# JF23 – OS Kant Frontlines

## 1AR – AT: Counterplans

### 1AR – AT: Terrorism PIC [Harker]

#### Extend the Cole ev – all agents are equal and can’t choose their location so they should be allowed to move to exercise freedom – there is no reason to reject an immigrant if that person could’ve been born as my neighbor. Their burden is to prove that there is an active reason to exclude people from borders but that’s incoherent and begs the question.

#### [1] Solvency deficit – they read a counterplan to the wrong aff contention. Kant’s law of hospitality says to take in refugees when the alternative is their deaths. Our offense is not that – it is about the inherent right to equality. We don’t care whether migrants are rich, poor, or a minority – our offense is derived from arbitrarily excluding people based off factors they can’t control like their birthplace. A couple implications:

#### [A] We’re a perfect duty – exclusion is something we need to prevent e.g. saying segregation is bad because it excludes people based off of factors they don’t control is bad just like the aff. Counterplan can’t solve the aff – saying refugees have other options is the same thing as saying black people can use the colored people water fountain next to the white one – it’s not about equal outcome, it’s about the principle.

#### [B] Disad to the counterplan – we can never consider the material position or past actions of an agent since they are unknowable absent using experience. We can’t verify what “unlawful violence and intimidation” are which proves its arbitrary and will be used to exclude lawful migrants

#### [2] Perm do both:

Arnaiz 22 (Borja, Political Science Professor, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Should we open borders? Yes, but not in the name of global justice, May 26, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/16544951.2022.2081398>, GA)

Some proponents of global justice question that opening borders is an effective strategy to alleviate global poverty and reduce inequalities between countries. This article goes a step further and asks whether an open borders policy is compatible with the objectives of global distributive justice. The latter, it will be argued, entails the ordering of needs, the assignment of priorities and the preference or subordination of some interests over others. In other words, global justice requires the establishment of conditions and restrictions on mobility. On the contrary, open borders claim an unrestricted and unconditional (not unqualified) freedom of movement, limited only by public health considerations, serious threats to national security or democratic institutions, but not by an aspiration for maximizing global redistributive utility. The main point is that not only would freedom of movement be instrumentalized, losing its presumptive moral force, but ultimately open borders as a remedy of global justice are an oxymoron. The article concludes with an alternative defence of freedom of international movement.

#### Prefer over Longley –

#### [A] Intent to include – Arnaiz specifies an exception to Longley’s interp, they have no intent to exclude ours

#### [B] Longley says “strictest interpretation” – no reason to use it since it’s unrealistic to implement and would allow the neg to PIC out of specific individuals e.g. Putin decking aff ground

#### [C] Author quals – Arnaiz is a professor with an intent to explore the resolution question, Longley only works for the government in URBAN PLANNING

#### [3] No link and general principle – saying open borders are just doesn’t justify violence once they get in since that’s a consequence of the aff just like how “we ought to donate to the homeless” doesn’t justify donating them cyanide since under Kant you can’t abuse a maxim to harm someone without violating another maxim – if the person harms someone that justifies the new state jailing them but not preemptively limiting their rights because that uses induction

#### [4] CP links to turns – Wellman says people can exclude for any reason; including if they are refugees; their evidence isn’t specific to the CP

#### [5] No net benefit – they have no reason why semi-open borders is uniquely Kantian since they link to their turns – vote aff because it’s the side of least change

#### [6] Perm do the counterplan – relocation is incoherent since to relocate them you need some place to open their borders which is the aff

### 1AR – AT: Vaccine PIC [ChoBros]

#### [1] Induction fails – we can’t know whether the CP will increase vaccination rates or whether vaccines even work.

#### [2] Perm do both:

Arnaiz 22 (Borja, Political Science Professor, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Should we open borders? Yes, but not in the name of global justice, May 26, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/16544951.2022.2081398>, GA)

Some proponents of global justice question that opening borders is an effective strategy to alleviate global poverty and reduce inequalities between countries. This article goes a step further and asks whether an open borders policy is compatible with the objectives of global distributive justice. The latter, it will be argued, entails the ordering of needs, the assignment of priorities and the preference or subordination of some interests over others. In other words, global justice requires the establishment of conditions and restrictions on mobility. On the contrary, open borders claim an unrestricted and unconditional (not unqualified) freedom of movement, limited only by public health considerations, serious threats to national security or democratic institutions, but not by an aspiration for maximizing global redistributive utility. The main point is that not only would freedom of movement be instrumentalized, losing its presumptive moral force, but ultimately open borders as a remedy of global justice are an oxymoron. The article concludes with an alternative defence of freedom of international movement.

#### Prefer over Longley –

#### [A] Intent to include – Arnaiz specifies an exception to Longley’s interp, they have no intent to exclude ours

#### [B] Longley says “strictest interpretation” – no reason to use it since it’s unrealistic to implement and would allow the neg to PIC out of specific individuals e.g. Putin decking aff ground

#### [C] Author quals – Arnaiz is a professor with an intent to explore the resolution question, Longley only works for the government in URBAN PLANNING

#### [3] Off their net benefit – they haven’t warranted why intent is the same as foresight under Kant, so foreseeing bad health as a consequence of the aff doesn’t mean we intend it. If predictions fail we can only evaluate the original intent of the maxim. States have an obligation to act on maxims that directly intend to promote health but not maxims that result in health as a consequence so their offense doesn’t apply

#### [4] Disad to the counterplan – we can never consider the material position or past actions of an agent since they are unknowable absent using experience. The state cannot predict future violations because induction fails; it can only punish current ones

#### [5] No link – saying open borders are just doesn’t justify antivaccination since that’s a consequence of the aff just like how “we ought to donate to the homeless” doesn’t justify donating them cyanide since under Kant you can’t abuse a maxim to harm someone without violating another maxim; this proves the state should force them to get vaccinated once they get in

#### [6] Vaccine Passports cause Vaccine hesitancy.

Brogan 21 Caroline Brogan 9-2-2021 "Vaccine passports linked to COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy in UK and Israel" <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/news/229153/vaccine-passports-linked-covid-19-vaccine-hesitancy/> (Communications Journalist at Imperial)//Elmer

A new study from Imperial College London has found a link between COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and a perceived lack of free will over vaccine passports. The findings, taken from surveys of 1,358 people across the UK and Israel – two highly vaccinated countries – found that people who feel their sense of autonomy, or free will, is unmet by government incentives like vaccine passports are less likely to take the COVID-19 vaccine. Domestic vaccine passports, where people must prove their vaccination status to stay in hotels and attend events for example, have been introduced across the world to restore freedom of movement within countries and encourage vaccination. However this new study, published in the journal Vaccines, highlights that such public health incentives might affect people’s vaccination decisions in unintended and undesirable ways. Vaccination is the single most effective way to reduce deaths and severe illness from COVID-19, and current vaccines have demonstrated high levels of protection against symptomatic infection. Most eligible adults in the UK (57.3 per cent) and Israel (62.3 per cent) are now fully vaccinated, but 11 per cent of eligible adults in the UK and 15 per cent in Israel have yet to receive a first dose. These unvaccinated groups could undermine herd immunity, which requires meeting a threshold of vaccinated individuals to secure the safety of people who are unable to take the vaccine. However, not much is known about the psychological factors at play in vaccine hesitancy, and how to tackle them. Lead author of the study Dr Talya Porat, of Imperial’s Dyson School of Design Engineering, said: “Although reluctant groups are relatively small, they are not insignificant: some estimates suggest that vaccine refusal rates greater than 10 per cent could significantly hinder herd immunity. If we want to ensure enough people get vaccinated to control the spread of SARS-CoV-2, we need to understand the factors that affect people’s decisions.” Measuring attitudes If we want to ensure enough people get vaccinated to control the spread of SARS-CoV-2, we need to understand the factors that affect people’s decisions. Dr Talya Porat Dyson School of Design Engineering The research team set out to investigate the extent to which people’s vaccine hesitancy relates to their psychological needs, and how the use of vaccine passports might affect those needs. They surveyed 681 people in the UK and 677 in Israel to measure the needs of autonomy (a feeling of free will to make one’s own decisions), competence (a feeling of being capable of achieving one’s goals and overcoming challenges) and relatedness (feeling cared for, trusted and understood by others), as well as the extent to which these needs were met (‘satisfied’) or unmet (‘frustrated’). They also asked how willing participants are (or were, if they had already been vaccinated) to get vaccinated, from 1 (not at all willing) to 5 (extremely willing). Then they measured attitudes towards vaccine passports by asking participants the extent to which they support three scenarios: A ‘COVID passport’ enabling only fully vaccinated people to perform some social activities; A ‘COVID passport’ enabling fully vaccinated or recently tested people to perform some activities; and mandatory vaccination for all residents. They found that people’s willingness to get vaccinated correlated with their sense of autonomy: participants who felt their need for free will was unmet were particularly unlikely to say they would take the vaccine. Dr Porat said: “If public health incentives like vaccine passports 'frustrate’ psychological needs – for example by making people feel a lack of free will over their decisions – then they might paradoxically reduce people’s willingness to get vaccinated.” Governments should focus on building a caring and trusting relationship with the public, rather than applying pressure and external controls. Professor Rafael Calvo Dyson School of Design Engineering The researchers say this suggests that even if government pressure causes people to get vaccinated now, they may be less willing to receive a booster dose or a vaccine against new variants in future. Autonomy-frustrating policies like vaccine passports might also have long-term public health implications in terms of trust in the health system, they explain. Moreover, failing to meet psychological needs can damage people’s wellbeing, so needs-frustrating policies might add to the already heavy burden of the pandemic on people’s mental health. Dr Porat added: “For some, vaccine passports act as incentives to get vaccinated so they can move freely in society. Our results suggest that for others, the passports might increase resistance to vaccination or alter the motivation behind their vaccine decisions in ways that might have detrimental long-term consequences.”

## 1AR – AT: Kant Turns

### 1AR – AT: Strake Offense

#### [1] (Act Omission) Act omission distinction doesn’t negate – states have promised via the social contract to protect the rights of their citizens which means it is their duty to enforce rights violations.

#### [2] (Property Rights) Property rights is a false equivalence – immigration does not affect your property, just the way public spaces are used so there’s no violation. For example, I can kick my neighbor out of my house, but I can’t ban them from going to a park.

#### [3] (Free Loading) No free loading – extend the Cole evidence. Open borders are necessary to recognize the innate equality of all agents. People can’t choose where they are born meaning that they should have the right to migrate – there is no reason to reject an immigrant if they could’ve been born as my neighbor. Cole answers free loading – A. Immigrants would pay taxes if they became permanent citizens – that’s like denying a job applicant because they haven’t worked there before B. NUQ – the elderly and children do not contribute much or pay taxes but they are allowed to stay C. Immigrants do contribute – we live in a globalized economy and their work spills over.

#### [4] (Contradiction in conception) No contradiction in conception – borders are regulations for how people cross over, loosening restrictions is still a regulation since there are hard rules in place like no threats to national security.

#### [5] (White) Yes positive obligation – A. Closing borders is actively discriminating against immigrants and it’s a perfect duty to not do that since we’ve won our offense, also assigning different obligations to non-citizens is incoherent – that was Cole. B. Kant is not a liberalist – he believed that the state had a perfect duty to prevent people from falling into coerced dependence on the private charity of others, necessitating public institutions to aid them. C. Immigrants also pay taxes so it’s not beneficence, it’s a contract.

#### [6] (Stilz) Territory rights don’t negate – A. C/A the 2 point – immigration does not affect personal private property, just public spaces, this evidence isn’t even about open borders B. States have an obligation to create a property system, but the rules in this system are flexible. When I am born I am entitled to access property, but not a specific piece of property – states can amend property laws to adjust for new citizens if the current system isn’t universalizable.

#### [7] (Wellman) No unconditional right to exclude – A. Using a public space doesn’t violate the rights of others since they contribute to maintaining it via things like taxes. B. Justifies segregation – if everything private has the right to exclude restaurants can say that they don’t allow black people – Kant’s entire philosophy is about a priori principles meaning the nature of someone’s rights shouldn’t be decided on a posteriori factors like where they are born C. Incoherent – other people using shared spaces doesn’t justify exclusion – e.g. if my neighbor wants to have children I can’t stop her just because her children will use public spaces or might have different political opinions than me

#### [8] (Hughes) No state power – A. Hindering a hindrance – saying that you have bodily autonomy doesn’t extend to excluding other people e.g. restaurants can’t say no black people B. We still allow states to control borders, we just say that they have to control them in a specific way. They can still control security and no brightline to how much control they need, their ev assumes we completely get rid of borders

### 1AR – AT: Scopa Offense

#### Extend the Cole evidence. Open borders are necessary to recognize the innate equality of all agents. People can’t choose where they are born meaning that they should have the right to migrate – there is no reason to reject an immigrant if they could’ve been born as my neighbor

#### Toplevel – most of these responses are just property good and can be grouped:

#### [1] No contradiction in conception – borders are regulations for how people cross over, loosening restrictions is still a regulation since there are hard rules in place like no threats to national security.

#### [2] No kingdom of ends – A. Using a public space doesn’t violate the rights of others since they contribute to maintaining it via things like taxes. B. Incoherent – other people using shared spaces doesn’t justify exclusion – e.g. if my neighbor wants to have children I can’t stop her just because her children will use public spaces or might have different political opinions than me C. Our offense isn’t from the right to Earth, it’s from the right to not be excluded, we aren’t saying that people should be included in every single piece of property but rather that denying their ability to even try to attain it is bad

#### [3] Constitution doesn’t negate – A. States should amend bad border policies if we win that closed borders aren’t universalizable just like how a segregated restaurant should open up to everyone even if they have to change their policies B. Property rights are flexible since nobody is entitled to a specific piece of property, just that they should have property – property ownership is a contract, not an a priori rule C. The Cole ev determines who should be let into this community in the first place – their offense begs the question of the aff

#### [4] Property rights don’t apply – C/A the warrant to kingdom of ends, we allow people to own property still

#### [5] No perpetual peace – A. This is a consequence that we can’t predict under the aff B. C/A responses to property rights – this ev is about how we acquire property not how we ought to maintain it

### 1AR – AT: ChoBros Offense

#### Top level – these are 5 words long and have no warrants – yes new 2AR implications

#### [1] Not hindering a hindrance – the state can’t predict future rights violations because that uses induction BUT people who commit violent acts can be punished once they do them under the new state

#### [2] Omnilateral power doesn’t apply – we should stop the state from actively harming potential citizens – that was Cole

#### [3] Open borders aren’t a contradiction – A) Borders still have some regulations like security B) They define nationalities and demarcate political lines which exist even with more immigration

#### [4] No promise breaking – A) Hindering a hindrance – you can’t promise wrongful things B) Open borders excludes national security threats – Biden is pro immigration and aligns with the aff

#### [5] No God – Kant warrants why agency is the source of value. His religious philosophy is not his moral philosophy and concludes God’s will is arbitrary.

#### [6] No act-omission distinction – A) Governments must protect the rights of citizens since they promised to which makes it an active obligation B) They haven’t warranted an alternative to open borders – reducing restrictions is the only way

#### [7] No private ownership – migrants would be on public property which they contribute to via things like taxes

#### [8] No link to Agamben – it has 10 words highlighted and our aff is about permanent migration, not refugees.