# 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose the affirmative constructive with highlighting at least 30 minutes prior to the round when asked on messenger.

#### Violation – they don’t

[ss]

#### 1] Evidence Ethics --- disclosure deters mis-cutting, power-tagging, abuse of brackets and ellipses, and plagiarism. Independent reason to vote you down because it promotes better norms about academic engagement---debate is an academic environment and must ensure that we become fair scholars. Even if you don’t lose on fairness in the round, you will lose in college if you violate academic ethics which establish a crucial real-world norm and outweighs any in-round impact. Also, if you aren’t honest, we don’t know what else you’re lying about which means we don’t know if your arguments are actually true since they can be misrepresented.

**2] Quality engagement- Disclosure allows for in-depth preparation before the round and the tournament which allows debaters to effectively write case negs and arguments. Their model forecloses the chance to test their aff against a well-prepared opponent, diminishing the only unique benefits to debate. Only our interpretation allows for intricate debate and advocacy refinement through the process of in depth argumentation on the 1ac which makes debates better in the long term. Engagement outweighs and is a voter-all of the benefits of their role of the ballot relies on deliberation and rigorous contestation, but they have precluded our ability to engage in it which makes it a one sided monologue and link turns their arguments because it prevents the best possible conclusion.**

**3] Reciprocity- Absent disclosure of broken positions we go into the round in the dark since we don’t know what generic arguments you go for commonly and what kinds of specific positions you have read which means we lose a lot of pre round and pre-tournament prep- but you can prep us out easily since I disclose everything which means you are at a structural advantage going into the round.**

#### 4] Small school inclusion – disclosure ensures equity of prepping resources.

Bietz 10 Mike (Coach for Harvard-Westlake) “The Case for Public Case Disclosure.” NFL Rostrum, Vol. 84, Issue 9. May 2010. <https://nationalforensicleague.org/DownloadHandler.ashx?File=/userdocs/publications/05-2010%20Complete%20Rostrum.pdf> JW

1. It harms the “little guy” because big teams will prep out everything. As I outlined above, big teams already get many, many more flows than the smaller teams just because they have more debaters, more judges, and more coaches. Open disclosure gives everyone access to the same information. Additionally, it helps the “little guy” even more because for many of these debaters, the option of going to a lot of tournaments isn’t available. Open case disclosure gives them the ability to see what other teams are running prior to showing up to the tournament. Thus, there is an added benefit of equalizing not only information at a tournament, but also equalizing (to some degree) the playing field for people who do not have the resources to travel as much.

#### Framing: You can’t coopt any of the reasons why procedurals are bad in the context of the affirmative since I don’t constrain your ability to read it– the contention is that this aff should’ve been read, just disclosed.

#### Fairness above the K

#### 1] Fairness is a prior question to effective dialogue – If fairness is bad writ large vote neg regardless of the flow because it’s unfair

#### 2] If the judge doesn't enforce fairness, none of your scholarship would pass since it would give them the unfair jurisdiction to reject it and vote you down. Even if they don't, rejecting fairness is a practice that would justify a bad norm, which all your arguments are predicated on anyways.

#### 3] We can’t compare or interact to find the best solution to oppression if the unfair nature of your arguments prevents me from strategizing. Fairness is an integral part of your solvency.

#### 4] Unfair practices would make kids quit debate if they can’t check it which means less people to spread your message to so the shell is a prior question.

#### Every reason fairness is a voter is a reason you can’t read substantive take-outs to the shell since it precludes your evaluation of them.

#### Disclosure above the K

#### 1] Out of round practices constrain what can be read in round

#### 2] Lexically prior, they might indite the neg but I indite their months old practices

#### Edu- funded ny schools

#### DTD- dta illogical, time skew

#### No RVI’s or perf cons- illogical, baiting, if theory is bad and you vote on a turn to theory you are voting on theory

#### CI- intervention, race to bottom, collapses, yours vs best

#### Theory isn’t violent – A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. Theory doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable – I just say make a better arg next time. B] Exclusion is inevitable – every role of the ballot excludes some arguments and even saying Theory bad excludes it – that means we should delineate ground along reciprocal lines, not abandon division altogether. Reading Theory isn’t psychic violence – that was above, but especially if we’re not going for it since reading Theory can be used to prevent aff shiftiness and make substance a viable option.

#### No silencing DA - Theory is just like a disad or critique we’ve said a certain practice the aff took was bad and it would’ve been better had they done it differently not that they are bad debaters – just like the cap k says the aff engaged in some practice that reinforced capitalism and it would’ve been better if they had emphasized Marxism – impositions in some form are inevitable because the negative has the burden of rejoinder and needs link arguments – every disad link says the aff did something wrong and theres an implicit version of the aff that wouldn’t have linked

#### Theory before the K – A] Prior question. My theory argument calls into question the ability to run the argument in the first place. They can’t say the same even if they criticize theory because theory makes rules of the game not just normative statements about what debaters should say. B] Fair testing. Judge their arguments knowing I wasn’t given a fair shot to answer them. Prefer theory takes out K because they could answer my arguments, but I couldn’t answer theirs. Without testing their args, we don’t know if they’re valid, so you prefer fairness impacts on strength of link. Impact turns any critical education since a marketplace of ideas where we innovate, and test ideas presumes equal access.

#### Reject aff pre empts – not clearly delineated, impossible to know implications

# 2

### 1NC – CP

#### Counterplan text: do the aff with the addition of a land acknowledgement of the indigenous tribes whose land the aff is speaking on.

#### Inserting land acknowledgements into government are important to disrupt structures of settler colonialism.

Vowel 16 [Chelsea Vowel is Métis from manitow-sâkahikan (Lac Ste. Anne) Alberta, residing in amiskwacîwâskahikan (Edmonton). Mother to six girls, she has a BEd and LLB, and is currently a graduate student and Cree language instructor at the Faculty of Native studies at the University of Alberta. "Beyond territorial acknowledgments" âpihtawikosisân, 9-23-2016, https://apihtawikosisan.com/2016/09/beyond-territorial-acknowledgments/, DOA:11-30-2019 // WWBW]

If we think of **territorial acknowledgments** as sites of potential disruption, they **can be transformative acts that to some extent undo Indigenous erasure.** I believe this is true **as long as these acknowledgments discomfit both those speaking and hearing the words. The fact of Indigenous presence should force non-Indigenous peoples to confront their own place on these lands. I would like to see territorial acknowledgments happening** in spaces where they are currently absent, particularly in rural and remote areas and **within the governance structures of settlers.** However as we are already seeing, territorial acknowledgments can become stripped of their disruptive power through repetition. The purpose cannot merely be to inform an ignorant public that Indigenous peoples exist, and that Canada has a history of colonialism. I wanted to come back to Bob Joseph’s suggestion that territorial acknowledgements are a part of Indigenous protocol. I think if we understand that to be true, at least to some extent, then we must also understand that the protocols he invokes are much deeper than verbal acknowledgments. This can perhaps guide us into the ‘beyond’; the space beyond acknowledgment. Stopping at territorial acknowledgments is unacceptable. Often, territorial acknowledgments characterize non-Indigenous peoples as ‘guests’. Are guests only those people who are invited? Or they anyone who finds themselves within the physical territory of their hosts? Why guests and not invaders? To what extent was permission actually sought to be in these territories, and conduct the affairs that Indigenous nations are thanked for ‘hosting’? What if an Indigenous person stood up and revoked that assumed permission? I think we need to start imagining a constellation of relationships that must be entered into beyond territorial acknowledgments. Great, that’s awesome you know you’re on (for example) Treaty 6 territory. That’s great you acknowledge that perhaps the Indigenous view of that treaty, that the land was not surrendered, is correct. Perhaps you understand the tension of your presence as illegitimate, but don’t know how to deal with it beyond naming it. Maybe now it is time to start learning about your obligations as a guest in this territory. What are the Indigenous protocols involved in being a guest, what are your responsibilities? What responsibilities do your hosts have towards you, and are you making space for those responsibilities to be exercised? To what extent are your events benefiting your hosts? I’m not saying Indigenous people want to be at your AGA, or your university lecture, or your Dean’s meeting (maybe they do though). What I am saying is that all Indigenous nations have specific expectations of guests, and of hosts, and so far non-Indigenous peoples have not been very good at finding out what those are. I think this needs to be the next step. **It requires having actual conversations with Indigenous communities, saying things like “we want to be better guests, how do we do that according to your laws and hey by the way, what ARE your laws” and being prepared to hear the answers, even those that are uncomfortable like “give us the land back”.** I mean damn…maybe your huge ass union needs to fork over some of the land its executives have squirreled away on their massive salaries as a gesture of good guesting. That could be a real thing that could happen.

#### Land acknowledgement: Today I need to acknowledge the Wappinger and Munsee Lenape peoples whose land I am on today. I would like to acknowledge their ancestors who were victims of genocide and ethnic cleansing and forcefully removed from here. I live on the traditional lands of these tribes, yet their land was stolen and removed by settler colonialism. The Wappinger and Munsee Lenape have rights to these lands even today.

#### 

#### **Settler colonialism operates via a series of moves to innocence – by prioritizing other issues above indigenous life, the 1AC has continued the deliberate removal of indigeneity from history.**

Barker 12 MA U of Victoria, BASc McMaster University [Adam J. Barker, “(Re-)Ordering the New World: Settler Colonialism, Space, and Identity” Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Leicester 224-234, December 2012

Dynamics of Erasure It is important to begin by investigating the erasure of Indigenous presence from place. Erasure is essential to both occupation and bricolage, the two other colonising acts that are critical to settler colonial spatial production. Erasure of Indigenous presence can take many forms and may precede and continue throughout the time of Settler occupation. The variety of ways that settler colonialism produces space is predicated on consuming elements of Indigenous relational networks. Elements of Indigenous relational networks are extracted (removed from contexts that sustain meaning), processed and redeployed through settler colonial social space. What is Erasure? Historical geographer Cole Harris chose to reprint his essay ‘The Good Life Around Idaho Peak, originally researched and written more than thirty years ago, in a 1997 collected volume partly because it contains an egregious error that reflects the mind‐set of colonialism” (xvi). In the first version of this essay, Harris asserted that Idaho Peak, north of Nelson, British Columbia, had never been a site of Indigenous settlement. In the 1997 volume, he recanted: “[m]y proposition that no Native people had ever lived near Idaho Peak is absurd, and grows out of the common assumption, with which I grew up, that a mining rush had been superimposed on wilderness” (p.124). Harris, one of the most important and influential scholars of British Columbia’s native‐newcomer history, bases this striking reversal on a 1930 report by ethnographer James Teit of which he had previously been unaware. Based on interviews conducted between 1904 and 1907 with elders of the Sinixt (Lake) people whose ancestors had lived in the region, Teit’s report details Indigenous peoples’ village sites and the devastating impacts of imported disease (pp.194‐195). In this case, not only were the physical bodies and communities of Indigenous peoples destroyed and reduced by pathogens introduced by European and American newcomers, even Settler knowledge of indigeneity was discarded and ignored. In Harris’ analysis, “[m]ine is another example, from one who should have known better, of the substitution of wilderness for an erased Native world” (1997 p.xvi). This is erasure: the total removal of Indigenous being on the land, even from history, memory, and culture, to facilitate the transfer of those lands. This can even be accomplished without the removal of Indigenous bodies; it is the relational networks with place that sustain Indigenous being that are the true targets of erasure. Veracini notes that settler colonialism is most often pursued by settler collectives operating in corporate form (Veracini, 2010a pp.59‐62). It is easy and not uncommon to ascribe Settler peoples the role of occupation while attributing erasure to a combination of ‘just war’ by state and imperial para‐/military forces, and uncontrollable diseases like smallpox or influenza, washing Settler hands of responsibility. Individual Settler people deny their colonial responsibilities through this corporate ‘limited liability’ such that settler colonialism “obscures the conditions of its own production” (p.14). However, Settler peoples are — historically and in the present — directly implicated in acts of erasure. It is more acceptable to suggest that the British Empire or the American state ‘have colonised’ than to suggest that the Settler populations of the northern bloc ‘are colonisers/colonial.’ This is part of the complex dynamic whereby Settler people, even as they are or become aware of the existence of settler colonial atrocities, are able to deny their own complicity (Regan, 2010) or even those of their forbears.60 The goal of erasure is the reconciliation of the colonial difference through the materialisation of perceived terra nullius (Tully, 2000), an ‘empty land’ that, if not actually empty, is at least open: to the entrance of settlers, to being reshaped, to the extraction of advantage. The literature on terra nullius is extensive, and it was recently condemned as part of the ‘doctrine of discovery’ by the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (2012). For the purposes of settler colonial erasure, terra nullius can be thought of as the creation of a vast, conceptual space of exception. Settler state sovereignty is premised on spaces of exception that reduce Indigenous people to homo sacer (Morgensen, 2011), and Settler identities are entwined with spatial segregation through frontier narratives that exile indigeneity to the wilderness beyond the reach of the civilising state (Larsen, 2003 pp.92‐94). Thus state space is premised on the erasure of indigeneity itself; Indigenous bodies stripped of sacred nature can be consumed or disposed of in a variety of ways without consequence. The governmental act of regulating and extinguishing indigeneity exceeds Settler sovereignty in two major ways: first, in the extension of the power of life or death over populations whose relationships are not considered part of the state (thus an extra‐territorial assertion of sovereign power), and second, in the extension of the state over territories to which Settler people have no legitimate claim based on the presence of Indigenous peoples. According with Agamben’s observations of the creation of spaces of exception and the imposition of spatial restriction, and the reduction of human life to numbers, both Canada and the United States imposed ‘band lists’ on Indigenous communities. These lists of names of ‘official’ members, later identified by personal identification cards (numbered), issued by the government, were used to control Indigenous movements on and off of reserves and to prevent the entry of Indigenous individuals into colonial spaces, like cities and towns (Frideres et al., 2004 pp. 95‐102). Further, the governments of these states have turned the extermination of Indigenous peoples into a demographic problem. By claiming the sole responsibility to determine who is ‘Indian’ (as per the Constitution in Canada or a whole host of statutes at federal and state levels in America), states were able to legislate rules of heritage. These ‘status’ laws — based often on varying levels of blood quantum in the USA (Garoutte, 2003 pp.38‐60), and an odd, collaping system of parentage in Canada (Lawrence, 2003 p.6) — ensure that, even as Indigenous populations increase, ‘Indian’ people are disappearing. Physical Erasure Indigenous peoples perceived across settler colonial difference are often constructed as a threat: to the advantages conferred by the occupation of spaces of opportunity, to the safety of Settler people and to the norms and ‘civilised’ values of settler colonisers. As a consequence, all manner of violence is directed at Indigenous peoples, resulting in the physical elimination, removal, or disappearance of indigeneity from place. Physical erasure of Indigenous peoples is often initiated extraterritorially by para‐/military forces. This is important for understanding the concept of ‘the frontier’ (below); however, it should not be read to implicate only metropole powers in physical erasure.Settler collectives also participate in the physical erasure of Indigenous peoples and spaces. With rare exceptions, it has been expected that Indigenous peoples will assimilate into and disappear from Settler spaces, rather than the other way around. There are, of course, exceptions to this. There are widespread accounts of Settler people either excluded or exiled from larger collectives, or remnants of failed or collapses collectives, being adopted into Indigenous societies. For example, the second Roanoke colony is believed to have been assimilated into local Indigenous societies sometime between 1578 and 1590 (Kupperman, 2000 p.12). In a different but related vein, the Métis people of the Red River Valley, while a hybrid of Scottish, French, English, Cree and other peoples, are widely recognised as an emergent Indigenous peoplehood (Read & Webb, 2012; Tough & McGregor, 2011). Although the Métis are both culturally and genetically related to European peoples, they assert indigenised networks of being on the land rather than dominating colonial displacement of indigeneity.61 Indigenous networks were capable of absorbing these non‐indigenous Others absent the violent intercession of colonial force. As Chapter 3 has shown, settler colonial space is created by the direct assertion of Settler power over place with the result that exceptional examples such as Roanoke or the Métis are rare. Of course, personal relationships between Settler and Indigenous peoples are not completely encompassed by the drive for erasure, but the threat of colonial violence is ever‐present. Even when pursued ‘peacefully,’ intermarriage and socialintegration of Indigenous peoples into Settler spaces occurs in a highly coercive and uneven environment. For example, settler colonial logics that divide and sort have consistently dehumanised Indigenous people, and especially Indigenous women (Smith, 2005; Maracle, 1996 pp.14‐19), leading to widespread gendered and racialised violence. The selective dehumanisation of Indigenous women by settler colonisers contributes to very real physical erasures; consider the contemporary case of the hundreds of missing and murdered Indigenous women in and around Vancouver (Dean, 2010 p.14). More broadly, Settler collectives also play direct roles in spreading disease (Swanky, 2012; Wright, 1992 pp.74, 103‐104) and in extermination through dispossession. Returning to the example of the Pacific Northwest, Settler ranchers did not necessarily intend to physically erase Indigenous populations, but as they monopolised both grazing lands and food markets in the British Columbia Interior, they deprived Indigenous communities of networks of resources that had sustained them since time immemorial (Thistle, 2011; Harris & Demeritt, 1997 pp.234‐240). Erasure through deprivation continues to this day. Despite the fact that Settler societies of the northern bloc are among the most affluent in history, Indigenous communities continue to endure starvation, lack of access to clean drinking water, lack of medical and other health and social services (including education), enforced isolation, and denial of a sufficient land base for social health and reproduction. Conceptual Erasure As well as the removal of the physical presence of Indigenous people from the land, settler colonial logics call for the removal of Indigenous peoples — at least as autonomous, intelligent actors — from the understood history of places (Veracini, 2007). Bureaucratic management techniques ensure that the business of solving the ‘Indian problem’ does not impact on the daily life of the average Settler person by positioning Indigenous populations as inventories to be liquidated rather than people to be engaged with. Erasure has been at times a matter of counting: how many ‘Indians’ are left, how many fewer than last year, how much property should be allocated ‘per Indian,’ and when will the ‘vanishing Indian’ become reality (Veracini, 2010a: 39‐40; Neu, 2000). This further allows individual Settlers to deny complicity in the erasure of Indigenous presence: the modern, industrial state counts, includes or excludes, and ultimately disposes of Indigenous peoples, and the state is impersonal. That the state exists because of settler colonisation, that Settler people serve as bureaucrats and colonial agents, or that erasure and occupation go hand in hand is rarely acknowledged. Indigenous histories, especially those living histories sustained in oral traditions, are the storehouse of knowledge of rituals, sacred places, and place‐ based personalities and tend to confound settler colonisation. These histories constantly remind Settler peoples of their illegitimacy on the land; they point out that there are ways of relating to place beyond the understanding of contemporary Settler peoples; and, they provide a source of strength and identity for Indigenous groups even after they have been separated from their places or their spaces have been replaced by colonial spaces. As Holm et al., point out, even the stories of loss regarding a sacred space can be a source of identity (Holm et al. 2003 pp.9‐12; see also Chapter 1). Settler colonisers, then, if they wish to avoid the discomfort associated with living Indigenous histories, must follow a logic of deliberately constructing histories in which Indigenous peoples are either absent or relegated at the margins. These then serve as the reference point for Settler people to judge their own ‘progress’ or ‘development’ as a people against anachronistic ‘savages’ who lack agency or power. This is also projected temporally forward: settler colonisation does not intend simply to erase these histories, but also to predetermine the future through “master narratives” (Austin, 2010) of technological progress, the inevitability of civilisation, rights‐based social assimilation, and the wholesale replacement of Indigenous systems of law and governance (Alfred, 2009a). Settler collectives create and perpetuate Settler myths such as the “Peacemaker myth” (Regan, 2010), the heroic trope of the frontier pioneer (Nettlebeck & Foster, 2012), and the up‐by‐the‐bootstraps myth of the self‐made Settler (Ramirez, 2012), to name but a few. Often these myths were created and are perpetuated by playing off of stereotypes about settlement in other colonial jurisdictions. Historian Chris Arnett has remarked: ... there remains the colonial myth that, contrary to what happened south of the 49th parallel, the British resettlement of British Columbia was benign, bloodless and law‐abiding ... Granted the “Indian Wars” of British Columbia came nowhere near the wholesale slaughter of aboriginal people that too often characterized the inter‐racial conflict in the western United States, but as one historian has observed, “human conflict does not decline in complexity as it does in scale.” Artnett, 1999 p.14 Both American and Canadian settler colonisation involved in varying combinations: treaty‐making and breaking; violent military and para‐military force; and, concerted attempts at cultural assimilation or extermination. In Regan’s work, she positions the peacemaker narrative in opposition to the violent reality of residential schools (Regan, 2010). As she points out, many physical buildings of residential schools still exist, though Settler people are unable to “see” them (2010 pp.5‐6). Steeped in national myths premised on narratives of treaty making and cooperation, and especially played off against perceptions of American ‘militant’ conquest, residential schools physically disappear to Settler Canadians: the structures are not seen, the damage not perceived. The residential school project in Canada, jointly pursued by the federal government and churches, was premised on the belief that ‘primitive’ and ‘disappearing’ Indigenous peoples could best be served by ushering their extinction through assimilation.62 However, given that the role of residential schools in erasure cannot be denied, Settler people instead must either deny their own involvement with them (and thus with settler colonisation) or deny that they existed at all. This is symptomatic of widespread Settler denial that serves not just to erase indigeneity, but also to erase the colonising act of erasure. Erasure and Transfer Erasure is required at some stage for each type of settler colonial land transfer. Sometimes this is obvious; for example “necropolitical transfer” (Veracini, 2010a: 35) involves the physical liquidation of Indigenous peoples by military action. However, erasure is involved in many other kinds of transfer either concurrent to (and hidden by) occupation and bricolage, or (usually) before or after these other colonising acts. Notably, Veracini describes that “perception transfer” — “when indigenous peoples are disavowed in a variety of ways and their actual presence is not registered (... for example, when indigenous people are understood as part of the landscape)” — “is a crucial prerequisite to other forms of transfer” (Veracini, 2010a p.36). Veracini then draws attention to an important dynamic: “when really existing indigenous people enter the field of settler perception, they are deemed to have entered the settler space and can therefore be considered exogenous” (2010a p.36). The implication is that erasure is unidirectional. Indigenous peoples cannot be retrieved or revived from their erased condition without serious disruption to settler colonial space. All transfer, regardless of whether it relies on physical or conceptual erasure, is intended to be permanent. Arguments that certain kinds of transfer are ‘better’ than others — such as the Canadian assertion of the peacemaker myth juxtaposed against violent American frontier adventurism — are seeking to differentiate between genocidal acts based on arbitrary distinctions, splitting colonial hairs.

#### No permutations: a] double-bind: either the perm includes the aff alt without the land acknowledgement and it links to the net benefit, or it doesn’t involve a bill without land acknowledgement and its severance b] the perm is cooption – it allows settler colonial acts of governance to pay lip service to indigenous life without interrogating why they’re doing it – by saying perm do both is not valuable when they have not done the critical interrogation that makes land acknowledgements valuable c] it’s not aff-plus – its literally alt – it’s not mutually exclusive but I’ve won the lack of a land acknowledgement in the aff is actively violent

# Case -

#### Cap is good – solves environmental destruction and increases the standard of living.

Houser 17 (Adam, National Director of Collegians for CFACT, 11/2/17, “Want to Protect the Environment? Embrace Capitalism”, http://www.cfact.org/2017/11/02/want-to-protect-the-environment-embrace-capitalism/, AZG)

At the People’s Climate March in April of this year, one young woman held a particularly interesting, and unfortunately terribly inaccurate sign. It said: “List of things capitalism killed: F&\*#%\*@ everything.” What this individual, and much of America and the world, fail to realize, is that capitalism’s benefits far outweigh its faults. Not only has capitalism lifted more people out of poverty than any system ever implemented in the history of civilization, but in so doing, it has done more to protect the environment than any socialist or communist initiative. If you want to protect the environment, you should love capitalism. Capitalism increases living standards. When living standards increase, people care more about the environment, and are more able to do something to protect it. According to the World Bank, world poverty rates have been declining in every region of the world over the last several decades. The Economist and the American Enterprise Institute say the primary reason for this is free markets, which involves the opening up of trade between nations. This is a cornerstone of capitalism. As countries find more markets to sell their goods and services to, jobs, and the elimination of poverty, follows. This is important, because as a nation creates more wealth, more individuals will inevitably want to give back to society. We would not have the national parks in America without wealthy individuals voluntarily giving away their wealth because they wanted to benefit society. Look at what John D. Rockefeller, Jr. did, according to the National Park Service: “The contributions of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his son Laurance S. Rockefeller to expand the national park system are especially remarkable. They gave more than $3 million for land and park roads at Acadia, more than $2 million to enlarge and improve Grand Teton National Park, more than $5 million for land to establish Great Smoky Mountains National Park, more than $2 million for the land comprising Virgin Islands National Park, more than $1.6 million to expand Yosemite, and lesser amounts for lands at Big Bend, Glacier, Grand Canyon, Haleakala, Lassen Volcanic, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, and Shenandoah national parks; Antietam, Big Hole, and Fort Donelson national battlefields; Capulin Volcano and George Washington Birthplace national monuments; Colonial National Historical Park; Ford’s Theatre National Historic Site; and the Blue Ridge Parkway.” Many contributions from wealthy individuals happened before Congress had even created the National Park Service in 1916. The museums at Mesa Verde National Park, Yosemite, and Yavapai Observation StationöMuseum at Grand Canyon National Park all are in existence because of private philanthropy, and those are only a few examples. Not only does more wealth provide greater opportunities for protecting the environment, but it also creates greater demand for it. According to Donald Boudreaux’s book Globalization, “Environmental quality is very much like leisure time: as people become wealthier they demand more of it, mostly because they can better afford it.” John Tamny, contributor at Forbes, explains this concept well: “In the 1930s the number of trips Americans took to U.S. national parks and forests were negligible. By 1950 total visits were under 200 million. Today parks and forests average 1.4 billion visitors annually. Today’s citizens have the time to watch the trees grow and smell the roses.” While of course there is poverty in the United States that we should all work towards reducing, over time, the overall quality of life of Americans has drastically improved. This means Americans need to spend less time doing tasks by hand that they can now afford to hire a business to do, or can now use technology to accomplish. Their minds are less focused on daily survival, and more on broader issues. This is a positive thing for protecting the environment. When you aren’t concerned about where or how to eat and get clean water or shelter, you care more about whether air is of good quality or if the nearby lake is protected from pollution. But the evidence showing that capitalism helps improve environmental quality is not just clear from history, it is shines as clear as day in statistical data as well. Yale University has a metric called the Environmental Performance Index, which takes statistics on environmental health and ecosystem vitality to rate a country’s environmental protection. James Roberts and Ryan Olson of the Heritage Foundation took this number and compared it to the Index of Economic Freedom, which measures how economically free through capitalism a nation is. They found a strong trend in the data that “indicates that as countries move from economic repression to economic freedom, their environments improve as well.” Olson and Roberts then looked at the state of private property rights in several countries, and compared that to Yale’s Environmental Performance Index. They found an incredibly strong correlation in this data, suggesting that as private property rights increase, so does environmental protection and quality. The two researchers explain: “Because land values usually increase over time, owners have an incentive to maintain the quality of the land and its improvements in order to preserve its value. Owners of private property have no interest in destroying the value of the land or its environmental qualities, because they would not profit from such degradation.” In the 1990’s, Iceland actually began to experiment with property rights when it comes to fisheries. It was long thought that using private property rights on fish or areas of the ocean, since there is no way to stop fish from swimming to other parts, was impossible. But Iceland began using “Individual Transferable Quotas” which allowed fishermen to “harvest specific portions of the overall quota of marine fish.” If a fisherman was having less success meeting their part of the quota, they could sell their rights to other more efficient fishermen, thus creating an incentive to reward more efficient, successful fishermen. This helped limit over-fishing, and over time fish stocks improved, thus increasing environmental quality. But what about the track record of communist countries? How do they do at protecting the environment? Countries in the European Soviet bloc, as well as the USSR and Venezuela, do not just fare worse than capitalist countries at protecting the environment; they do such an awful job at protecting the environment that it inevitably becomes a humanitarian crisis. According to a report from the Multinational Monitor in 1990, air pollution was a serious problem for the Soviet Union. 40% of citizens lived in areas where contaminants were three or four times the maximum safety levels. In addition, water quality was abysmal. “In Leningrad, nearly half of the children have intestinal disorders caused by drinking contaminated water from what was once Europe’s most pristine supply.” 44% of East German forests were heavily affected by acid rain that came from coal facilities that lacked the equipment necessary to scrub sulfur from emissions. East Germany had air pollution that was deemed to be as many as 12 times worse than that in capitalist West Germany. Venezuela is in a deep crisis on almost every social level. Food and basic necessities such as toilet paper are becoming almost non-existent. Strong socialist policies have caused deep shortages. While the government was focused on depriving individuals of private property and growing its control over the economy, it ignored the issue of water supply. As the financial crisis deepens and the recent drought continues, much of Venezuela is becoming ill with diarrhea, other stomach diseases, and skin conditions such as scabies, and folliculitis. Hospitals and households alike see limited water supply, and when there is water, it often comes out of faucets yellow or brown. As a nation becomes wealthier through capitalism, it starts paying attention to environmental issues, because they no longer have to worry as much about simply surviving. If only Venezuela’s government had focused on growing economic freedom, perhaps then enough could have been done to prevent the water quality crisis happening today. Whether you are a head of state or just a concerned citizen that wants to protect the environment, you should embrace economic freedom, free markets, capitalism, and private property rights. Your citizens will be lifted out of poverty, your air and water will become cleaner, and your people and neighbors will want to protect the environmental treasures your country offers because they don’t have to worry about what they are going to eat and drink that night. History, statistical data, and countless real-life examples all agree: to protect the environment, embrace capitalism.