everything I have to say in the field of philosophy is true, absolutely true, and therefore any departure necessarily leads you into error. Don't try to mix your irrational fantasies with my immutable truths. This insistence turned Ayn Rand's philosophy, for all practical purposes, into dogmatic religion, and many of her followers chose that path.

AFF—VALUE TO LIFE

Turn: the capitalist system destroys the intrinsic meaning of the products of human labor

Milbank, professor of theology @ Nottingham University, 2006

(John, “Geopolitical Theology: Economy, Religion and Empire after 9/11” May 16, EKC)

By contrast, the modern capitalist fetishised commodity is truly an alienation of human power, just because it is like a kind of offering to an abstract (‘Buddhistic’, as Žižek says) void, which cannot offer to humans any return, and therefore sheerly removes from us our true property in our persons and our characterised activity. The measure of alienation here is the idea that we are simply subject to the capitalist ‘laws of the market’ which always secretly insist beneath superstitious obfuscations (as the Scottish and a faction of the Neapolitan Enlightenment saw it). But beyond Marx the measure is also the very idea that the true human goal is to maximise productive wealth and power outside any symbolic coding.

AFF—OBJ = RACISM

Objectivism justifies racism

AntiRand 2005

(www.antirand.org/racist.html “The Objectivist Movement's Racist, White Backlash, Origins”, EKC)

Some of the more conservative students were able to simply laugh all of this off, burying themselves in homework, day and night. Others were a bit more shaken, and needed reassurances that they and “level headed” people like Robert V. Sabonjian and were indeed right, and popular radio personalities like Ron Britain were wrong. Simply knowing that their own courses were more difficult and demanding than liberal arts courses (thus proving them to be a good deal smarter than the students who had liberal arts majors), helped. But some tech students needed still more. They wanted logical proof that they were right— just like the sorts of proofs they encountered in math and science courses. Ayn Rand’s “axiom of existence” which said “existence exists,” and furthermore claimed to “derive” everything from there, was just what Tommy Tech-Hawk’s Doctor ordered. What is more, **Objectivism promised a neat and clean system, a system based on reason. And being based on reason, anything which challenged it was by simple logical inference unreasonable— or irrational. Hence, in the final analysis, not only could the latent racism and prejudice of these most conservative** of a basically conservative lot of **students be rationally and morally justified, all the social unrest of the day, challenging such racism and prejudice, could just as readily be dismissed as people being irrational, and avoiding “the facts of reality.”** All the people who used drugs neatly fit into this former category. **Poor people and racial minorities who did not know their rightful place in society, and that they needed to stay in their own neighborhoods and behave themselves, were readily lumped into the latter category of those who denied the facts of reality.**

The above may well be a bit of an over generalization, but insofar as it paints the picture of Objectivism as a social movement growing out of racism, elitism, and fear of social change, it is quite accurate. Indeed, save for the exact Sabonjian quote, it is drawn entirely upon personal memories of the time, and based on a countless number of personal encounters and conversations during those years. But regardless of the finer historical details, the main thing to understand is that **Objectivism arose primarily as a reactionary movement against the turmoil of the times, and served as a tool for rationalizing— or more precisely, sublimating— racism and prejudice.** That is to say, in large measure, **it served as a sort of refuge for those who could not help being disturbed by what was going on around them, but at the same time lacked not only the social and psychological skills, but also the moral foundation needed to appropriately deal with it all. Ayn Rand promised to provide all of that in one neat package.**

AFF—ALT CAUSES DEHUMANIZATION

Objectivism dogmatically dehumanizes all non-objectivists

AntiRand 2005

(www.antirand.org/racist.html “The Objectivist Movement's Racist, White Backlash, Origins”, EKC)

How, specifically, was Objectivism able to fill this void, and why Objectivism? To begin, one needs to understand that **most “students of Objectivism”** (as they called themselves) of that time came from deeply religious and dogmatic working class backgrounds. They **were never encouraged to think moral and social issues through on their own, so they never gained any experience or competence in doing such.** All their lives, they had been simply told what was right, and how God ruled the world. However, that kind of background, and what they had always been told about God’s ways, was somewhat at odds with what they were learning in their science classes, and the sort of analytical thinking they needed to do in order to do their homework and pass their exams. This alone was enough to pose an existential crisis of sorts to many students. Hence, **a new dogma to replace the old, and someone new to tell them what was right and what was wrong, was quickly needed; Atlas Shrugged and its chief character John Galt fit the bill perfectly. After reading just one book** (albeit an incredibly long one) **the world was set straight again; one could go on doing ones homework, taking ones exams, and so forth. There was no longer a need to be bothered by, or feel any sympathy with or empathy toward anyone who did drugs, rioted, or did anything else of the sort.** What is more, **anyone who didn’t follow Rand could be dismissed a virtual non person, because they were in denial of the facts of reality and the Law of Identity. Such were people who deliberately chose not to live— not to live as rational human beings, the way John Galt said rational human beings should live, which was the only way worth living.** What is more, Galt said that all such persons, who failed to live by his pronouncements, were doomed to perish anyway. Hence, such people were doomed at the outset by virtue of their own irrational choices, and therefore not worth the time of day of any “rational” person who followed Galt.

AFF—UTIL OUTWEIGHS

EXTINCTION OUTWEIGHS LIBERTY.

ROTHBARD, Dean of Austrian School, Head of Mises Institute, 1973

Murray, 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 cliché, 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.**