

THE FORENSICS FILES



Compete Prepared

Resolved: Oppressive government is more desirable than no government.

THE
FORENSICS
FILES

THE LD FILE



Index

Topic Overview	3-14
Definitions	15-16
First Affirmative Case	17-21
Second Affirmative Case	22-25
First Negative	26-28
Second Negative	29-31
Affirmative Extensions	32- 43
The logic of anarchism cannot even govern a baseball game.	32
There is no uniquely beneficial method of resolving disputes in anarchy.	32
For anarchy to even possibly function, we must assume everyone is a pacifist.	33
The logic of anarchism collapses under any scrutiny.	34
Anarchy is not a check on oppression because oppression is a reflection of the ideas accepted by the people.	34
If a society cannot check oppression, anarchy will not check oppression.	35
Dictatorships bounce back from economic recession faster.	35
Autocratic powers helped Franco turn around a chaotic Spain.	36
Autocratic powers ensured Franco's Spain had full employment with reasonable hours.	36
Rights can be protected, even if to a very limited degree, in a dictatorship.	36
Citizens can be at least moderately empowered in a dictatorship.	37
Dictatorships can be concerned with the rights of prisoners.	37
Autocratic regimes need not necessarily be anti-democratic.	37
Autocratic regimes can have a basic, even if weak, system of checks.	38
Autocratic regimes can cultural institutions and pluralism.	38
Oppressive government can be used to drastically improve the healthcare system.	38
Despotic governments can demonstrate concern for neighboring countries.	39
Bias against dictatorial governments undermines international cooperative efforts for the good.	39
Dictatorships can provide significant humanitarian aid.	40
Latin Americans have historically found dictatorships more desirable.	40
Dictatorships can be more desirable when civil services fail.	41
Dictatorships can be checked when they become too oppressive.	41
Dictatorships can be useful in bringing positive reforms to their country.	42
Military dictatorships can be progressive.	42
Dictatorships can be responsive to their people.	43
Negative Extensions	44-54
There is overwhelming evidence that the market does everything better than the government.	44
Not being able to predict the future is not an argument against anarchy.	44
History proves that society thrives when evil is abolished.	44
Evil is better prevented in the absence of the state.	45
Anarchy is not a system lacking in enforcement.	45
The state is not a necessary evil; it is an unnecessary evil.	45
The common Hobesian view of anarchism is flawed.	46
Communities can be used to enforce contracts.	47
Abolishing government will not lead to violence and chaos.	47
Society can stop crime without government.	48
Associating anarchy with chaos and violence prevents reasoned discussion of the topic.	48
Associating anarchy with violence and chaos blinds us to the facts of reality.	48
Anarchy is society without a government, not a society without governance.	49
Arguing for peaceful anarchism is not utopian.	49
National defense is meaningless in the context of anarchy.	49
The affirmative has a burden to prove that there are services that can only be provided by...	50
The government is not necessary to establish rules of order for society.	50
Most modern laws are merely the codification of accepted customs and rules...	51
In contrast to publicly generated common law, governments only undermine order and liberty.	51-52
Lack of uniformity of rules with anarchy is a good thing.	52
A government is not required for rules that need be universal.	53
Much of the success of US governance has been due to diversity in governing.	53
Government is an impediment to good governance.	53
Government is an impediment to an accessible system of laws.	54
In contrast to government, common law developed by communities creating intelligible laws...	54
Blocks	55-66
Rebuttal Overviews	67-70
Pre-Flows	71-74

Topic Overview

Part I: Introduction

This resolution is an exciting and interesting topic, but it is by no means an easy topic. There are many reasons for this. The resolution lacks context. This means that the initial assumption, a reasonable assumption that the resolution is dealing with institutions of the state is not fully grounded because there are other definitions of government. Government can simply mean the exercise of authority meaning this resolution could literally be a debate between an authoritarian and laissez faire management style within a company. In other words, one could make this a debate about who is the more desirable chef, authoritarian Gordon Ramsey or easy going Guy Fieri. This is also supported by the fact that oppressive can refer to a person's behavior. Oppression and anarchy could apply in many, non-political, contexts. Another issue with this resolution is that there is no explicit value. There is not an evaluative term in the resolution so it is not clear what value debaters should be striving for within their cases. Our cases defend the value of justice, but no value is perfect as any could arguably link to the resolution. Additionally, if the resolution is talking about governments, it is quite possible the two situations presented, oppression and anarchy, could make the achievement of any value ridiculously difficult. There is a ton of room for value clash on this resolution.

Even if the resolution is discussing government, as we treat it in this file, while this clarifies the resolution to an extent, it does not necessarily simplify the resolution. This is because, again, the options are not great ones, at least on the surface. Fairly universally now, democracy is hailed as the best form of government. Anarchy is commonly viewed as chaos and violence while oppression is viewed as the violation of

rights on a massive scale. So, not only can identifying any value be difficult, identifying a standard to weigh these two competing ideas has been easier on other resolutions. The fact that the resolution is comparative presents its own challenge as well. It is not enough for the affirmative to say that oppression can be ok sometimes or even for the negative to argue that anarchy rocks. Both sides have to do so in a comparative manner meaning, unless specific comparative cards are found, most debaters will have to extend two pieces of offense to win. The affirmative will have to win that anarchy is bad in some way and oppression is preferable in that way. This is also true for the negative, only vice versa.

Believe it or not, literature does exist for both sides of this topic. There are articles on the affirmative discussing the advantages of oppression but essays making this specific argument are not that easy to find. More often it seems that one can find literature defending the various successes of different states generally considered to be oppressive, such as Cuba or China. There are authors who highlight some of the good things occurring in these nations. Other affirmative literature can be found discussing the policies of past oppressive regimes. These regimes are generally not complete failures and so some positives can be found. It is possibly more challenging to find literature objecting to anarchism, not impossible by any means but difficult, because the undesirability of anarchy seems to be common sense for most people. It is possible many authors do not see a need to write such articles as there is little need to write anything condemning slavery for example. It might seem too obvious to bother with. We found literature condemning anarchy written by libertarians. Libertarian authors who see a need for the state are likely friends with or know of specific libertarians who are open

anarchists. Thus, these libertarian writers believe it is important to refute their anarchical, libertarian brethren.

There is no shortage of literature for the negative and the negative has the advantage that this literature is opposed to any state. They see any state as naturally and inherently oppressive. Hence, anarchist literature is inherently anti-state and so researching the negative should be easier. There are libertarian anarchists better known as anarcho-capitalists. There are also communist anarchists and so the negative has flexibility in how they wish to approach the resolution. This literature is very thorough and answers, or at least attempts to answer, any conceivable affirmative objection to anarchy. When looking through the negative extensions the reader will see that anarchists argue we don't need government police, courts, regulations, or even national defense. This means it should be relatively simple to write blocks to answer affirmative objections to anarchy. Another significant difference is that while affirmative authors rarely, if ever, sing the praises of oppression, advocates of anarchy see anarchy as a viable option to achieve an ideal society. This means if the anarchy literature is correct, that value achievement in the negative world is not just possible, but more likely. Anarchists are beginning to point to Belgium, which at the time of this writing has existed sans government for a year, as evidence that anarchy can work. (This might end up being affirmative evidence as well.)

Part II: The Affirmative

One approach to affirming that has yet to be mentioned is a more philosophical approach. This approach avoids empirical data about how some oppressive regimes might somehow function well in a given area or two. This approach would argue that

individual identity depends upon citizenship. “For modern communitarians it is a core thesis that the self is embedded in the community. In Michael Sandel's phraseology, there are no "unencumbered selves" standing outside a community frame. There is no sense, therefore, that one could speak of human nature outside a community. Thus, for Sandel, we cannot adopt the stance of the early Rawlsian original position, because it makes the unwarranted metaphysical assumption of the unencumbered self. There is no Archimedean point.⁽¹⁴⁾ If we cannot accept this unanchored insubstantial Rawlsian self, then it follows that we have no grounds for accepting the two principles of justice. Thus, in the Sandelian view, Rawls presupposes an implausible account of the moral subject which is the logical prerequisite for the impartiality of justice. Life in the polls and citizenship precede any sense we might have of our unique human individuality. Liberal politics, in the Rawlsian mode (or even more so in the Nozickian mode), lacks any coherent communal underpinning. This argument is also echoed in Alisdair MacIntyre's narrative conception of the self, a self which is constituted, in part, from the history and telos of the community.”¹ This would mean state and community precedes any notions of value and so guide desirability. A vulnerability that this approach suffers from is anarchists might argue that community does not cease to exist without a government. Any affirmative using this approach must win that membership in a state is unique to membership in a community.

The first affirmative case we offer defends the value of justice. This case argues that this is the correct value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value. Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the

most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round. The case then argues that to achieve justice we must look to utilitarianism. The case quotes Daniel Sanchez of the Mises Institute who writes, “The ultimate yardstick of justice is conduciveness to the preservation of social cooperation. Conduct suited to preserve social cooperation is just, conduct detrimental to the preservation of society is unjust. There cannot be any question of organizing society according to the postulates of an arbitrary preconceived idea of justice. The problem is to organize society for the best possible realization of those ends which men want to attain by social cooperation. Social utility is the only standard of justice.”² So the criterion for the round would be achieving the greatest good for the greatest number. The case has two contentions. The first point argues that oppression is preferable for protecting rights. It begins by quoting David Kelley who writes, “If we ask how our rights are to be secured to us in the anarchist system, the anarchist can only answer *que sera sera*. At best he can try to predict what would happen.”³ So if oppressive regimes can be shown to even possibly protect rights, oppressive regimes must be more desirable. The second point in this contention quotes Eric Solsten and Sandra Meditz who explain how Franco’s Spain, a dictatorship, did protect rights, at least to some degree making oppressive regimes preferable.⁴ The second contention argues that oppressive regimes are preferable for the economy. The first point also quotes David Kelley who writes, “Consider, for example, the law of supply and demand. What would happen to prices if one did not have to pay for a good at a price acceptable to the seller, but could take the good by force, giving nothing in exchange? There is no way of telling. The law of supply and demand does not apply to thieves.” Thus, economic planning is impossible in anarchy. The last point in

this case quotes Ignacio Ramonet who writes, “You also fail to emphasize the reforms that Castro's regime has embarked on, including the opening up to foreign investment, partial deregulation of foreign trade, the decriminalization of the possession of foreign currency, the revitalization of tourism, and so on. More important, the regime has diversified the country's trade relations.”⁵ Thus oppressive regimes are more desirable for economic reasons.

The second affirmative case also defends the value of justice but argues that the fundamental requirement of justice is barring physical force from human interactions. The case quotes Ayn Rand who writes, “Men who attempt to prosecute crimes, without such rules, are a lynch mob. If a society left the retaliatory use of force in the hands of individual citizens, it would degenerate into mob rule, lynch law and an endless series of bloody private feuds or vendettas. If physical force is to be barred from social relationships, men need an institution charged with the task of protecting their rights under an objective code of rules.”⁶ So the criterion that must be met for there even to be a chance of achieving justice is barring the use of force. The first point in this case quotes from the same David Kelly article as in the first affirmative. He explains that anarchists reject the only means of eliminating violence from human interactions. He writes, “In the end, the anarchist cannot escape his dilemma; his dilemma is a contradiction. He is advocating a certain end, a society free of violence among men, while rejecting the only means of achieving that end. Thus anarchism is hardly even a political philosophy. It is, much rather, an attempt to escape the responsibility of providing one. It would, as critics contend, be a disaster in practice; but that is because it is fantastic and incoherent in theory.”⁷ The second point in this case argues that dictatorships are not necessarily

human rights abuses. This point also quotes Ignacio Ramonet who writes, "No serious organization has ever accused Cuba--where, in fact, a moratorium on the death penalty has been in place since 2001--of carrying out "disappearances," engaging in extrajudicial executions, or even performing physical torture on detainees. The same cannot be said of the United States in its five-year-old "war on terror." Of these three types of crimes, not a single case exists in Cuba." So oppressive regimes can protect rights, meaning individuals are protected from violence.

One last approach the affirmative might consider is to argue that if society cannot check oppression, anarchy will not check oppression. Harry Binswanger explains, "We see here a variant of the contradiction in Plato's doctrine of the philosopher-king. Plato held that "the masses" are inherently incapable of distinguishing true philosophic ideas from trickily presented false ones, as promulgated by the Sophists of his time. Yet, inconsistently, Plato held that the ideal society would be one in which the military would enforce the right philosophy (i.e., Plato's) on the populace. But how would the military know who is the right philosopher to follow? How would they know which philosopher to obey? And what would make the populace submit to the rule of those military men? On Plato's pessimistic view of the average man, no philosopher-king could ever come to power or stay in power."⁹ So essentially this explains that if people want oppression they will find way to be oppressed regardless of the type of system and so there is no reason to prefer anarchy as the people will get what they want. Thus any benefit of government, even the slightest benefit, is sufficient to affirm.

Part III: The Negative

While the negative must overcome the intuitive idea that anarchy is equivalent to chaos, that should not be too big an obstacle because the affirmative must defend oppressive regimes where it is a given that values are very difficult to achieve. Many affirmatives will likely just try to find some small way in which they are preferable. Advocates of anarchy do not argue that anarchy is slightly preferable. They argue that society will actually thrive absent a government. So this can be a significant advantage in that anarchist literature is plentiful and it will claim to solve for any and every harm that oppressive governments cause. Additionally, anarchists claim government to be an intrinsic evil so a deontological approach could work. For example writing in response to people wondering what might happen if we abolish government, libertarian Nick Coons writes, “Answering these questions would require a crystal ball. But they're completely irrelevant, because the issue is not in the effect of abolishing slavery; it's in the morality, which is something that we can and do know in advance, because morality is a universal. Slavery is wrong; this is a moral rule, and it is the only thing we need to know if we are going to discuss whether or not slavery should exist. The free market will allow freed slaves to get jobs and benefit from being free, and so history shows us that this was absolutely true. It's amazing how society as a whole prospers when we abolish something that we know to be evil, even if we can't predict the exact path prosperity takes us.”¹⁰ So, the negative can use either a teleological or consequentialist framework or use a deontological approach giving the negative many options.

The first negative case we offer defends the value of justice and because of the supposition that everyone is due the right to their life. Because of this, we must do everything we can to prevent nuclear war. The case quotes Bill Wickersham who writes,

“the threat of nuclear war is the most serious potential health, environmental, agricultural, educational and moral problem facing humanity. Steven Starr, senior scientist with Physicians for Social Responsibility, said research makes clear the environmental consequences of a U.S.-Russian nuclear war: “If these weapons are detonated in the large cities of either of their nations, they will cause such catastrophic damage to the global environment that the Earth will become virtually uninhabitable for most humans and many other complex forms of life.”¹¹ So the criterion to achieve justice in the round is decreasing the chances of nuclear war. The only point in this case argues that a nation transitioning to anarchy will be modeled by other nations which will minimize threats. The case quotes John Hasnas who writes, “other nations would learn by the liberalizing nation’s example and begin to copy its policies. As the economic and technological gap between the liberalizing nation and the rest of world widens, as the rest of the world becomes more dependent upon the goods and services manufactured and supplied by that nation, and as a greater number of other nations are moved to adopt liberalizing policies themselves, the threat the rest of the world poses to the liberalizing nation decreases.”¹² Thus, with fewer threats there is a decreased chance of nuclear war.

The second negative case defends justice as all our cases do but argues the way to achieve justice is by adhering to the criterion of overcoming poverty. This case attempts to approach the resolution in a way that is different from the most likely typical anarcho-capitalist perspective. The case supports this criterion by arguing that allowing people to live in poverty demonstrates how a society values people. It quotes Francine Mestrum to support this. She writes, “The income people receive is not only a means whereby to acquire more goods and services, it is also a tangible recognition of how society values

them. Equality is a fundamental value in each society, and that is why the point of inequality becomes relevant when so much attention is focused on globalisation.”¹³ There are three points in this case. The first point argues that the state keeps people poor and subservient. The case quotes Gary Chartier who writes, “The state raises the cost of self-employment, boosts the cost of living, and increases the liabilities associated with being poor. The practical result is that people are denied opportunities to better their economic positions and channeled into often unappealing work environments because the state has eliminated viable alternatives.”¹⁴ The second point argues that the state enables the corporate elite again quoting Chartier who explains, “The state confers privileges on the wealthy and well connected. It protects favored industries with tariffs and grants of intellectual property rights, sanctifies large-scale theft by elite groups, hands out direct and indirect subsidies, implements regulatory regimes that suppress competition, constrains the most effective union activity, uses the tax system to benefit politically favored businesses and hamper the activities of others, employs eminent domain to boost the profits of developers and big box retailers, awards staggering bailouts to cronies in the financial and manufacturing sectors, and otherwise furthers the interests of elites and others.”¹⁵ This case concludes with Chartier who writes, “principled people on the political left—the sort of people who could be expected to listen, at least, to arguments from bleeding heart libertarians—should find anarchism attractive precisely because the state unavoidably harms people on a vast scale through its attacks on the poor, its support for corporate privilege, its war making, and its assaults on personal freedom”¹⁶ so people who want to help the poor should support anarchy.

While the affirmative might argue that if civil society is impossible with a government, anarchists argue the inverse. They argue that if civil society is impossible without government police, civil society is impossible. John Hasnas explains, “Unless government brings the use of violence under its monopolistic control, peaceful coexistence is impossible, and life is indeed as “nasty, brutish, and short” as Hobbes contended.²³ Before I respond to this by suggesting that you look around, reflect for a moment on the silliness of this argument. For if civil society cannot exist without a government monopoly over the use of coercion, then civil society does not exist. Societies do not spring into existence complete with government police forces. Once a group of people has figured out how to reduce the level of interpersonal violence sufficiently to allow them to live together, entities that are recognizable as governments often develop and take over the policing function. Even a marauding band that imposes government on others through conquest must have first reduced internal strife sufficiently to allow it to organize itself for effective military operations. Both historically and logically, it is always peaceful coexistence first, government services second. If civil society is impossible without government police, then there are no civil societies.”¹⁷ If the negative can win this argument, there can be no unique benefit to affirming as the government will simply be a reflection of the uncivil society. Worse, it empowers an institution to enforce this incivility.

This is a very complex topic that allows for many different approaches. The major challenge will be to attempt to find value in systems that at least intuitively do not lend themselves to value seeking. People can play word games and may not discuss the government at all, depending on how they think judges will respond to such approaches.

The complexity of the topic should mean rounds will be fun and educational, but it also means that debaters will have to spend a great amount of time preparing for any position they can imagine. If a debater thinks an idea is too silly or 'out there' we suggest preparing for that anyway as an opponent can and will disagree. Good luck from The Forensics Files!

Bibliography

- 1 Andrew Vincent (Australian National University), "Liberal nationalism and communitarianism: an ambiguous association," *The Australian Journal of Politics and History*. Volume: 43. Issue: 1. Publication Year: 1997
- 2 Daniel James Sanchez (editor of Mises.org, the world center of the Austrian School of economics and libertarian political and social theory, and director of the Mises
- 3 David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," *Freedom Advocates*, April 12, 2005
- 4 Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988
- 5 Ignacio Ramonet (Spanish journalist and writer), "Was Fidel Good for Cuba? A Debate between Carlos Alberto Montaner & Ignacio Ramonet," *Foreign Policy*, January-February 2007
- 6 Ayn Rand, "The Nature of Government," *The Virtue of Selfishness*, 1964
- 7 David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," *Freedom Advocates*, April 12, 2005
- 8 Ignacio Ramonet (Spanish journalist and writer), "Was Fidel Good for Cuba? A Debate between Carlos Alberto Montaner & Ignacio Ramonet," *Foreign Policy*, January-February 2007
- 9 Harry Binswanger (a member of the Ayn Rand Institute's Board of Directors and a Professor in ARI's Objectivist Academic Center), "Anarchy versus Objectivism," *The Objectivist Forum*, August 1981
- 10 Nick Coons (CEO of RedSeven Computer Company and radio talk show host), "The Case Against the State - Anarchy, Not Chaos," *The Libertarian Solution*, October 21, 2009
- 11 Bill Wickersham (University of Missouri adjunct professor of Peace Studies and a member of The Missouri University Nuclear Disarmament Education Team), "Nuclear weapons still a threat, disarmament would avoid accidental war," *Columbia Daily Tribune*, September 27, 2011
- 12 John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," *Mises Institute*, 12/4/2006
- 13 Francine Mestrum (Researcher, PhD in social sciences), "Why we should fight global income inequality," *Global Social Justice*, January 9, 2011
- 14 Gary Chartier (Associate Dean of the School of Business and Associate Professor of Law and Business Ethics at La Sierra University), "Should Bleeding Hearts Be Anarchists," *Bleeding Heart Libertarians*, July 13, 2011
- 15 IBID
- 16 IBID
- 17 John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," *Mises Institute*, 12/4/2006

Definitions

Resolved: Oppressive government is more desirable than no government.

Oppressive 1 Difficult to bear; burdensome
 2 Exercising power arbitrarily and often unjustly; tyrannical.
 3 Weighing heavily on the senses or spirit

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language

Oppressive 1 cruel, harsh, or tyrannical
 2 heavy, constricting, or depressing

Source: Collins English Dictionary

Oppressive It can be something that crushes your spirit, like a bad relationship, or something that crushes you with its tyranny, like the oppressive rule of a dictator

Source: Vocabulary.com

Oppressive 1 oppressive leaders, governments, or laws treat people unfairly or in a cruel way
 2 something that is oppressive makes you feel worried or unhappy
 3 hot in an unpleasant way, especially because there is no wind

Source: MacMillan Dictionary

Government 1 The act or process of governing, especially the control and administration of public policy in a political unit
 2 The office, function, or authority of a governing individual or body
 3 Exercise of authority in a political unit; rule
 4 The agency or apparatus through which a governing individual or body functions and exercises authority
 5 A governing body or organization, as:
 a. The ruling political party or coalition of political parties in a parliamentary system.
 b. The cabinet in a parliamentary system.
 c. The persons who make up a governing body.
 6 A system or policy by which a political unit is governed
 7 Administration or management of an organization, business, or institution

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language

Government 1 the exercise of political authority over the actions, affairs, etc, of a political unit, people, etc, as well as the performance of certain functions for this unit or body; the action of governing; political rule and administration
2 the system or form by which a community, etc, is ruled
3 the executive policy-making body of a political unit, community, etc; ministry or administration
4 the state and its administration

Source: Collins English Dictionary

Government the system of people, laws, and officials that define and control the country that you live in

Source: Vocabulary.com

Government 1 the people who control a country, region, or city and make decisions about its laws and taxes
2 the process, method, or effects of governing

Source: MacMillan Dictionary

Desirable 1 Worth having or seeking, as by being useful, advantageous, or pleasing
2 Worth doing or achieving; advisable: a desirable reform; a desirable outcome.
3 Arousing desire, especially sexual desire

Source: American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language

Desirable 1 worthy of desire or recommendation
2 arousing desire, esp sexual desire; attractive

Source: Collins English Dictionary

Desirable it is worthy, so many people might want it

Source: Vocabulary.com

Desirable 1 something that is desirable has qualities that make you want it
2 used for saying that you would like something to happen
3 sexually attractive

Source: MacMillan Dictionary

Affirmative Cases

I affirm the resolution, “Resolved: Oppressive government is more desirable than no government.” Affirming achieves the value of justice defined as giving each their due. This is the proper definition of justice because it the popular understanding of justice and so to discuss justice in some other way would make the round incomprehensible to the general audience. Justice is the proper value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value. Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round. To have any possible way of determining which of these two systems to prefer we must use utilitarianism.

Utility is the foundation of morality and the yardstick of justice.

Daniel James [Sanchez](#) (editor of Mises.org, the world center of the Austrian School of economics and libertarian political and social theory, and director of the Mises

The utility of social cooperation is paramount for virtually all acting men, and it is the very foundation of morality. The notion of right and wrong is ... a utilitarian precept designed to make social cooperation under the division of labor possible.^[8] And as the foundation of all morality in general, the utility of social cooperation is also the alpha and the omega of all questions of justice and property in particular. The ultimate yardstick of justice is conduciveness to the preservation of social cooperation. Conduct suited to preserve social cooperation is just, conduct detrimental to the preservation of society is unjust. There cannot be any question of organizing society according to the postulates of an arbitrary

preconceived idea of justice. The problem is to organize society for the best possible realization of those ends which men want to attain by social cooperation.

Social utility is the only standard of justice.^[9]

So, in order to determine which system is more desirable we must use utilitarianism. So the criterion for the round must be achieving the greatest good for the greatest number.

The way to measure this in the context of this round, the greatest number may still be a minority, but that minority is still better off than they would be in the competing system.

The thesis of my case is that oppressive governments do more good for more of their citizens than anarchical systems.

My first contention is that oppressive regimes are preferable for rights protections.

1. Anarchists cannot assure that rights will be protected at all.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), “The Necessity of Government,” Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

For anarchism, however, all this is changed. Anarchists hold that in their scheme also, force would not be used; coercion would not be a feasible alternative to voluntary exchanges. But they cannot assume this in describing the market as they would have it. They cannot assign the problem to another field, as we do, and say that whatever is necessary to prevent the use of force we shall bring about consciously designing our institutions to that end. The anarchists would place governmental services on the market, to be offered by entrepreneurs on the basis of their expectations about the preferences of others. But if so, they can only try to predict what is likely to come about from the interplay of human interests. If we

ask how our rights are to be secured to us in the anarchist system, the anarchist can only answer que sera sera. At best he can try to predict what would happen. This means that if oppressive regimes can be shown to even possibly protect rights, oppressive regimes must be more desirable because anarchy cannot protect rights in the slightest.

2. Rights can be protected, even if to a very limited degree, in a dictatorship.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

Following the Allied victories in 1945, Franco sought to impress the world's democratic powers with Spain's "liberal" credentials by issuing a fundamental law that was ostensibly a bill of rights--the Charter of Rights. The rights granted by this charter were more cosmetic than democratic, because the government bestowed them and could suspend them without justification; furthermore, the charter placed more emphasis on the duty of all Spaniards to serve their country and to obey its laws than on their basic rights as citizens. Thus, for example, the charter guaranteed all Spaniards the right to express their opinions freely, but they were not to attack the fundamental principles of the state.

This means that there is some chance rights will be protected in oppressive regimes because we have empirical proof that it is possible. Thus oppressive regimes are always more desirable.

My second contention is that oppression is better for the economy.

1. Anarchy destroys the law of supply and demand.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), “The Necessity of Government,” Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

The free market is one in which all exchanges are voluntary. A person can trade his time, effort, money, or goods for those of another only if the latter is willing. The economic laws of a free market are true only when or to the extent that this condition obtains. Consider, for example, the law of supply and demand. What would happen to prices if one did not have to pay for a good at a price acceptable to the seller, but could take the good by force, giving nothing in exchange? There is no way of telling. The law of supply and demand does not apply to thieves. The economic analysis of the market assumes that the use of force does not occur, that all exchanges are mutually acceptable to the parties involved. It assumes, in effect that the cost of using force is infinite.

This means that anarchy destroys economic law making it impossible to make any economic predictions with any accuracy meaning anarchy, economically, is pure chance.

2. Dictatorships can make positive economic reforms.

Ignacio Ramonet (Spanish journalist and writer), “Was Fidel Good for Cuba? A Debate between Carlos Alberto Montaner & Ignacio Ramonet,” Foreign Policy, January-February 2007

You also fail to emphasize the reforms that Castro's regime has embarked on, including the opening up to foreign investment, partial deregulation of foreign trade, the decriminalization of the possession of foreign currency, the revitalization of tourism, and so on. More important, the regime has diversified

the country's trade relations, signing agreements with Argentina, Brazil, China, Venezuela, and Vietnam. The result? During the past 10 years, Cuba's average annual growth in gross domestic product was roughly 5 percent, among the highest in Latin America. In 2005, for example, the country saw growth rates of 11.8 percent (including the value of its social services), and a similar rate is expected for 2006. For the first time in its history, this country does not depend on a preferred partner, as it depended, successively, on Spain, the United States, and the Soviet Union. It is more independent than ever. With that rare and hard-earned distinction, Cubans are unlikely to reverse course.

This means that, even if the chance is slight, we have empirical evidence of oppressive regimes making positive economy reforms that benefit the economy. Hence, the odds of a better economy are better within an oppressive regime and so you can affirm.

I affirm the resolution, “Resolved: Oppressive government is more desirable than no government.” Affirming achieves the value of justice defined as giving each their due. This is the proper definition of justice because it the popular understanding of justice and so to discuss justice in some other way would make the round incomprehensible to the general audience. Justice is the proper value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value. Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round.

If there is even going to be a possibility of justice, physical force must be barred from human interactions.

Ayn Rand, “The Nature of Government,” The Virtue of Selfishness, 1964

The use of physical force—even its retaliatory use—cannot be left at the discretion of individual citizens. Peaceful coexistence is impossible if a man has to live under the constant threat of force to be unleashed against him by any of his neighbors at any moment. Whether his neighbors’ intentions are good or bad, whether their judgment is rational or irrational, whether they are motivated by a sense of justice or by ignorance or by prejudice or by malice—the use of force against one man cannot be left to the arbitrary decision of another. Visualize, for example, what would happen if a man missed his wallet, concluded that he had been robbed, broke into every house in the neighborhood to search it, and shot the first man who gave him a dirty look, taking the look to be a proof of guilt. The retaliatory use of force requires objective rules of evidence to establish that a

crime has been committed and to prove who committed it, as well as objective rules to define punishments and enforcement procedures. Men who attempt to prosecute crimes, without such rules, are a lynch mob. If a society left the retaliatory use of force in the hands of individual citizens, it would degenerate into mob rule, lynch law and an endless series of bloody private feuds or vendettas. If physical force is to be barred from social relationships, men need an institution charged with the task of protecting their rights under an objective code of rules.

So the criterion that must be met for there even to be a chance of achieving justice is barring the use of force. In the context of this resolution, we must consider in which society is it more likely that force will be barred. If I prove force is more likely barred in an oppressive regime then you can affirm.

The thesis of my case is that oppressive governments are more desirable than anarchism because they are more likely to bar violence from human interaction.

1. Anarchists reject the only means of potentially eliminating violence from human interactions.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

That such things happen, or would happen, is embarrassing to the anarchist because he allows no means for preventing them from happening. The anarchist is caught in a dilemma. Like his namesake of the nihilistic left, he rejects the social institution through which men attempt, by positive action, to insure themselves of

certain conditions necessary for social existence; yet unlike the nihilist he believes that there are such conditions, and that a form of society in which they do not obtain is unacceptable. Caught in this dilemma, he can only try to argue that these conditions will come about by natural law, so that we need to do nothing ourselves. But this argument, we have seen, is riddled with logical errors. It ignores the difference between coercion and economic goods on the market, a difference that undercuts the argument from the outset. It relies, for its argument that coercion would not in fact occur, on principles that assume coercion cannot occur, which makes the argument circular. And since it rests on a prediction about what men would do, it is vulnerable to the historical facts about what men have done. In the end, the anarchist cannot escape his dilemma; his dilemma is a contradiction. He is advocating a certain end, a society free of violence among men, while rejecting the only means of achieving that end. Thus anarchism is hardly even a political philosophy. It is, much rather, an attempt to escape the responsibility of providing one. It would, as critics contend, be a disaster in practice; but that is because it is fantastic and incoherent in theory.

This means that violence cannot possibly be barred from human interactions in an anarchical system and so there is absolutely no chance of achieving justice.

2. Dictatorships are not necessarily human rights abusers.

Ignacio Ramonet (Spanish journalist and writer), "Was Fidel Good for Cuba? A Debate between Carlos Alberto Montaner & Ignacio Ramonet," *Foreign Policy*, January-February 2007

No serious organization has ever accused Cuba--where, in fact, a moratorium on the death penalty has been in place since 2001--of carrying out "disappearances," engaging in extrajudicial executions, or even performing physical torture on detainees. The same cannot be said of the United States in its five-year-old "war on terror." Of these three types of crimes, not a single case exists in Cuba. On the contrary, to a certain extent the Cuban regime stands for life. It has succeeded in increasing life expectancy and lowering infant mortality. As New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof asserted in a Jan. 12, 2005, article, "If the U.S. had an infant mortality rate as good as Cuba's, [it] would save an additional 2,212 American babies a year." These successes constitute a great legacy of Fidel Castro's, one that few Cubans, even those in the opposition, would want to lose and one that the many Latin Americans who have been swayed recently by populist leaders covet. Cubans enjoy full employment, and each citizen is entitled to three meals a day, an achievement that continues to elude Brazil's Lula. But Castro will not only be remembered as a defender of the weakest and poorest citizens. Historians 100 years from now will credit Castro with building a cohesive nation with a strong identity, even after a century and a half of the white, elitist temptation to side with the United States out of fear of the numerous and oppressed black population. They will remember him correctly, as a preeminent pioneer in the history of his country.

This means there is at least a chance of justice within an oppressive regime because empirically we know that they do not always violate rights and thus they protect their citizen's freedom. Thus this is enough to affirm.

Negative Cases

I negate the resolution, “Resolved: Oppressive government is more desirable than no government.” Negating achieves the value of justice defined as giving each their due. This is the proper definition of justice because it the popular understanding of justice and so to discuss justice in some other way would make the round incomprehensible to the general audience. Justice is the proper value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value. Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round. Most fundamentally, humans are due their own lives.

For this reason, we must do everything we can to prevent nuclear war.

Bill Wickersham (University of Missouri adjunct professor of Peace Studies and a member of The Missouri University Nuclear Disarmament Education Team),

“Nuclear weapons still a threat, disarmament would avoid accidental war,”

Columbia Daily Tribune, September 27, 2011

The time frame for those decisions could be as short as seven minutes, depending on the nature of the perceived attack and the efficiency of communications within the respective early-warning chains of command. Launch-to-landing time for submarine-launched nuclear missiles can occur in as few as four minutes. Launch-to-landing time for hundreds of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles is about 25 minutes. An attack with just two 1-megaton nuclear warheads would unleash explosive power equivalent to that caused by all the bombs used during

World War II. For the duration of the Cold War, leaders of the United States and USSR were concerned about the devastation both countries would experience if a nuclear war were triggered by a false alarm attributable to human or technological error. The Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attack on New York killed nearly 3,000 people, causing massive destruction, chaos and grief. In comparison, a purposeful or accidental nuclear strike between the United States and Russia would kill hundreds of millions in the short term and many more over time caused by worldwide, wind-driven nuclear fallout. Thus, the threat of nuclear war is the most serious potential health, environmental, agricultural, educational and moral problem facing humanity. Steven Starr, senior scientist with Physicians for Social Responsibility, said research makes clear the environmental consequences of a U.S.-Russian nuclear war: "If these weapons are detonated in the large cities of either of their nations, they will cause such catastrophic damage to the global environment that the Earth will become virtually uninhabitable for most humans and many other complex forms of life."

Thus, the criterion for the round must be decreasing the chances of nuclear war. If I prove that nuclear war is less likely with anarchy, then that is enough to negate as it outweighs any other possible concerns.

**A nation transitioning to anarchy will be modeled by other nations
minimizing threats.**

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

The economic effects of this are well-known and are currently being demonstrated in China. As economists point out, revolutionary change can be wrought by marginal effects. Even a slow process of liberalization that is sustained over time will produce massively accelerated economic and technological growth. And the increase in freedom and prosperity in this nation would have profound external effects as well. Many of the bravest and most industrious residents of more repressive nations would attempt to immigrate to the liberalizing one, and some other nations would learn by the liberalizing nation's example and begin to copy its policies. As the economic and technological gap between the liberalizing nation and the rest of world widens, as the rest of the world becomes more dependent upon the goods and services manufactured and supplied by that nation, and as a greater number of other nations are moved to adopt liberalizing policies themselves, the threat the rest of the world poses to the liberalizing nation decreases. Evidence of this is supplied by the demise of the Soviet Union. Radical regimes and terrorist organizations may constitute a serious and continuing threat, but consider it in historical context. Such a threat is considerably less serious and less expensive to address than the threat of thermonuclear war.

This means that moving to a system of anarchy reduces the risk of nuclear war because other nations will model that nation in order to reap the economic benefits. This then is enough to negate.

I negate the resolution, “Resolved: Oppressive government is more desirable than no government.” Negating achieves the value of justice defined as giving each their due. This is the proper definition of justice because it the popular understanding of justice and so to discuss justice in some other way would make the round incomprehensible to the general audience. Justice is the proper value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value. Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round.

Allowing people to struggle in poverty demonstrates how a society values people.

Francine Mestrum (Researcher, PhD in social sciences), “Why we should fight global income inequality,” Global Social Justice, January 9, 2011

The income people receive is not only a means whereby to acquire more goods and services, it is also a tangible recognition of how society values them. Equality is a fundamental value in each society, and that is why the point of inequality becomes relevant when so much attention is focused on globalisation. The inequality between Africa and Europe is not relevant as long as there is no human interaction between them, but once there is, inequality becomes very important.

As fundamentally, people are due being valued by their societies, we must look to what will bring people out of poverty. Hence, the criterion for the round must be overcoming poverty.

The thesis of my case is that anarchy is better at overcoming poverty.

A. The state keeps people poor and subservient.

Gary Chartier (Associate Dean of the School of Business and Associate Professor of Law and Business Ethics at La Sierra University), “Should Bleeding Hearts Be Anarchists,” Bleeding Heart Libertarians, July 13, 2011

Poverty and workplace inequity can occur for multiple reasons. But neither could be expected to be remotely as prevalent in the absence of the state. The state raises the cost of self-employment, boosts the cost of living, and increases the liabilities associated with being poor. The practical result is that people are denied opportunities to better their economic positions and channeled into often unappealing work environments because the state has eliminated viable alternatives. *The state makes and keeps people poor and makes and keeps workers subservient.*

B. The state enables the corporate elite.

Gary Chartier (Associate Dean of the School of Business and Associate Professor of Law and Business Ethics at La Sierra University), “Should Bleeding Hearts Be Anarchists,” Bleeding Heart Libertarians, July 13, 2011

The state confers privileges on the wealthy and well connected. It protects favored industries with tariffs and grants of intellectual property rights, sanctifies large-scale theft by elite groups, hands out direct and indirect subsidies, implements regulatory regimes that suppress competition, constrains the most effective union activity, uses the tax system to benefit politically favored businesses and hamper the activities of others, employs eminent domain to boost the profits of developers and big box retailers, awards staggering bailouts to cronies in the financial and

manufacturing sectors, and otherwise furthers the interests of elites and others.

The state masquerades as the protector of the defenseless against big business, when it is actually very much the ally and enabler of the corporate elite.

This means the state keeps people poor by enabling the corporate elite to keep the poor in poverty.

C. People who want to help the poor should support anarchy.

Gary Chartier (Associate Dean of the School of Business and Associate Professor of Law and Business Ethics at La Sierra University), “Should Bleeding Hearts Be Anarchists,” Bleeding Heart Libertarians, July 13, 2011

People who favor markets, as I do, often defend anarchism by arguing that the state’s monopoly of force and law and its taxation of its subjects violate people’s rights. Without dismissing this sort of argument at all, I want to argue that principled people on the political left—the sort of people who could be expected to listen, at least, to arguments from bleeding heart libertarians—should find anarchism attractive precisely because the state unavoidably harms people on a vast scale through its attacks on the poor, its support for corporate privilege, its war making, and its assaults on personal freedom.

This means that anarchy is better for the poor because it eliminates the institution that pretends to help the poor but actually keeps them down. Hence, this is enough to negate.

Affirmative Extensions

The logic of anarchism cannot even govern a baseball game.

Harry Binswanger (a member of the Ayn Rand Institute's Board of Directors and a Professor in ARI's Objectivist Academic Center), "Anarchy versus Objectivism," The Objectivist Forum, August 1981

In any society, disputes over who has the right to what are inescapable. Even strictly rational men will have disagreements of this kind, and the possibility of human irrationality, which is inherent in free will, multiplies the number of such disputes. The issue, then is: how are political and legal disputes to be settled: by might or by right—by street fighting or by the application of objective, philosophically validated procedures? The most twisted evasion of the "libertarian" anarchists in this context is their view that disputes concerning rights could be settled by "competition" among private force-wielders on the "free market." This claim represents a staggering stolen concept: there is no free market until after force has been excluded. Their approach cannot be applied even to a baseball game, where it would mean that the rules of the game will be defined by whoever wins it. This has not prevented the "libertarian" anarchists from speaking of "the market for liberty" (i.e., the market for the market).

There is no uniquely beneficial method of resolving disputes in anarchy.

Harry Binswanger (a member of the Ayn Rand Institute's Board of Directors and a Professor in ARI's Objectivist Academic Center), "Anarchy versus Objectivism," The Objectivist Forum, August 1981

Behind the puerile fantasies of "market solutions" to political and legal disputes lies the collectivist notion that the ideas of the individual are determined by social institutions, so that once the "proper" social institutions have been established, "the people" will automatically agree on political and legal issues, and government will no longer be necessary. In the Marxist version of anarchism, once a socialist economy has "conditioned" men to altruism, they will automatically act according to the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need." In the "libertarian" version, once a capitalist economy has been established, rational selfishness will become automatic, and "the market" will act to resolve whatever short-lived disputes still arise. In the words of one of the "libertarians": "Legislation forcing the parties [in a dispute] to submit to binding arbitration would be unnecessary, since each party would find arbitration to be in his own self-interest. Nor would it be necessary to have legal protection for the rights of all involved, because the structure of the market situation would protect them." In any irreconcilable dispute, at least one party will find that its view of justice is stymied. Even under anarchy, only one side will be able to enforce its ideas of where the right lies. But it does not occur to the anarchists that when one of their private "defense agencies" uses force, it is acting as a "monopolist" over whomever it coerces. It does not occur to them that private, anarchistic force is still force—i.e., the "monopolistic" subjection of another's will to one's own. They are aware of and object to the forcible negation of "competing" viewpoints only when it is done by a government. Thus, their actual objection to government is not to its "monopolistic" character, but to the fact that "A government is the means of placing the retaliatory use of physical force under objective control—i.e., under objectively defined laws."

For anarchy to even possibly function, we must assume everyone is a pacifist.

Harry Binswanger (a member of the Ayn Rand Institute's Board of Directors and a Professor in ARI's Objectivist Academic Center), "Anarchy versus Objectivism," The Objectivist Forum, August 1981

The first might be called "the argument from moral freedom." This argument holds that it is wrong to impose morality by force, which government, as a monopoly, necessarily does, since it is on moral grounds that it prohibits "competitors." The alternative to imposing morality by force, it is claimed, is letting a thousand flowers bloom—i.e., non-monopolizing "defense agencies," each attracting, voluntarily, "customers" who patronize whichever agency has the moral outlook they find most congenial. But this ignores the fact that we are not concerned with shopping for shoes but with "shopping" for wielders of physical force. Force is not a market good; force is "monopolistic": it is the subjugation of another's will to your own. Force is the opposite of permitting dissent. By its nature, force is the imposition of value-judgments—the coercer's ideas about what ought to be. This remains true whether the wielder of force is called "the government" or "Joe's defense agency." If one must avoid imposing moral ideas by force, then one must renounce force altogether—i.e., practice pacifism. Like all arguments against the monopolization of force, "the argument from moral freedom," reduces to an advocacy of pacifism. Pacifism is the most nearly consistent form of anarchism. Few anarchists, however realize this. They implicitly assume that there is such a thing as physical force that lets dissenters go their own way. Let me concretize this. If someone shoots at me and I shoot back, I am using force to impose my morality—the moral rightness of my defending my life—on the gunman shooting at me. To avoid imposing my morality by force, I could only try to persuade him not to kill me. I could not use defensive force against him. The non-initiation of force principle is itself a moral principle. Individual rights are moral principles. Is it wrong to use retaliatory force to "impose" freedom and to protect rights? This points to the equivocation in "imposing morality." It is indeed wrong for the government to "impose morality" in the sense of trying to force men to be virtuous. But that is not what a proper, limited government does: its coercive "imposition" of morality is retaliatory force used to protect freedom. It is indeed in the name of morality that the government "imposes" freedom: freedom is what makes virtuous action possible. But only the free choice of the individual can make virtue actual. Virtue cannot be coerced. For example, it is wrong for the government to make men go to church or to stop them from going to church; it is right for the government to wield retaliatory force to secure their freedom to make this choice for themselves. Force used to maintain freedom is force used to "impose morality" to that extent. This is true whether the force is wielded by the government, a private group, or an individual. Again, the only alternative is not merely the absence of government but the absence of retaliatory force—i.e., pacifism.

The logic of anarchism collapses under any scrutiny.

Harry Binswanger (a member of the Ayn Rand Institute's Board of Directors and a Professor in ARI's Objectivist Academic Center), "Anarchy versus Objectivism," The Objectivist Forum, August 1981

If it is morally proper for an individual to defend himself by force, it is morally proper for him to band together with others to do so—i.e., to form a government. The same facts that make individual self-defense moral—i.e., the right to self-defense—makes governmental force moral if it is used in defense of the rights of individuals. Government is not a collective super-organism. It is the agent of those individuals who establish and support it, by delegating their right of self-defense to it. If those individuals have the right to defend themselves, then the government, as their agent, has the right to wield retaliatory force on their behalf. Only a collectivized mentality can hold that the police, acting on my behalf, cannot forcibly exclude "competitors" but a "defense agency" can. Put it this way: a proper government is a defense agency, and to carry out its mission it can't let "competitors" (other gangs) use unsupervised force. The telling difference between a proper government and a private defense agency is that a proper government is placed under objective control. Thus non-pacifist anarchists object not to retaliatory force but to placing retaliatory force under objective control. Their objection is to objectivity.

Anarchy is not a check on oppression because oppression is a reflection of the ideas accepted by the people.

Harry Binswanger (a member of the Ayn Rand Institute's Board of Directors and a Professor in ARI's Objectivist Academic Center), "Anarchy versus Objectivism," The Objectivist Forum, August 1981

The second argument of "anarcho-capitalists" is the argument from history: governments have always grown beyond their proper limits, so we must assume they inevitably do so. This argument ignores why government has grown. The cause is: bad philosophy. Particularly, altruism. The history of the United States shows exactly this. Our Government has grown beyond its proper limits because Americans have thought that it ought to. It is men's ideas that rule their actions and their politics. It is not the power-lust of politicians but the philosophical ideas of the citizenry that have caused the expansion of state power since the founding of this country. The power-lust of politicians would be impotent in a society whose citizenry—and intellectuals—understood the Objectivist political philosophy. Does anyone think that a power-luster who got into Galt's Gulch would have any chance of succeeding? End of story. And if one holds that the majority of men are too irrational to ever see that their own self-interest requires a free society, then one must simply give up and retreat to a deserted island. One cannot consistently advocate any ideas—including anarchism—if the vast majority will not listen to reason.

If a society cannot check oppression, anarchy will not check oppression.

Harry Binswanger (a member of the Ayn Rand Institute's Board of Directors and a Professor in ARI's Objectivist Academic Center), "Anarchy versus Objectivism," The Objectivist Forum, August 1981

We see here a variant of the contradiction in Plato's doctrine of the philosopher-king. Plato held that "the masses" are inherently incapable of distinguishing true philosophic ideas from trickily presented false ones, as promulgated by the Sophists of his time. Yet, inconsistently, Plato held that the ideal society would be one in which the military would enforce the right philosophy (i.e., Plato's) on the populace. But how would the military know who is the right philosopher to follow? How would they know which philosopher to obey? And what would make the populace submit to the rule of those military men? On Plato's pessimistic view of the average man, no philosopher-king could ever come to power or stay in power. In the same way, if "the masses" are too irrational to keep government within its proper bounds, they are too irrational to keep "defense agencies" to the task of actual defense. One final wrinkle. "Anarcho-capitalists" claim that "the market" would keep defense agencies in check. (This idea represents a collectivist view of the market.) But remember: what is up for grabs here is whether or not there will be a market. When the society is turned over to warring gangs, the race goes to the bloodiest, not to the best producers. And that is one more aspect in which the "anarcho-capitalists" are actually statist: they equate the dollar and the gun, production and force. The Left claims that "concentrations of wealth" on the market are coercive. The "anarcho-capitalists" claim that coercion is just another service on the market. But both are wrong: voluntary exchange has nothing in common with coercive interactions.

Dictatorships bounce back from economic recession faster.

Hao Li, "The Economic Advantages of Dictatorship," International Business Times, December

Koo explains that the real estate collapse left the private sector with too much debt and too little assets. In response, it is using income to pay down debt, or de-leveraging, instead of spending, investing, and taking out more loans. In this case, the government must step in and fill that void, through fiscal stimulus, until the private sector has repaired its balance sheet and can move forward. So far, China, "because it is a dictatorship," has been able to do so, said Koo at a Council on Foreign Relations meeting. He pointed it out that China's stimulus package, as a percentage of its GDP, was three times larger than the U.S. fiscal stimulus. As a result, China is bouncing back quickly while the U.S., Japan, and many other countries lag behind. Koo cited Nazi Germany as another example to illustrate the economic advantage of dictatorships. Germany was reeling from the heavy burden of war reparations and a global economic recession in the early 1930s. However, from 1933 (when Hitler ascended to power) to 1938, the unemployment rate declined from 30 percent to 2 percent and industrial production doubled. Hitler achieved this through massive government intervention and spending. Meanwhile, democracies like the U.S., U.K., and France languished economically during the 1930s. Interestingly, the U.S. was finally lifted out of the Great Depression in the 1940s by its own massive government spending. The U.S. democratic government, of course, was only able to do so because it was facing the military crisis of World War II.

Autocratic powers helped Franco turn around a chaotic Spain.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

Ideology or political theories were not the primary motivators in Franco's developing of the institutions that came to be identified with his name. Franco had spent his life as a professional soldier, and his conception of society was along military lines. Known for his iron political nerve, Franco saw himself as the one designated to save Spain from the chaos and instability visited upon the country by the evils of parliamentary democracy and political parties, which he blamed for destroying the unity of Spain. His pragmatic goal was to maintain power in order to keep what he termed the "anti-Spain" forces from gaining ascendancy. The political structures established under Franco's rule represented this pragmatic approach. Because he never formulated a true, comprehensive, constitutional system, Franco had great flexibility in dealing with changing domestic and international situations. Seven fundamental laws decreed during his rule provided the regime with a semblance of constitutionalism, but they were developed after the fact, usually to legitimize an existing situation or distribution of power.

Autocratic powers ensured Franco's Spain had full employment with reasonable hours.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

The first of these fundamental laws was the Labor Charter, promulgated on March 9, 1938. It set forth the social policy of the regime, and it stressed the mutual obligations of the state and its citizens: all Spaniards had the duty to work, and the state was to assure them the right to work. Although the decree called for adequate wages, paid vacations, and a limit to working hours, it ensured labor's compliance with the new regime by labeling strikes as treason. Later legislation required Spanish workers to join vertical syndicates in which both owners and employees were supposed to cooperate for the good of the nation.

Rights can be protected, even if to a very limited degree, in a dictatorship.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

Following the Allied victories in 1945, Franco sought to impress the world's democratic powers with Spain's "liberal" credentials by issuing a fundamental law that was ostensibly a bill of rights--the Charter of Rights. The rights granted by this charter were more cosmetic than democratic, because the government bestowed them and could suspend them without justification; furthermore, the charter placed more emphasis on the duty of all Spaniards to serve their country and to obey its laws than on their basic rights as citizens. Thus, for example, the charter guaranteed all Spaniards the right to express their opinions freely, but they were not to attack the fundamental principles of the state.

Citizens can be at least moderately empowered in a dictatorship.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

The Law on Referenda, also issued in 1945, was a further attempt by Franco to make his regime appear less arbitrary. It provided that issues of national concern would be submitted for the consideration of Spanish citizens by means of popular referenda. Franco decreed this law without having consulted the Cortes, however, and he retained the sole right to determine whether a referendum would be called. The law stipulated that after 1947, a referendum would have to be called in order to alter any fundamental law; Franco retained the right to decree such laws, however--a right which he exercised in 1958.

Dictatorships can be concerned with the rights of prisoners.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

Additional measures that were taken in the immediate postwar years to provide the Franco regime with a facade of democracy included pardons and reduced terms for prisoners convicted of civil war crimes and a guarantee that refugees who returned would not be prosecuted if they did not engage in political activities. The regime announced new elections for municipal councils; council members were to be selected indirectly by syndicates and heads of "families." The government retained the right to appoint all mayors directly.

Autocratic regimes need not necessarily be anti-democratic.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

The Law of Succession (1947) was the first of the fundamental laws to be submitted to popular referendum. It proclaimed that Spain would be a "Catholic, social, and representative monarchy" and that Franco would be regent for life (unless incapacitated). Franco had the authority to name the next king when he thought the time was appropriate and also to revoke his choice at a later date if he so desired. The law also provided for a Council of the Realm to assist Franco in the exercise of executive power and for a three-member Regency Council to be in charge of the government during the period of transition to the Caudillo's successor. When the plebiscite was held, over 90 percent of the 15 million voters approved the measures. Although the Law of Succession ostensibly reestablished the monarchy, it actually solidified Franco's rule and legitimized his position as head of state by popular suffrage.

Autocratic regimes can have a basic, even if weak, system of checks.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

The final fundamental law, the Organic Law of the State, was presented in 1966. It incorporated no major changes, but was designed to codify and to clarify existing practices, while allowing for some degree of reform. It established a separation between the functions of the president of government (prime minister) and the head of state, and it outlined the procedures for the selection of top government officials. It included other measures designed to modernize the Spanish system and to eliminate vestiges of fascist terminology. Although presented as a move toward democratization, it nevertheless retained the basic structure of an authoritarian system.

Autocratic regimes can cultural institutions and pluralism.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

In spite of the regime's strong degree of control, Franco did not pursue totalitarian domination of all social, cultural, and religious institutions, or of the economy as a whole. The Franco regime also lacked the ideological impetus characteristic of totalitarian governments. Furthermore, for those willing to work within the system, there was a limited form of pluralism. Thus, Franco's rule has been characterized as authoritarian rather than totalitarian.

Oppressive government can be used to drastically improve the healthcare system.

Steve Brouwer, "The Cuban Revolutionary Doctor: The Ultimate Weapon of Solidarity," *Monthly Review*, 2009, Volume 60, Issue 08 (January)

Their experience is the newest reflection of how Cuba, in concert with the people of many nations in Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean, is transforming the training of doctors, nurses, and other health professionals while also delivering medical care to poor populations that in the past seldom received any attention at all. This dynamic notion, planted by Che and others at the beginning of the Revolution, has taken decades finally to develop, and now has come to fruition: thousands of doctors have been created who are capable of practicing and teaching revolutionary medicine, and they are putting this "weapon" to good use.

Despotic governments can demonstrate concern for neighboring countries.

Steve Brouwer (author), "The Cuban Revolutionary Doctor: The Ultimate Weapon of Solidarity," Monthly Review, 2009, Volume 60, Issue 08 (January)

In 2003, this positive force was deployed on a massive scale in order to aid the Bolivarian Revolution in Venezuela in delivering health care to its long-neglected population. The process began when a strike by the Venezuelan Medical Federation created such a total breakdown in medical service that the mayor of the Libertador section of Caracas, Fredy Bernal, sought to directly hire Venezuelan doctors to form a new community medical network. But only fifty Venezuelans applied for the positions, and just twenty of those doctors were willing to work in Libertador's impoverished neighborhoods. The frustrated mayor then asked the Cuban Embassy for help, and Cuba responded by dispatching a small group of highly trained physicians who had extensive experience working with medical brigades in other nations. Within a few months, hundreds more Cuban doctors arrived in Caracas to add their skills to the new network of family care. The experiment was so successful that the Venezuelan government decided the pilot program, called Barrio Adentro (inside the barrio), should be duplicated nationwide. In scarcely more than a year, by mid-2004, there were more than ten thousand Cuban doctors working in Barrio Adentro and meeting the needs of urban and rural residents all over the country. This massive deployment of medical force did not go unnoticed by antirevolutionary forces in the hemisphere.

Bias against dictatorial governments undermines international cooperative efforts for the good.

Steve Brouwer (author), "The Cuban Revolutionary Doctor: The Ultimate Weapon of Solidarity," Monthly Review, 2009, Volume 60, Issue 08 (January)

"We are concerned that Cuba is developing a limited biological weapons effort," said John Bolton, U.S. undersecretary of state for George W. Bush, on March 30, 2004, repeating an allegation he made in May 2002. It was clear to most observers, even within the Bush administration, that Bolton's accusations that Cuba was developing "Weapons of Mass Destruction" in the form of deadly biological materials concocted in the laboratory, were unfounded. It was also clear from Bolton's rhetoric, however, that the U.S. government was escalating its longstanding hostility toward Cuba because its attempts to isolate and impoverish Cuba were failing. So were its efforts to undermine the Bolivarian Revolution. It was ironic that the most prominent of all the cooperative ventures being pursued by the Cuban and Venezuelan government involved a very different kind of biological warfare, a benign and energetic campaign by medical professionals to defeat germs and disease and bring quality health care to the majority of the Venezuelan people. The United States, the world's only military superpower and, until very recently, the master of global financial capital, rightly feared that Cuba's example of international solidarity would be admired by many nations around the world, at a time when the U.S. image was more tarnished than ever before. It could do little to frustrate the capacity of Cuba, a small and poor nation, to deploy its human capital in such a useful and impressive manner.

Dictatorships can provide significant humanitarian aid.

Steve Brouwer (author), "The Cuban Revolutionary Doctor: The Ultimate Weapon of Solidarity," *Monthly Review*, 2009, Volume 60, Issue 08 (January)

The extraordinary number of physicians in this small nation, 72,417 as of 2007, has allowed Cuba to mobilize thousands of medical professionals (including nurses, dentists, and medical technicians) who are willing to go anywhere in the world to provide disaster relief and treat poor populations who do not have access to adequate health care.⁴ Revolutionary Cuba has always been willing to do this in the spirit of international solidarity, even when they had a shortage of personnel to treat their own citizens. In 1963, the first Cuban doctors traveled to Africa to help deliver health care in the newly independent Algeria, which suffered a dearth of medical professionals when the French colonialists departed. Later, Cuban physicians volunteered to go to sub-Saharan Africa, including those who accompanied Che Guevara on clandestine missions in the Congo in the 1960s. They also accompanied Cuban troops fighting alongside soldiers of the revolutionary Angolan government in its bitter wars against apartheid South Africa and rebel forces backed by the United States.⁵

Latin Americans have historically found dictatorships more desirable.

Marc Becker, "Dictatorship in Latin America – Bibliography," *Science Encyclopedia*, <http://science.jrank.org/pages/7630/Dictatorship-in-Latin-America.html>

It is a somewhat common refrain in Latin America that countries need the *mano dura* (strong hand) of a military dictatorship in order to get things done. Surveys in the early twenty-first century reveal a growing disenchantment with civilian governments, with a surprisingly large minority of Latin Americans stating a preference for a dictatorial form of government over democracy. Such sentiments date back to the founding of the Latin American republics in the early nineteenth century. After the removal of the Iberian crowns, conservatives argued that the new states were like children who needed parental guidance. These conservatives favored a centralist form of government in which a small group of elites would hold power and rule paternalistically on behalf of the rest of the country. Positivism, with its emphasis on order and progress, often provided a philosophical basis for such regimes in Latin America.

Dictatorships can be more desirable when civil services fail.

Marc Becker, "Dictatorship in Latin America – Bibliography," Science Encyclopedia, <http://science.jrank.org/pages/7630/Dictatorship-in-Latin-America.html>

Military rule has been a feature of Latin America dating back to the colonial period. Rather than interpreting this as a cultural phenomenon, many observers have pointed to a failure of civilian institutions to address persistent problems of poverty and corruption. Some twentieth-century military dictatorships follow the pattern of nineteenth-century caudillo leaders who often ruled more through a use of personal charisma than brute military force. In fact, the only remaining nonelected executive in Latin America at the end of the twentieth century was Fidel Castro in Cuba, and his personalist style was more in line with the leadership of classic caudillos than what many would understand as the defining characteristics of a military dictatorship. However, while caudillos could be civilians and presented a variety of ideological stripes, "dictatorship" in Latin America normally refers to right-wing rulers who maintain themselves in power through overwhelming military force. For example, the Somoza and Pinochet dictatorships in Nicaragua and Chile maintained power more through repressive means than through personalist, caudillo styles of government. Particularly in South America in the 1960s and 1970s, bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes like those in Chile and Argentina attempted to use the power of state institutions to enact a fundamental reordering of society.

Dictatorships can be checked when they become too oppressive.

Marc Becker, "Dictatorship in Latin America – Bibliography," Science Encyclopedia, <http://science.jrank.org/pages/7630/Dictatorship-in-Latin-America.html>

In Nicaragua, a series of three Somozas established a family dynasty that ruled the country from 1936 to 1979. The United States placed the first Somoza, Anastasio Somoza García, at the head of a national guard in order to continue a fight against the nationalist hero Augusto César Sandino after the United States withdrew its military forces from the country. Somoza, as well as his two successors, his sons Luis Somoza Debayle and Anastasio Somoza Debayle, spoke English fluently and remained submissive to United States foreign policy objectives. As Franklin Roosevelt allegedly said of the elder Somoza, "He may be a son-of-a-bitch, but he is our son-of-a-bitch" (Schmitz, p. 4). Over time, the Somoza family dynasty became increasingly brutal as it extended complete control over the country. A growing disparity in land distribution and gaps between the rich and the poor led to increasing discontent. Mounting repression and corruption finally led to alienation of the middle class and evaporation of business support for the regime. On 19 July 1979 Sandinista guerrillas overthrew the dictatorship and implemented a leftist revolutionary government.

Dictatorships can be useful in bringing positive reforms to their country.

Marc Becker, "Dictatorship in Latin America – Bibliography," Science Encyclopedia, <http://science.jrank.org/pages/7630/Dictatorship-in-Latin-America.html>

The Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces, which came to power in Peru in 1968 under the leadership of General Juan Velasco Alvarado, provides an interesting counterpoint to these conservative military dictatorships. At first, Velasco's rise to power appeared to be just another military coup, but he soon announced plans for deep changes in government, including the nationalization of industries, worker participation in the ownership and management of these industries, and a sweeping agrarian reform law designed to end unjust social and economic structures. In implementing these reforms, Velasco challenged the incompetence and corruption of civilian politicians who were unable to implement badly needed reforms. He announced a "third way" of national development between capitalism and socialism. As a result of his reforms, food production increased, and peasants' wages and quality of life improved. Much as nineteenth-century caudillos sometimes brought positive changes to their countries, supporters viewed Velasco's military government as what Peru needed to improve and advance the country.

Military dictatorships can be progressive.

Marc Becker, "Dictatorship in Latin America – Bibliography," Science Encyclopedia, <http://science.jrank.org/pages/7630/Dictatorship-in-Latin-America.html>

While progressive military governments in Peru and, to a lesser extent, Ecuador and Panama ruled in favor of the lower classes, implementing agrarian, labor, and other reforms, their ultimate aim was to undercut leftist organizing strategies. Providing agrarian reforms, even though they were partial, limited, and served to support the existing class structures, drew strength away from peasant and guerrilla demands. Ultimately, however, these reforms failed to address fundamental structural problems in society. These failures reveal how difficult it was to escape from dependent development without radical structural changes in class, property relations, and income distribution. At the same time, this history reveals that military governments are not always as reactionary as one might think. Furthermore, various branches of the military also tend to have different ideological orientations. Specifically, the army is sometimes seen as progressive because of its development work in rural communities, whereas the navy is usually affiliated with the elite and the police are often accused of committing the bulk of human rights abuses. This reveals the need for a more careful and complex interpretation of the role of the military, to break away from simplistic and unidimensional perspectives on the history of dictatorships in Latin America.

Dictatorships can be responsive to their people.

Ignacio Ramonet (Spanish journalist and writer), "Was Fidel Good for Cuba? A Debate between Carlos Alberto Montaner & Ignacio Ramonet," Foreign Policy, January-February 2007

Unlike in Hungary, major Cuban reforms have not been the result of foreign ideas driven by foreign troops arriving on Soviet-armored vehicles. Rather, they have proceeded from a popular movement in which the hopes of peasants, workers, and even professionals from the small urban bourgeoisie have converged. This movement also capitalized on the desire for genuine national independence (frustrated by the 1898 U.S. intervention) and the longing to put an end to humiliating racial discrimination. And it continues to have the support of the majority of its citizens. Castro's death will not dismantle a movement hundreds of years in the making. To disavow this national character is to ignore some of the regime's essential dimensions. And it is to fail to understand why, 15 years after the disappearance of the Soviet Union, Cuba's regime is still in place.

Negative Extensions

There is overwhelming evidence that the market does everything better than the government.

Nick Coons (CEO of RedSeven Computer Company and radio talk show host), "The Case Against the State - Anarchy, Not Chaos," The Libertarian Solution, October 21, 2009

But we do know from experience that the free market does everything better than government. There has never been a case where the free market provided a service, and was taken over by the government only to find that the service improved. Likewise, there has never been a case where government provided a service, and it was turned loose to the free market where the quality of the service declined. The free market, very literally, does everything of value better than government. The empirical evidence is overwhelming, so much so that it can reliably said that everything the government currently does, including security and dispute resolution, will be handled better by the free market. The public sector has given us no evidence that it provides these services well, nor does it act as some sort of necessary glue holding society together.

Not being able to predict the future is not an argument against anarchy.

Nick Coons (CEO of RedSeven Computer Company and radio talk show host), "The Case Against the State - Anarchy, Not Chaos," The Libertarian Solution, October 21, 2009

Not being able to predict the future ("how will security and dispute resolution work without government?") is not a case for keeping the government, any more than it is a case for maintaining the institution of slavery. When slavery was on the cusp of being abolished, there were likely people who wondered what would become of former slaves. Their masters fed and clothed them. How would they eat once they were freed? Would they find jobs? Would all of them find enough work to make enough money to eat? How can you know for sure?

History proves that society thrives when evil is abolished.

Nick Coons (CEO of RedSeven Computer Company and radio talk show host), "The Case Against the State - Anarchy, Not Chaos," The Libertarian Solution, October 21, 2009

Answering these questions would require a crystal ball. But they're completely irrelevant, because the issue is not in the effect of abolishing slavery; it's in the morality, which is something that we can and do know in advance, because morality is a universal. Slavery is wrong; this is a moral rule, and it is the only thing we need to know if we are going to discuss whether or not slavery should exist. The free market will allow freed slaves to get jobs and benefit from being free, and so history shows us that this was absolutely true. It's amazing how society as a whole prospers when we abolish something that we know to be evil, even if we can't predict the exact path prosperity takes us.

Evil is better prevented in the absence of the state.

Nick Coons (CEO of RedSeven Computer Company and radio talk show host), “The Case Against the State - Anarchy, Not Chaos,” *The Libertarian Solution*, October 21, 2009

Likewise, governments around the world are responsible for the vast majority of all violence. The institution of state power is evil, as it attempts to create virtue out of acts of aggression. How can we prevent such acts of evil by thugs in the absence of a state? The short answer is, "better than in the presence of a state." If society is unenlightened and morality misunderstood, the presence of government does not temper evil, it amplifies it. In a statist society, those hungry for power will seek out institutions like government in order to put their desires into practice behind the protective wall of the state. If you believe that all human interactions should be voluntary and not compulsory, if you believe in the non-aggression principle, then the only logical conclusion is a stateless society; free market anarchism.

Anarchy is not a system lacking in enforcement.

Andrew Rutten (Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Stanford University and Associate Editor of *The Independent Review*), “Can Anarchy Save Us From Leviathan?” *The Independent Institute*, Spring, 1999

The advocates of anarchy would answer “not us.” The theme of their work is that Hobbes, Locke, and almost everyone else are wrong about anarchy. The advocates point to the growing body of theory and evidence that life in anarchy isn’t at all as most people imagine it. Whether we look at businessmen in Wisconsin, diamond merchants in New York, or farmers in Sri Lanka, we find that “order without law” is not just a slogan but a way of life (Macaulay 1963; Bernstein 1992; Ostrom 1990). Those anarchies work because, contra Hobbes, they do not lack an enforcer of rights.¹ Or rather, instead of a single enforcer—the centralized monopolist we call the state— anarchies have a variety of decentralized enforcers, such as markets, firms, and communities. Thus, anarchies avoid chaos by providing lots of folks with an incentive to pitch in and punish deviants.

The state is not a necessary evil; it is an unnecessary evil.

Andrew Rutten (Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Stanford University and Associate Editor of *The Independent Review*), “Can Anarchy Save Us From Leviathan?” *The Independent Institute*, Spring, 1999

For a small but growing group of anarchists, rehabilitating anarchy is only the first step toward reconstructing liberal political theory. For them, liberal theory errs by treating the state as a necessary evil, rather than an unnecessary one. The anarchists argue that the state is evil because it invariably abuses its power, violating the rights of some for the benefit of others, and that it is unnecessary because even without it we would still have social order and respect for each other’s rights. From their perspective, “limited government” is a contradiction in terms, a project that simply cannot succeed. Thus, for them, the job of the political economist is not to tame the state but to teach us how to do without it.

The common Hobbesian view of anarchism is flawed.

Andrew Ruttan (Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Stanford University and Associate Editor of The Independent Review), "Can Anarchy Save Us From Leviathan?" The Independent Institute, Spring, 1999

The major difference between the Hobbesian and the de Jasian view of anarchy is that de Jasy, like other anarcho-liberals, takes into account a central fact of social life: not everyone is a stranger. Whether at work or at play, most of us find ourselves dealing again and again with the same people. This fact makes a huge difference for strategic behavior. Put crudely, the knowledge that we will see people again gives us a powerful incentive to be nice to them, because if we are not, they may not be nice to us in the future. Facing that threat, even the most narrowly self-interested, brutally calculating egotist might find that it pays to act like Mother Teresa. Because this account is central to de Jasy's claims, and because he touches on it only briefly, it is worthwhile to explore the underlying logic of the rational-choice account of anarchy in some detail. Stripped to its core, the argument for anarcho-liberalism is that the Hobbesians mischaracterize anarchy when they treat it as a series of isolated two-person deals. Doing so ignores the obvious fact that most of our dealings with others are embedded in a rich web of social relations. In game-theoretic terms, that embeddedness moves society from one-shot games to repeated games. And, as is now well known, cooperation is rational in repeated games. It is rational not because dealing with each other again and again changes peoples' preferences or because it allows them to learn who is honest and thus trustworthy. Rather, people cooperate in repeated games because doing so pays them more than not cooperating. It pays more because, as long as the future value of the relationship exceeds the onetime gain from cheating, people can punish each other by not cooperating in the future. Thus, in the shadow of the future, people can make what economists call implicit or self-enforcing contracts, agreements that bind them without the help of any third parties. Such a contract exemplifies an equilibrium institution, a set of rules obeyed because everyone finds it in his interest to obey. Of course, besides following the rules about their own behavior in the social games they play with each other, people must also follow the rules about monitoring compliance and punishing deviants.

Communities can be used to enforce contracts.

Andrew Ruttan (Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Stanford University and Associate Editor of The Independent Review), "Can Anarchy Save Us From Leviathan?" The Independent Institute, Spring, 1999

The idea of a self-enforcing contract, if not the terminology, lies behind much of the empirical literature on "order without law." For example, few business arrangements resemble the classic arms-length agreements enforced by courts that used to populate textbooks in economics and law. Instead, in many instances real contracts are better thought of as relational contracts, deals between people who expect to have a long (and prosperous) relationship. Moreover, in the shadow of the future, people can sustain cooperation even with strangers. They can do so because, even though we may not deal with any one person often, we do deal with the same group of people repeatedly. Even in the modern world, many of our relationships take place in communities, groups of people who have overlapping relations. We can use those communities to enforce cooperation by expanding the terms of cooperation, so that we respond not just to our own history but to everyone else's history as well. In that way, people who belong to a community can use the other members as third parties to enforce their agreements (Greif 1993; Kreps 1990).

Abolishing government will not lead to violence and chaos.

Ludwig Von Mises Institute, "Myths about market anarchy," Ludwig Von Mises Institute, 2011

The idea the law and order can exist only when they are forcibly imposed on a society is both flawed and dangerous. People who value their safety and their reputations typically do not cause to much trouble for others. We can surmise that if government suddenly disappeared, seemingly normal people would not suddenly turn to nudism and cannibalism as hobbies. It is dangerous, because if it is true that people need the government to keep them from raising Cain, then the question logically arises: why should we have any freedoms at all? Why should we have freedom of speech, of the Fourth Amendment, or have the right to choose our leaders at the ballot box? Those are some uncomfortable questions. Mainstream sociologists assume that "we need government" and don't bother to explain why, but then they avoid the politically-incorrect conclusion that we need fascism. In other words, people who would go crazy with no government will be civilized with democratic institutions. That is obviously a hollow argument at best.

Society can stop crime without government.

Ludwig Von Mises Institute, "Myths about market anarchy," Ludwig Von Mises Institute, 2011

Firstly, there is something to be said for the role in privately-owned, civilian firearms in deterring crime. "Laws that forbid the carrying of arms . . . disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes . . . Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man." Cesare of Beccaria, 1738-1794 Secondly, it is an established fact that laws against prostitution and controlled substances promote the activities of criminal organizations through a lucrative black market. A laissez-faire society would have these victimless crimes, and would not have "the mob". And finally, the free market would allocate police where they are most needed. Some people might pay to have their homes under 24-hour surveillance. Some people would insure their possessions against theft, and some would refuse to pay for any protective services at all.

Associating anarchy with chaos and violence prevents reasoned discussion of the topic.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Anarchy refers to a society without a central political authority. But it is also used to refer to disorder or chaos. This constitutes a textbook example of Orwellian newspeak in which assigning the same name to two different concepts effectively narrows the range of thought. For if lack of government is identified with the lack of order, no one will ask whether lack of government actually results in a lack of order. And this uninquisitive mental attitude is absolutely essential to the case for the state. For if people were ever to seriously question whether government actions are really productive of order, popular support for government would almost instantly collapse.

Associating anarchy with violence and chaos blinds us to the facts of reality.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

The identification of anarchy with disorder is not a trivial matter. The power of our conceptions to blind us to the facts of the world around us cannot be gainsaid. I myself have had the experience of eating lunch just outside Temple University's law school in North Philadelphia with a brilliant law professor who was declaiming upon the absolute necessity of the state provision of police services. He did this just as one of Temple's uniformed private armed guards passed by us escorting a female student to the Metro stop in this crime-ridden neighborhood that is vastly underserved by the Philadelphia police force. A wise man once told me that the best way to prove that something is possible is to show that it exists.

Anarchy is society without a government, not a society without governance.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), “The Obviousness of Anarchy,” Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

I am presenting an argument for anarchy in the true sense of the term—that is, a society without government, not a society without governance. There is no such thing as a society without governance. A society with no mechanism for bringing order to human existence is oxymoronic; it is not “society” at all.

Arguing for peaceful anarchism is not utopian.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), “The Obviousness of Anarchy,” Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

In arguing for anarchy, I am arguing that a society without a central political authority is not only possible but desirable. That is all I am doing, however. I am not arguing for a society without coercion. I am not arguing for a society that abides by the libertarian non-aggression principle or any other principle of justice. I am not arguing for the morally ideal organization of society. I am not arguing for utopia. What constitutes ideal justice and the perfectly just society is a fascinating philosophical question, but it is one that is irrelevant to the current pursuit. I am arguing only that human beings can live together successfully and prosper in the absence of a centralized coercive authority. To make the case for anarchy, that is all that is required.

National defense is meaningless in the context of anarchy.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), “The Obviousness of Anarchy,” Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

An additional limitation on my argument is that I do not address the question of national defense. There are two reasons for this. One is the logical one that a society without government is a society without nations. In this context, “national” defense is a meaningless concept. If you wish, you may see this as an assertion that an argument for anarchy is necessarily an argument for global anarchy. I prefer to see it merely as the recognition that human beings, not nations, need defense. The more significant reason, however, is that I regard the problem of national defense as trivial for reasons I will expand upon subsequently.¹

The affirmative has a burden to prove that there are services that can only be provided by a monopolistic, coercive entity.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Note that the question is not whether the "market" can supply all necessary goods and services, at least not the market as it is usually defined by economists. Some anarchists argue that the free market can supply all necessary goods and services. But the case for anarchy does not require that one assert this claim, and I do not. Anarchy requires, and I argue, only that no essential good or service must be supplied through the conscious actions of the agents of a coercively maintained monopoly. Properly understood, the question is whether there are some essential goods and services that must be provided politically or whether all such goods and services can be provided by non-political means.² Many political theorists argue that there is a wide array of goods and services that must be provided by the state. In the present context, however, there is no need to consider whether the government must provide postal service, elementary schooling, or universal health insurance. The debate between anarchists and the supporters of a classical liberal, night watchman state concerns the core functions of government. The question thus resolves itself into whether these core functions can be supplied through non-political means.

The government is not necessary to establish rules of order for society.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Supporters of government claim that government is necessary to provide the fundamental rules that bring order to human life in society. Without government to create rules of law, they contend, human beings are unable to banish violence and coordinate their actions sufficiently to produce a peaceful and prosperous society, and hence, are doomed to a Hobbesian existence that is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."³ The proper response to this is: look around. Those of us residing in the United States or any of the British Commonwealth countries live under an extremely sophisticated and subtle scheme of rules, very few of which were created by government. Since almost none of the rules that bring peace and order to our existence were created by government, little argument should be required to establish that government is not necessary to create such rules. On the contrary, it is precisely the rules that were created by government that tend to undermine peace and order.

Most modern laws are merely the codification of accepted customs and rules once called common law meaning order does not originate from the state.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

The Anglo-American legal system is often referred to as a common law legal system. This is unfortunate, given the anachronistic contemporary understanding of the term "common law." Currently, common law is associated with "judge-made" law. For most of the formative period of the common law, however, judges did not make the law, but merely presided over proceedings where disputes were resolved according to the accepted principles of customary law. Hence, describing the English common law as judge-made law is akin to describing the market as something created by economists. English common law is, in fact, case-generated law; that is, law that spontaneously evolves from the settlement of actual disputes. Almost all of the law that provides the infrastructure of our contemporary society was created in this way. Tort law, which provides protection against personal injury; property law, which demarcates property rights; contract law, which provides the grounding for exchange; commercial law, which facilitates complex business transactions; and even criminal law, which punishes harmful behavior, all arose through this evolutionary process. It is true that most of our current law exists in the form of statutes. This is because much of the common law has been codified through legislation. But the fact that politicians recognized the wisdom of the common law by enacting it into statutes, hardly proves that government is necessary to create rules of law. Indeed, it proves precisely the opposite.

In contrast to publicly generated common law, governments only undermine order and liberty.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

The students fail because they think of the law as created by conscious human agency to serve an intended end. Thus, they miss the simpler evolutionary explanation. In earlier centuries, one of the most urgent social needs was to reduce the level of violence in society. This meant discouraging people from taking the kind of actions that were likely to provoke an immediate violent response. Quite naturally, then, when disputes arising out of violent clashes were settled, the resolutions tended to penalize those who had taken such actions. But what type of actions are these? Direct physical attacks on one's person are obviously included. But affronts to one's dignity or other attacks on one's honor are equally if not more likely to provoke violence. Hence, the law of battery evolved to forbid not merely harmful contacts, but offensive ones as well. Furthermore, an attack that failed was just as likely to provoke violence as one that succeeded, and thus gave rise to liability. But if the intended victim was not aware of the attack, it could not provoke a violent response, and if the threat was not immediate, the threatened party had time to escape, enlist the aid of others, or otherwise respond in a nonviolent manner. Hence, the law of assault evolved to forbid only threats of immediate battery of which the target was aware. This example shows how the common law creates the rules necessary for a peaceful society with minimal infringement upon individual freedom. Law that arises

from the settlement of actual conflicts, settles conflicts. It does not create a mechanism for social control. Common law is law that is created by non-political forces. As such, it can give us rules that establish property rights, ground the power to make contracts, and create the duty to exercise reasonable care not to injure our fellows, but not those that impose a state religion, segregate races, prohibit consensual sexual activity, or force people to sell their homes to developers. Only government legislation, which is law that is consciously created by whatever constitutes the politically dominant interest, can give us rules that restrict the freedom of some to advance the interests or personal beliefs of others. The unenacted common law provides us with rules that facilitate peace and cooperative activities. Government legislation provides us with rules that facilitate the exploitation of the politically powerless by the politically dominant. The former bring order to society; the latter tend to produce strife. Hence, not only is government not necessary to create the basic rules of social order, it is precisely the rules that the government does create that tend to undermine that order.

Lack of uniformity of rules with anarchy is a good thing.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Supporters of government claim that government is necessary to ensure that there is one law for all and that the law applies equally to all citizens. If the government does not make the law, they contend, there would be no uniform code of laws. People in different locations or with different cultural backgrounds or levels of wealth would be subject to different rules of law. The proper response to this is probably the one Woody Allen made to Diane Keeton in *Annie Hall* when she complained that her apartment had bad plumbing and bugs, which was: "You say that as though it is a negative thing." How persuasive is the following argument? Government is necessary to ensure that there is one style of dress for all and that all citizens are equally clothed. If the government does not provide clothes, there would be no uniform mode of dress. People in different locations or with different cultural backgrounds or levels of wealth would be clothed in garments of different styles and quality. Why would anyone think that uniformity in law is any more desirable than uniformity in dress? The quest for uniformity leads us to treat the loving husband who kills his terminally ill wife to relieve her suffering the same way we treat Charles Manson, to apply the same rules of contracting to sophisticated business executives purchasing corporations and semi-literate consumers entering into installment contracts, and to act as though the slum lord in the Bronx and the family letting their spare room in Utica should be governed by the same rules of property law.

A government is not required for rules that need be universal.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

There are, of course, certain rules that must apply to all people; those that provide the basic conditions that make cooperative behavior possible. Thus, rules prohibiting murder, assault, theft, and other forms of coercion must be equally binding on all members of a society. But we hardly need government to ensure that this is the case. These rules always evolve first in any community; you would not even have a community if this were not the case.

Much of the success of US governance has been due to diversity in governing.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

The idea that we need government to ensure a uniform rule of law is especially crazy in the United States, in which the federal structure of the state and national governments is designed to permit legal diversity. To the extent that the law of the United States can claim any superiority to that produced by other nations, it is at least partially due the fact that it was generated by the common law process in the "laboratory of the states." Allowing the development of different⁸ rules in different states teaches us which rules most effectively resolve disputes. To the extent that the conditions that give rise to disputes are the same across the country, the successful rules tend to be copied by other jurisdictions and spread. This creates a fairly uniform body of law. To the⁹ extent that the conditions that give rise to disputes are peculiar to a particular location or milieu, they do not spread. This creates a patchwork of rules that are useful where applied, but would be irrelevant or disruptive if applied in other settings.

Government is an impediment to good governance.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

One of the beauties of the common law process is that it creates a body of law that is uniform where uniformity is useful and diverse where it is not. This is the optimal outcome. Government legislation, in contrast, creates uniformity by imposing ill-fitting, one-size-fits-all rules upon a geographically and ethnically diverse population. Once again, not only is government not necessary to the creation of a well-functioning body of law, it is a significant impediment to it. Please consider this the next time you find yourself wondering why all businesses must be closed on Sunday in the Orthodox Jewish sections of Brooklyn.

Government is an impediment to an accessible system of laws.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Supporters of government claim that government must make the law in order for it to be accessible to the citizens to be governed by it. The government promulgates its legislation in statute books that are available to all citizens. The unenacted rules of common law, they claim, are unintelligible to the lay person. Consisting of rules abstracted from cases over long periods of time, the common law is known only to the judges and lawyers who deal with it as part of their profession. A system of law that requires citizens to hire attorneys merely to find out what the law is obviously unacceptable. The proper response to this is: Are you serious? Look around. Please! Can any human being possibly be aware of the myriad of arcane government regulations to which he or she is subject? Have you ever seen the Code of Federal Regulations? When was the last time you tried to prepare your income tax return? Critics of the common law contend that lay people would need professionals to tell them what the law is. Yet, year after year, studies demonstrate that even most professional tax preparers and IRS employees cannot understand what the United States tax code requires. The common law rule that protects citizens against unintentional injury is the requirement to exercise the degree of care a reasonable person would employ to avoid causing harm to others. This is hardly inaccessible. Does anyone know what all the rules are that the Federal Trade Commission, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration have issued to accomplish the same end?

In contrast to government, common law developed by communities creating intelligible laws people will abide by.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

The common law consists of rules that have proven over time to be successful in resolving disputes. Only rules that are both intelligible to the ordinary person and correspond to the ordinary person's sense of fairness can achieve this status. Rules which are inaccessible to those to be governed by them cannot be effective. This is why, for example, the common law rules of contract and commercial law specifically incorporate references to customary business practice and the duty to act in good faith. It is also why no legal expertise is required to know that the law of self-defense permits one to use deadly force to repel a life-threatening attack, but not to shoot the aggressor after the immediate danger has passed. Understanding the traditional rules of common law requires only that one be a member of the relevant community to which the rules apply, not that one be an attorney.

Blocks

Affirmative Blocks

Affirmative answers to (A/T) common negative arguments

A/T The individual can exist without a state.

1. Humans are intrinsically social beings constructed by their communities.

Andrew Vincent (Australian National University), "Liberal nationalism and communitarianism: an ambiguous association," The Australian Journal of Politics and History. Volume: 43. Issue: 1. Publication Year: 1997

First, the structural embeddedness theme asserts that humans are intrinsically social beings. These social beings find their idiosyncratic roles, values and beliefs from within nations or communities, which are the most fundamental social units. The outcomes of such social agency might be very diverse, since different nations and units of communities will give rise to different value systems, but the conditions within which humans establish their differences are nonetheless common to the species. Humans are (to use the favoured terminology) "constituted" by communities.

2. Citizenship precedes notions of individuality.

Andrew Vincent (Australian National University), "Liberal nationalism and communitarianism: an ambiguous association," The Australian Journal of Politics and History. Volume: 43. Issue: 1. Publication Year: 1997

For modern communitarians it is a core thesis that the self is embedded in the community. In Michael Sandel's phraseology, there are no "unencumbered selves" standing outside a community frame. There is no sense, therefore, that one could speak of human nature outside a community. Thus, for Sandel, we cannot adopt the stance of the early Rawlsian original position, because it makes the unwarranted metaphysical assumption of the unencumbered self. There is no Archimedean point.⁽¹⁴⁾ If we cannot accept this unanchored insubstantial Rawlsian self, then it follows that we have no grounds for accepting the two principles of justice. Thus, in the Sandelian view, Rawls presupposes an implausible account of the moral subject which is the logical prerequisite for the impartiality of justice. Life in the polls and citizenship precede any sense we might have of our unique human individuality. Liberal politics, in the Rawlsian mode (or even more so in the Nozickian mode), lacks any coherent communal underpinning. This argument is also echoed in Alisdair MacIntyre's narrative conception of the self, a self which is constituted, in part, from the history and telos of the community.

3. Individual identity can only be created within human communities.

Andrew Vincent (Australian National University), "Liberal nationalism and communitarianism: an ambiguous association," The Australian Journal of Politics and History. Volume: 43. Issue: 1. Publication Year: 1997

Writers of liberal nationalist persuasion also place a heavy emphasis on this embedded claim. All humans are "encumbered" by their nations. In consequence Neil MacCormick advocates a social, embedded or contextual individualism, as against an atomistic individualism. In fact, he suggests that the more atomistic liberal concept which allows individuals to form their own sense of the good life, is deeply implausible.⁽¹⁶⁾ He states that "The truth about human beings is that they can only become individuals -- acquire a sense of their own individuality -- as a result of their social experiences within human communities".⁽¹⁷⁾ In David Miller, national identity also forms an essential pelt of personal identity. Miller explicitly associates his embedded thesis with communitarianism, noting approvingly that "Rawls' failure to investigate the sense of community that his principles of justice presuppose forms the basis for Michael Sandel's critique".⁽¹⁸⁾ It is clear, however, that Miller, for one, wishes to dissociate himself from the stronger "face to face" communitarianism and to retain a strong dose of rational (liberal-minded) deliberation concerning communal identity. Yet he is still keen to assert that nationality is "constituted by mutual belief, extended in history, active in character, connected with a particular territory, and ... marked off from other communities by its members' distinct traits". For Miller these features demarcate nationality from other collective sources of personal identity.

A/T Anarchy is preferable economically.

1. Governments establish the framework for the economy to function.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

The assumption is legitimate, for in free market theory there exists an institution outside the market which protects the rights of individuals, and therefore ensures that the principle of voluntary exchange will be observed. This institution may work well or badly, but its working well or badly is not a subject of economic law; it is the concern, rather, of political and legal theory. The government codifies and enforces the rules of the market; it establishes a framework of rights and liberties that men must respect in action. Economic theory then tells us what happens as individuals act within that framework to acquire the things that they value. Economic laws are to political laws as principles of strategy are to the rules of the game.

2. The predicted benefits of anarchy can never be valid.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

The anarchists, then, have their work cut out for them. They must show how, by the mechanism of the market, things work out in such a way that force is not used. But of course they cannot do this without assuming the existence of a free market, an assumption to which they are not entitled. They cannot make their case – substantiate their prediction that force will not be used – without relying on economic laws; but economic laws, as we have seen, are true only on the assumption that all exchange is voluntary, which is the very point at issue. It should, no doubt, be easy to prove that the cost of using force is prohibitive, if one assures from the outset that the cost of using force is infinite. But the proof would be invalid; it would be circular. A principle of strategy which tells one what to do given that the rules must be followed, is hardly the vehicle by which to prove that the rules must be followed in the first place.

3. Dictatorships can be useful in bringing positive reforms to their country.

Marc Becker, "Dictatorship in Latin America – Bibliography," Science Encyclopedia, <http://science.jrank.org/pages/7630/Dictatorship-in-Latin-America.html>

The Revolutionary Government of the Armed Forces, which came to power in Peru in 1968 under the leadership of General Juan Velasco Alvarado, provides an interesting counterpoint to these conservative military dictatorships. At first, Velasco's rise to power appeared to be just another military coup, but he soon announced plans for deep changes in government, including the nationalization of industries, worker participation in the ownership and management of these industries, and a sweeping agrarian reform law designed to end unjust social and economic structures. In implementing these reforms, Velasco challenged the incompetence and corruption of civilian politicians who were unable to implement badly needed reforms. He announced a "third way" of national development between capitalism and socialism. As a result of his reforms, food production increased, and peasants' wages and quality of life improved. Much as nineteenth-century caudillos sometimes brought positive changes to their countries, supporters viewed Velasco's military government as what Peru needed to improve and advance the country.

A/T The market can provide sufficient enforcement mechanisms.

1. The market is not the place for coercion.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

The use of coercion against criminals and foreign aggressors is a service, one provided by the government to its citizens. As such it may be considered an economic good. But it differs from all other economic goods in just the respect mentioned. When its use is morally improper, it does violate individual rights. Coercion, in this world, must sometimes be exercised. Given the existence of criminals, and the constant possibility that some men prefer criminal to honest means and ends, the existence of a power to prevent and punish this by force has a certain value. Its value is restricted, however, by the moral principle forbidding its use against persons who have not themselves used force against others. If this power is exercised improperly, if it is not used in accordance with the objective principles that define and delimit its value, then it violates rights – the rights of innocent people, or at least the right of the guilty to have their guilt objectively demonstrated before suffering punishment. This is true by the very nature of coercion, and it is true only of coercion. Coercion, therefore, and coercion alone, falls under the provision mentioned earlier: since it has the potential for violating rights if used improperly, its use cannot be determined by the value preferences people happen to hold, whether right or wrong; and so cannot be determined by market forces. Coercion has a place in social life, but it must be kept in place; and the market is not the institution to do this. Power to coerce, then, must be reposed in another institution altogether, one outside the market and the sway of subjective value preferences. This institution must have strict control – a monopoly, in effect – over the use of force, since its function is to take force off the market. Its use of coercion must be determined solely by the rules derived from the appropriate moral principles; and it must operate in accordance with such values without taking into consideration any individual or collective desires to the contrary. This institution all men call government.

2. Protection agencies in an anarchy system would resemble the mafia.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

Consider, for example, the problem of monopolies in an anarchistic society. What is to prevent protection agencies from banding together to destroy the competition and form a monopoly over protective services? Is it because monopolies do not occur in a free society? But the reason monopolies do not occur is that anyone is free to compete with large firms and, by underselling them, cut into their market; it is because the only determinant of success in a free market is the ability of the entrepreneur to persuade consumers of the value of his goods, to give the best choice. What would happen if force as well as persuasion could be used against consumers and competitors? Why would the large protection agencies restrain themselves from driving out the competition by force? That is, after all, what happens in the nearest model we have to the anarchist system of protection agencies – the criminal underworld. Clearly the anarchists are assuming what they have to prove: that the market would be free, that competition would exist unhindered, that coercion is not a means by which men would deal with each other.

A/T Anarchy solves for all the harms of oppressive regimes.

1. The predicted benefits of anarchy can never be valid.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

The anarchists, then, have their work cut out for them. They must show how, by the mechanism of the market, things work out in such a way that force is not used. But of course they cannot do this without assuming the existence of a free market, an assumption to which they are not entitled. They cannot make their case – substantiate their prediction that force will not be used – without relying on economic laws; but economic laws, as we have seen, are true only on the assumption that all exchange is voluntary, which is the very point at issue. It should, no doubt, be easy to prove that the cost of using force is prohibitive, if one assures from the outset that the cost of using force is infinite. But the proof would be invalid; it would be circular. A principle of strategy which tells one what to do given that the rules must be followed, is hardly the vehicle by which to prove that the rules must be followed in the first place.

2. Anarchists cannot prevent the reformulation of governments.

David Kelley (Doctorate in Philosophy from Princeton and was Executive Director of The Objectivist Center), "The Necessity of Government," Freedom Advocates, April 12, 2005

Coercion is not, of course, the only means by which men do deal with each other; in most societies, gang warfare is an exception. The anarchist may wish to argue, on the basis of this fact, that from a state of nature protection agencies would arise in peaceful competition, and the anarchist fission would be fulfilled. But this argument too is denied him. For wherever men, finding themselves without government, have not descended to the level of gang warfare, they have done something equally damaging to the anarchist hypothesis: they have formed new governments. Or, in the anarchist terminology, they have formed monopolistic "protection agencies." But this is precisely what the anarchist says would not happen in an anarchistic situation. Anarchism lives on its opposition to government, but every government that exists is a refutation of anarchism; for it belies the anarchists' prediction that if only we can send government away it will not come back.

3. Anarchy is not a check on oppression because oppression is a reflection of the ideas accepted by the people.

Harry Binswanger (a member of the Ayn Rand Institute's Board of Directors and a Professor in ARI's Objectivist Academic Center), "Anarchy versus Objectivism," The Objectivist Forum, August 1981

The second argument of "anarcho-capitalists" is the argument from history: governments have always grown beyond their proper limits, so we must assume they inevitably do so. This argument ignores why government has grown. The cause is: bad philosophy. Particularly, altruism. The history of the United States shows exactly this. Our Government has grown beyond its proper limits because Americans have thought that it ought to. It is men's ideas that rule their actions and their politics. It is not the power-lust of politicians but the philosophical ideas of the citizenry that have caused the expansion of state power since the founding of this country. The power-lust of politicians would be impotent in a society whose citizenry—and intellectuals—understood the Objectivist political philosophy. Does anyone think that a power-luster who got into Galt's Gulch would have any chance of succeeding? End of story. And if one holds that the majority of men are too irrational to ever see that their own self-interest requires a free society, then one must simply give up and retreat to a deserted island. One cannot consistently advocate any ideas—including anarchism—if the vast majority will not listen to reason.

A/T Oppressive regimes destroy human rights.

1. Rights can be protected, even if to a very limited degree, in a dictatorship.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

Following the Allied victories in 1945, Franco sought to impress the world's democratic powers with Spain's "liberal" credentials by issuing a fundamental law that was ostensibly a bill of rights--the Charter of Rights. The rights granted by this charter were more cosmetic than democratic, because the government bestowed them and could suspend them without justification; furthermore, the charter placed more emphasis on the duty of all Spaniards to serve their country and to obey its laws than on their basic rights as citizens. Thus, for example, the charter guaranteed all Spaniards the right to express their opinions freely, but they were not to attack the fundamental principles of the state.

2. Dictatorships can be responsive to their people.

Ignacio Ramonet (Spanish journalist and writer), "Was Fidel Good for Cuba? A Debate between Carlos Alberto Montaner & Ignacio Ramonet," *Foreign Policy*, January-February 2007

Unlike in Hungary, major Cuban reforms have not been the result of foreign ideas driven by foreign troops arriving on Soviet-armored vehicles. Rather, they have proceeded from a popular movement in which the hopes of peasants, workers, and even professionals from the small urban bourgeoisie have converged. This movement also capitalized on the desire for genuine national independence (frustrated by the 1898 U.S. intervention) and the longing to put an end to humiliating racial discrimination. And it continues to have the support of the majority of its citizens. Castro's death will not dismantle a movement hundreds of years in the making. To disavow this national character is to ignore some of the regime's essential dimensions. And it is to fail to understand why, 15 years after the disappearance of the Soviet Union, Cuba's regime is still in place.

3. Autocratic regimes can cultural institutions and pluralism.

Eric Solsten and Sandra W. Meditz, editors. *Spain: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress, 1988.

In spite of the regime's strong degree of control, Franco did not pursue totalitarian domination of all social, cultural, and religious institutions, or of the economy as a whole. The Franco regime also lacked the ideological impetus characteristic of totalitarian governments. Furthermore, for those willing to work within the system, there was a limited form of pluralism. Thus, Franco's rule has been characterized as authoritarian rather than totalitarian.

A/T Oppressive regimes are more likely to make war.

1. Despotism can demonstrate concern for neighboring countries.

Steve Brouwer (author), "The Cuban Revolutionary Doctor: The Ultimate Weapon of Solidarity," Monthly Review, 2009, Volume 60, Issue 08 (January)

In 2003, this positive force was deployed on a massive scale in order to aid the Bolivarian Revolution in Venezuela in delivering health care to its long-neglected population. The process began when a strike by the Venezuelan Medical Federation created such a total breakdown in medical service that the mayor of the Libertador section of Caracas, Fredy Bernal, sought to directly hire Venezuelan doctors to form a new community medical network. But only fifty Venezuelans applied for the positions, and just twenty of those doctors were willing to work in Libertador's impoverished neighborhoods. The frustrated mayor then asked the Cuban Embassy for help, and Cuba responded by dispatching a small group of highly trained physicians who had extensive experience working with medical brigades in other nations. Within a few months, hundreds more Cuban doctors arrived in Caracas to add their skills to the new network of family care. The experiment was so successful that the Venezuelan government decided the pilot program, called Barrio Adentro (inside the barrio), should be duplicated nationwide. In scarcely more than a year, by mid-2004, there were more than ten thousand Cuban doctors working in Barrio Adentro and meeting the needs of urban and rural residents all over the country. This massive deployment of medical force did not go unnoticed by antirevolutionary forces in the hemisphere.

2. Bias against dictatorial governments undermines international cooperative efforts for the good.

Steve Brouwer (author), "The Cuban Revolutionary Doctor: The Ultimate Weapon of Solidarity," Monthly Review, 2009, Volume 60, Issue 08 (January)

"We are concerned that Cuba is developing a limited biological weapons effort," said John Bolton, U.S. undersecretary of state for George W. Bush, on March 30, 2004, repeating an allegation he made in May 2002. It was clear to most observers, even within the Bush administration, that Bolton's accusations that Cuba was developing "Weapons of Mass Destruction" in the form of deadly biological materials concocted in the laboratory, were unfounded. It was also clear from Bolton's rhetoric, however, that the U.S. government was escalating its longstanding hostility toward Cuba because its attempts to isolate and impoverish Cuba were failing. So were its efforts to undermine the Bolivarian Revolution. It was ironic that the most prominent of all the cooperative ventures being pursued by the Cuban and Venezuelan government involved a very different kind of biological warfare, a benign and energetic campaign by medical professionals to defeat germs and disease and bring quality health care to the majority of the Venezuelan people. The United States, the world's only military superpower and, until very recently, the master of global financial capital, rightly feared that Cuba's example of international solidarity would be admired by many nations around the world, at a time when the U.S. image was more tarnished than ever before. It could do little to frustrate the capacity of Cuba, a small and poor nation, to deploy its human capital in such a useful and impressive manner.

3. Dictatorships can provide significant humanitarian aid.

Steve Brouwer (author), "The Cuban Revolutionary Doctor: The Ultimate Weapon of Solidarity," Monthly Review, 2009, Volume 60, Issue 08 (January)

The extraordinary number of physicians in this small nation, 72,417 as of 2007, has allowed Cuba to mobilize thousands of medical professionals (including nurses, dentists, and medical technicians) who are willing to go anywhere in the world to provide disaster relief and treat poor populations who do not have access to adequate health care.⁴ Revolutionary Cuba has always been willing to do this in the spirit of international solidarity, even when they had a shortage of personnel to treat their own citizens. In 1963, the first Cuban doctors traveled to Africa to help deliver health care in the newly independent Algeria, which suffered a dearth of medical professionals when the French colonialists departed. Later, Cuban physicians volunteered to go to sub-Saharan Africa, including those who accompanied Che Guevara on clandestine missions in the Congo in the 1960s. They also accompanied Cuban troops fighting alongside soldiers of the revolutionary Angolan government in its bitter wars against apartheid South Africa and rebel forces backed by the United States.⁵

Negative Blocks

Negative answers to (A/T) common affirmative arguments

A/T There is no enforcement mechanism in anarchy.

1. Anarchy is not a system lacking in enforcement.

Andrew Rutten (Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Stanford University and Associate Editor of The Independent Review), "Can Anarchy Save Us From Leviathan?" The Independent Institute, Spring, 1999

The advocates of anarchy would answer "not us." The theme of their work is that Hobbes, Locke, and almost everyone else are wrong about anarchy. The advocates point to the growing body of theory and evidence that life in anarchy isn't at all as most people imagine it. Whether we look at businessmen in Wisconsin, diamond merchants in New York, or farmers in Sri Lanka, we find that "order without law" is not just a slogan but a way of life (Macaulay 1963; Bernstein 1992; Ostrom 1990). Those anarchies work because, contra Hobbes, they do not lack an enforcer of rights.1 Or rather, instead of a single enforcer—the centralized monopolist we call the state— anarchies have a variety of decentralized enforcers, such as markets, firms, and communities. Thus, anarchies avoid chaos by providing lots of folks with an incentive to pitch in and punish deviants.

2. Communities can be used to enforce contracts.

Andrew Rutten (Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Stanford University and Associate Editor of The Independent Review), "Can Anarchy Save Us From Leviathan?" The Independent Institute, Spring, 1999

The idea of a self-enforcing contract, if not the terminology, lies behind much of the empirical literature on "order without law." For example, few business arrangements resemble the classic arms-length agreements enforced by courts that used to populate textbooks in economics and law. Instead, in many instances real contracts are better thought of as relational contracts, deals between people who expect to have a long (and prosperous) relationship. Moreover, in the shadow of the future, people can sustain cooperation even with strangers. They can do so because, even though we may not deal with any one person often, we do deal with the same group of people repeatedly. Even in the modern world, many of our relationships take place in communities, groups of people who have overlapping relations. We can use those communities to enforce cooperation by expanding the terms of cooperation, so that we respond not just to our own history but to everyone else's history as well. In that way, people who belong to a community can use the other members as third parties to enforce their agreements (Greif 1993; Kreps 1990).

3. Anarchy is society without a government, not a society without governance.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

I am presenting an argument for anarchy in the true sense of the term—that is, a society without government, not a society without governance. There is no such thing as a society without governance. A society with no mechanism for bringing order to human existence is oxymoronic; it is not "society" at all.

A/T We cannot predict any benefits in anarchy.

1. Not being able to predict the future is not an argument against anarchy.

Nick Coons (CEO of RedSeven Computer Company and radio talk show host), "The Case Against the State - Anarchy, Not Chaos," The Libertarian Solution, October 21, 2009

Not being able to predict the future ("how will security and dispute resolution work without government?") is not a case for keeping the government, any more than it is a case for maintaining the institution of slavery. When slavery was on the cusp of being abolished, there were likely people who wondered what would become of former slaves. Their masters fed and clothed them. How would they eat once they were freed? Would they find jobs? Would all of them find enough work to make enough money to eat? How can you know for sure?

2. History proves that society thrives when evil is abolished.

Nick Coons (CEO of RedSeven Computer Company and radio talk show host), "The Case Against the State - Anarchy, Not Chaos," The Libertarian Solution, October 21, 2009

Answering these questions would require a crystal ball. But they're completely irrelevant, because the issue is not in the effect of abolishing slavery; it's in the morality, which is something that we can and do know in advance, because morality is a universal. Slavery is wrong; this is a moral rule, and it is the only thing we need to know if we are going to discuss whether or not slavery should exist. The free market will allow freed slaves to get jobs and benefit from being free, and so history shows us that this was absolutely true. It's amazing how society as a whole prospers when we abolish something that we know to be evil, even if we can't predict the exact path prosperity takes us.

3. Evil is better prevented in the absence of the state.

Nick Coons (CEO of RedSeven Computer Company and radio talk show host), "The Case Against the State - Anarchy, Not Chaos," The Libertarian Solution, October 21, 2009

Likewise, governments around the world are responsible for the vast majority of all violence. The institution of state power is evil, as it attempts to create virtue out of acts of aggression. How can we prevent such acts of evil by thugs in the absence of a state? The short answer is, "better than in the presence of a state." If society is unenlightened and morality misunderstood, the presence of government does not temper evil, it amplifies it. In a statist society, those hungry for power will seek out institutions like government in order to put their desires into practice behind the protective wall of the state. If you believe that all human interactions should be voluntary and not compulsory, if you believe in the non-aggression principle, then the only logical conclusion is a stateless society; free market anarchism.

A/T The government is needed to regulate the negative externalities of the market.

1. Government regulation is not needed to deal with the negative externalities of the market.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Supporters of government contend that only government can regulate market activity to ensure that private contractors consider the social costs of their transaction. Thus, even if rules of law, courts, and police services could be supplied non-politically, government would nevertheless be essential to internalize externalities. I must confess that I am at a loss as to how to respond to this argument. Look around is not enough. That this argument has any plausibility at all is a testament to how completely oblivious people can be to the world around them. In a world in which one of the dominant political issues is tort reform; in which businesses are continually complaining to Congress that they are over-regulated by the common law of tort and begging government to protect them from this non-political method of internalizing externalizes, how can anyone seriously assert that government regulation is needed to deal with the problem of social costs?

2. One must ignore the existence of non-political regulations to believe government regulation is necessary.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

It is true that economists posit a fictitious realm in which human beings engage in voluntary transactions free of all forms of regulation. But they do so because such an idealized conception of the market is useful to their exploration of the science of human interaction in much the same way that the concept of a perfect vacuum is useful to physicists exploring the laws of nature; not because they think it corresponds to anything in reality. In the real world, human interaction is always subject to regulation; by custom, by people's ethical and religious beliefs, and, in our legal system, by the common law. Tort law is precisely that portion of the law that evolved to protect individuals' persons and property from the ill-considered actions of their fellows, that is, to internalize externalities. It is only by ignoring the existence of these forms of non-political regulation, that is, only by believing that the economists' model of the market is a description of reality, that one could possibly believe that government is necessary to address the problem of social costs. Of course, one should never underestimate the power of a conceptual model to blind intellectuals to what is going on in the real world.

3. Government regulation is just as retroactive in operation as common law.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

But, supporters of government claim, common law can never be an adequate regulatory mechanism because it is necessarily retroactive in operation. Lawsuits arise only after harm is done. Therefore, civil liability could never provide the type of proactive regulation necessary to prevent serious harm from occurring. Really? The basic rules of tort law prohibit individuals from intentionally harming others and require them to act with reasonable care to avoid causing harm inadvertently. There is nothing retroactive about this. It is true that precisely what constitutes reasonable care may have to be determined on a case by case basis, but in this respect, the common law is no different than government legislation that announces a general rule and then leaves it up to the courts to determine how it applies in particular cases. Furthermore, the common law can act prospectively in appropriate cases. The injunction, an order not to engage in a specified activity, evolved precisely to handle those cases in which one party's conduct poses a high risk of irreparable harm to others. And by the way, government legislation is almost always²⁸ retroactive as well. Limitations on human knowledge (not to mention public choice considerations) mean that legislators are rarely able to accurately anticipate future harm. Megan's law required public notification when a known sex offender moves into a community. It is called Megan's law because it was enacted after Megan was killed by a repeat sex offender who lived in her community. If I remember correctly, Sarbanes-Oxley was passed after Enron collapsed. And when was the USA Patriot Act passed? Oh, yes, after 9/11.

A/T A government would be needed for national defense.

1. Anarchical approaches to national defense are preferable to governmental approaches.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Like national defense? National defense is perhaps the archetypical public good. The security it provides is both non-rivalrous in consumption and benefits all members of society whether they pay for it or not. Can national defense be adequately supplied without government? If 'national defense' refers to the type of military expenditures associated with contemporary national governments, the answer is an obvious 'no.' Once a state becomes invested with the power to expropriate the wealth of its citizenry to provide for national defense, almost any desired expenditure begins to look like a requirement for national defense. Before long propping up Southeast Asian dictators and overthrowing Middle Eastern ones are being characterized as urgent national defense concerns. The fact that there is no non-governmental way to raise sufficient capital to realize this conception of national defense proves nothing about the viability of anarchy, and, in fact, serves as one more argument in favor of markets.

2. National defense is a trivial issue when considering transitioning to anarchy.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

However, if 'national defense' refers to only what is strictly necessary to protect the citizens of a nation against outside aggression, I am willing to admit that I do not know the answer to this question. I am not discomforted by this admission, however, because as I said at the outset, the question of national defense is, as a practical matter, a trivial one. No one believes that we can transition from a world of states to anarchy instantaneously. No reasonable anarchist advocates the total dissolution of government tomorrow. Once we turn our attention to the question of how to move incrementally from government to anarchy, it becomes apparent that national defense would be one of the last governmental functions to be de-politicized. If my argument for anarchy is flawed and anarchy is not a viable method of social organization, this will undoubtedly be revealed long before doing away with national defense becomes an issue. On the other hand, to the extent that the gradual transition from government to anarchy is successful, the need for national defense continually lessens.

3. Transitioning to anarchy will make the question of self-defense moot.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Recall that we are considering the cost only of protecting citizens against aggression, not the cost of foreign adventures or "pre-emptive" warfare. How significant a threat of foreign invasion does the United States currently face? How much of its "national defense" spending is actually devoted to preventing such invasion? After years or decades of continual and sustained reduction in the size of government, how much wider will the economic and technological gap between the prenatal anarchy and the more repressive nations be? How much more sophisticated its defensive technology? How much more dependent will the repressive nations be on its goods and services? Let a nation begin to tread the path toward anarchy and by the time the question of whether national defense is a public good that must be supplied by government becomes relevant, it is very likely to be moot.

A/T A government is required to resolve disputes peacefully.

1. The fact of successful, international business cooperation demonstrates courts are not needed to resolve disputes.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Now that we have eliminated the legislature, what about the judiciary? Supporters of government claim that government is necessary to provide a system of courts for settling disputes. In the absence of the government provision of "a known and indifferent judge," human beings¹⁵ would have no way to peacefully resolve interpersonal disputes. For "men being partial to themselves," adverse parties would inevitably seek to employ judges who would favor their¹⁶ interests; and judges, who would receive their fees from the litigants, would naturally favor those who could pay the most. Hence, they would not be impartial. Because parties would be unable to agree on a neutral arbiter, they would be forced to resort to violence to resolve their disputes. Thus, without government courts, peaceful coexistence is impossible. I know this is getting boring, but the proper response to this is: look around.

This is the age of globalization. Business is contracted around the world among parties from virtually all countries. Although there is neither a world government nor world court, businesses do not go to war with each other over contract disputes. News is almost always the news of violent conflict. The very lack of reporting on international business disputes is evidence that international commercial disputes are effectively resolved without the government provision of courts. How can this be?

2. International commercial law works better absent government.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

The answer is simplicity itself. The parties to international transactions select, usually in advance, the dispute settlement mechanism they prefer from among the many options available to them. Few choose trial by combat. It is too expensive and unpredictable. Many elect to submit their disputes to the London Commercial Court, a British court known for the commercial expertise of its judges and its speedy resolution of cases that non-British parties may use for a fee. Others subscribe to companies such as JAMS/Endispute or the American Arbitration¹⁷ Association that provide mediation and arbitration services. Most do whatever they can to avoid becoming enmeshed in the coils of the courts provided by the federal and state governments of the United States, which move at a glacial pace and provide relatively unpredictable results. The evidence suggests that international commercial law not only functions quite well without government courts, it functions better because of their absence.

3. People regularly settle disputes without government courts.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

But there is no need to focus on the international scene to observe that human beings do not need government courts to settle disputes peacefully. Labor contracts not only specify wage rates and working conditions; they create their own workplace judiciary, complete with due process guarantees and appellate procedures. Universities regularly provide their own judicial processes, as do homeowner associations. Stockbrokers agree to submit employment disputes to binding arbitration as a condition of employment. Religious groups regularly settle disputes¹⁸ among congregants by appeal to priest or rabbi. Disfavored groups, for whom prejudice makes trial in government courts a mockery, readily devise alternative mechanisms for settling disputes without violence. Insurance companies provide not only compensation for personal injury and¹⁹ property damage, but liability insurance, by which they assume the responsibility of resolving conflicts between their clients and those of other insurance companies according to antecedently specified agreements that allow them to avoid the morass of the government judicial system. And empirical evidence demonstrates that when potential litigants in the government court system are directed into mediation, a significant portion of the lawsuits are resolved without trial.

A/T Abolishing the government would lead to chaos.

1. The common Hobbesian view of anarchism is flawed.

Andrew Rutten (Lecturer in the Department of Political Science at Stanford University and Associate Editor of The Independent Review), "Can Anarchy Save Us From Leviathan?" The Independent Institute, Spring, 1999

Hobbesians mischaracterize anarchy when they treat it as a series of isolated two-person deals. Doing so ignores the obvious fact that most of our dealings with others are embedded in a rich web of social relations. In game-theoretic terms, that embeddedness moves society from one-shot games to repeated games. And, as is now well known, cooperation is rational in repeated games. It is rational not because dealing with each other again and again changes peoples' preferences or because it allows them to learn who is honest and thus trustworthy. Rather, people cooperate in repeated games because doing so pays them more than not cooperating. It pays more because, as long as the future value of the relationship exceeds the onetime gain from cheating, people can punish each other by not cooperating in the future. Thus, in the shadow of the future, people can make what economists call implicit or self-enforcing contracts, agreements that bind them without the help of any third parties. Such a contract exemplifies an equilibrium institution, a set of rules obeyed because everyone finds it in his interest to obey. Of course, besides following the rules about their own behavior in the social games they play with each other, people must also follow the rules about monitoring compliance and punishing deviants.

2. Abolishing government will not lead to violence and chaos.

Ludwig Von Mises Institute, "Myths about market anarchy," Ludwig Von Mises Institute, 2011

The idea the law and order can exist only when they are forcibly imposed on a society is both flawed and dangerous. People who value their safety and their reputations typically do not cause too much trouble for others. We can surmise that if government suddenly disappeared, seemingly normal people would not suddenly turn to nudism and cannibalism as hobbies. It is dangerous, because if it is true that people need the government to keep them from raising Cain, then the question logically arises: why should we have any freedoms at all? Why should we have freedom of speech, of the Fourth Amendment, or have the right to choose our leaders at the ballot box? Those are some uncomfortable questions. Mainstream sociologists assume that "we need government" and don't bother to explain why, but then they avoid the politically-incorrect conclusion that we need fascism. In other words, people who would go crazy with no government will be civilized with democratic institutions. That is obviously a hollow argument at best.

3. Associating anarchy with chaos and violence prevents reasoned discussion of the topic.

John Hasnas (Associate Professor, Georgetown University), "The Obviousness of Anarchy," Mises Institute, 12/4/2006

Anarchy refers to a society without a central political authority. But it is also used to refer to disorder or chaos. This constitutes a textbook example of Orwellian newspeak in which assigning the same name to two different concepts effectively narrows the range of thought. For if lack of government is identified with the lack of order, no one will ask whether lack of government actually results in a lack of order. And this uninquisitive mental attitude is absolutely essential to the case for the state. For if people were ever to seriously question whether government actions are really productive of order, popular support for government would almost instantly collapse.

Rebuttal Overviews

1st Affirmative

Affirming achieves the value of justice. This is the correct value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it justice would be the most relevant value. Remember justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round. The way to achieve justice we must look to utilitarianism. Daniel Sanchez of the Mises Institute explained writing, “The ultimate yardstick of justice is conduciveness to the preservation of social cooperation. Conduct suited to preserve social cooperation is just, conduct detrimental to the preservation of society is unjust. There cannot be any question of organizing society according to the postulates of an arbitrary preconceived idea of justice. The problem is to organize society for the best possible realization of those ends which men want to attain by social cooperation. Social utility is the only standard of justice.” So the criterion for the round must be achieving the greatest good for the greatest number. Recall my first contention argued that oppression is preferable for protecting rights. David Kelley explained that, “If we ask how our rights are to be secured to us in the anarchist system, the anarchist can only answer que sera sera. At best he can try to predict what would happen.” So if oppressive regimes can be shown to even possibly protect rights, oppressive regimes must be more desirable. Eric Solsten and Sandra Meditz explained in my sub point 2 how Franco’s Spain, a dictatorship, did protect rights, at least to some degree making oppressive regimes preferable. My second contention argued that oppressive regimes are preferable for the economy. David Kelley explains that anarchy destroys the law of supply and demand writing, “Consider, for example, the law of supply and demand. What would happen to prices if one did not have to pay for a good at a price acceptable to the seller, but could take the good by force, giving nothing in exchange? There is no way of telling. The law of supply and demand does not apply to thieves.” Thus, economic planning is impossible in anarchy. My last point explains that dictators can make positive economic reform as Ignacio Ramonet explained, “You also fail to emphasize the reforms that Castro’s regime has embarked on, including the opening up to foreign investment, partial deregulation of foreign trade, the decriminalization of the possession of foreign currency, the revitalization of tourism, and so on. More important, the regime has diversified the country’s trade relations.”⁵ Thus oppressive regimes are more desirable for economic reasons. For these reasons we must affirm.

2nd Affirmative

Affirming achieves the value of justice. This is the correct value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it justice would be the most relevant value. Remember justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round. The fundamental requirement of justice is barring physical force from human interactions. Ayn Rand explained why, "Men who attempt to prosecute crimes, without such rules, are a lynch mob. If a society left the retaliatory use of force in the hands of individual citizens, it would degenerate into mob rule, lynch law and an endless series of bloody private feuds or vendettas. If physical force is to be barred from social relationships, men need an institution charged with the task of protecting their rights under an objective code of rules." So the criterion that must be met for there even to be a chance of achieving justice is barring the use of force. In my first sub point David Kelly explained that anarchists reject the only means of eliminating violence from human interactions. He wrote, "In the end, the anarchist cannot escape his dilemma; his dilemma is a contradiction. He is advocating a certain end, a society free of violence among men, while rejecting the only means of achieving that end. Thus anarchism is hardly even a political philosophy. It is, much rather, an attempt to escape the responsibility of providing one. It would, as critics contend, be a disaster in practice; but that is because it is fantastic and incoherent in theory." My second point argues that dictatorships are not necessarily human rights abuses. Ignacio Ramonet explained that, "No serious organization has ever accused Cuba--where, in fact, a moratorium on the death penalty has been in place since 2001--of carrying out "disappearances," engaging in extrajudicial executions, or even performing physical torture on detainees. The same cannot be said of the United States in its five-year-old "war on terror." Of these three types of crimes, not a single case exists in Cuba." So oppressive regimes can protect rights, meaning individuals are protected from violence. For these reasons we must affirm.

1st Negative

Negating achieves the value of justice. This is the correct value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it justice would be the most relevant value. Remember justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round. Fundamentally, everyone is due the right to their life. Because of this, we must do everything we can to prevent nuclear war. Bill Wickersham explained why writing, “the threat of nuclear war is the most serious potential health, environmental, agricultural, educational and moral problem facing humanity. Steven Starr, senior scientist with Physicians for Social Responsibility, said research makes clear the environmental consequences of a U.S.-Russian nuclear war: “If these weapons are detonated in the large cities of either of their nations, they will cause such catastrophic damage to the global environment that the Earth will become virtually uninhabitable for most humans and many other complex forms of life.” So the criterion to achieve justice in the round is decreasing the chances of nuclear war. The only point in my case argued that a nation transitioning to anarchy will be modeled by other nations which will minimize threats. John Hasnas of the Von Mises Intitute explained why writing, “other nations would learn by the liberalizing nation’s example and begin to copy its policies. As the economic and technological gap between the liberalizing nation and the rest of world widens, as the rest of the world becomes more dependent upon the goods and services manufactured and supplied by that nation, and as a greater number of other nations are moved to adopt liberalizing policies themselves, the threat the rest of the world poses to the liberalizing nation decreases.” Thus, with fewer threats there is a decreased chance of nuclear war. For this reason we must negate.

2nd Negative

Negating achieves the value of justice. This is the correct value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it justice would be the most relevant value. Remember justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round. The way to achieve justice is by adhering to the criterion of overcoming poverty. Remember, allowing people to in poverty demonstrates how a society values people. It quotes Francine Mestrum to support this. She writes, “The income people receive is not only a means whereby to acquire more goods and services, it is also a tangible recognition of how society values them. Equality is a fundamental value in each society, and that is why the point of inequality becomes relevant when so much attention is focused on globalisation.” My first point explained that the state keeps people poor and subservient. Gary Chartier explained why writing, “The state raises the cost of self-employment, boosts the cost of living, and increases the liabilities associated with being poor. The practical result is that people are denied opportunities to better their economic positions and channeled into often unappealing work environments because the state has eliminated viable alternatives.” My second point proved that the state enables the corporate elite Chartier again explained, “The state confers privileges on the wealthy and well connected. It protects favored industries with tariffs and grants of intellectual property rights, sanctifies large-scale theft by elite groups, hands out direct and indirect subsidies, implements regulatory regimes that suppress competition, constrains the most effective union activity, uses the tax system to benefit politically favored businesses and hamper the activities of others, employs eminent domain to boost the profits of developers and big box retailers, awards staggering bailouts to cronies in the financial and manufacturing sectors, and otherwise furthers the interests of elites and others.” My last point proves that people who want to help the poor should support anarchy. Chartier concluded, “principled people on the political left—the sort of people who could be expected to listen, at least, to arguments from bleeding heart libertarians—should find anarchism attractive precisely because the state unavoidably harms people on a vast scale through its attacks on the poor, its support for corporate privilege, its war making, and its assaults on personal freedom” so people who want to help the poor should support anarchy. Thus this is sufficient to negate.

V = Justice
Giving each their due

it the popular understanding of justice and so to discuss justice in some other way would make the round incomprehensible to the general audience.

Justice is the proper value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value.

Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides ample ground to decide the round.

Cr = greatest good for greatest number
x-Sanchez
The utility of social cooperation is paramount for virtually all acting men, and it is the very foundation of morality. The notion of right and wrong is ... a utilitarian precept designed to make social cooperation under the division of labor possible.¹⁸¹ And as the foundation of all morality in general, the utility of social cooperation is also the alpha and the omega of all questions of justice and property in particular

C1: Ors are preferable for rights
1. As cannot assure that rights will be protected
x-Kelley

The anarchists would place governmental services on the market, to be offered by entrepreneurs on the basis of their expectations about the preferences of others. But if so, they can only try to predict what is likely to come about from the interplay of human interests. If we ask how our rights are to be secured to us in the anarchist system, the anarchist can only answer que sera sera
2 Rts can be protected in a dictatorship
x-Solsten & Meditz
Franco sought to impress the world's democratic powers with Spain's "liberal" credentials by issuing a fundamental law that was ostensibly a bill of rights--the Charter of Rights. The rights granted by this charter were more cosmetic than democratic, because the government bestowed them. Thus, for example, the charter guaranteed all Spaniards the right to express their opinions freely, but they were not to attack the fundamental principles of the state.

C2 O is better for the economy
1. A destroys the law of supply and demand
x-Kelley
Consider, for example, the law of supply and demand. What would happen to prices if one did not have to pay for a good at a price acceptable to the seller, but could take the good by force, giving nothing in exchange? There is no way of telling.

2. Dictatorships can make positive economic Reforms
x-Ramonet
During the past 10 years, Cuba's average annual growth in gross domestic product was roughly 5 percent, among the highest in Latin America. In 2005, for example, the country saw growth rates of 11.8 percent (including the value of its social services), and a similar rate is expected for 2006. For the first time in its history, this country does not depend on a preferred partner, as it depended, successively, on Spain, the United States, and the Soviet Union

V = Justice
Giving each their due

it the popular understanding of justice and so to discuss justice in some other way would make the round incomprehensible to the general audience.

Justice is the proper value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value.

Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides

Cr = barring the use of force
x-Rand

If a society left the retaliatory use of force in the hands of individual citizens, it would degenerate into mob rule, lynch law and an endless series of bloody private feuds or vendettas. If physical force is to be barred from social relationships, men need an institution charged with the task of protecting their rights under an objective code of rules.

1. A's reject the only means of potentially eliminating violence from human interaction
x-Kelley

Caught in this dilemma, he can only try to argue that these conditions will come about by natural law, so that we need to do nothing ourselves. But this argument, we have seen, is riddled with logical errors. It ignores the difference between coercion and economic goods on the market, a difference that undercuts the argument from the outset.

2. Dictatorships are not necessarily human rights abusers
x-Ramonet

No serious organization has ever accused Cuba --where, in fact, a moratorium on the death penalty has been in place since 2001--of carrying out "disappearances," engaging in extrajudicial executions, or even performing physical torture on detainees. The same cannot be said of the United States in its five-year-old "war on terror."

V = Justice
Giving each their due

it the popular understanding of justice and so to discuss justice in some other way would make the round incomprehensible to the general audience.

Justice is the proper value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value.

Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides

Cr = decreasing chances of nuclear war
x-Wickersham
the threat of nuclear war is the most serious potential health, environmental, agricultural, educational and moral problem facing humanity. Steven Starr, senior scientist with Physicians for Social Responsibility, said research makes clear the environmental consequences of a U.S.-Russian nuclear war: "If these weapons are detonated in the large cities of either of their nations, they will cause such catastrophic damage to the global environment that the Earth will become virtually uninhabitable for most humans and many other complex forms of life

A nation transitioning to A will be modeled by other nations minimizing threats
x-Hasnas
As the economic and technological gap between the liberalizing nation and the rest of world widens, as the rest of the world becomes more dependent upon the goods and services manufactured and supplied by that nation, and as a greater number of other nations are moved to adopt liberalizing policies themselves, the threat the rest of the world poses to the liberalizing nation decreases. Evidence of this is supplied by the demise of the Soviet Union. Radical regimes and terrorist organizations may constitute a serious and continuing threat, but consider it in historical context. Such a threat is considerably less serious and less expensive to address than the threat of thermonuclear war.

V = Justice
Giving each their due

it the popular understanding of justice and so to discuss justice in some other way would make the round incomprehensible to the general audience.

Justice is the proper value because the debate is the context of governance or lack thereof. Justice is the primary goal of good governance and so it seems justice would be the most relevant value.

Justice should be preferred as the value because it is one of the most common values debated in LD debate and so looking to justice provides both sides

Cr = overcoming poverty
x-Mestrum

The income people receive is not only a means whereby to acquire more goods and services, it is also a tangible recognition of how society values them. Equality is a fundamental value in each society, and that is why the point of inequality becomes relevant when so much attention is focused on globalisation.

A the state keeps people poor & subservient
x-Chartier

Poverty and workplace inequity can occur for multiple reasons. But neither could be expected to be remotely as prevalent in the absence of the state. The state raises the cost of self-employment, boosts the cost of living, and increases the liabilities associated with being poor.

B The state enables the corporate elite
x-Chartier

The state confers privileges on the wealthy and well connected. It protects favored industries with tariffs and grants of intellectual property rights, sanctifies large-scale theft by elite groups, hands out direct and indirect subsidies, implements regulatory regimes that suppress competition, constrains the most effective union activity, uses the tax system to benefit politically favored businesses and hamper the activities of others, employs eminent domain to boost the profits of developers and big box retailers, awards staggering bailouts to cronies in the financial and manufacturing sectors, and otherwise furthers the interests of elites and others.

C People who want to help the poor should support anarchy
x-Chartier

I want to argue that principled people on the political left—the sort of people who could be expected to listen, at least, to arguments from bleeding heart libertarians—should find anarchism attractive precisely because the state unavoidably harms people on a vast scale through its attacks on the poor, its support for corporate privilege, its war making, and its assaults on personal freedom.