## 1NC – Kant

### 1NC – Long [2:20]

#### Practical Reason first –

#### 1] Constitutivism – the only thing constitutive to subjectivity is reason. I could be dreaming or a brain in a vat but so all other forms of knowledge based on empirical circumstances are unreliable and doubtful. The only thing I know is that I am doubting and reasoning.

#### 2] Infinite Regress – a theory is only binding when you can answer “why should I do this?” and not continue to ask “why”. Only reason provides a deductive foundation since the question “why should I be rational” already concedes the authority of agency since your agency is at work.

#### 3] Is-Ought Gap – making claims about the world don’t generate obligations – just because someone WILL kill doesn’t make it GOOD – that relies on a normative precept ie that death is bad which triggers a doublebind since only providing ethics can generate a guide to action or a theory isn’t binding.

#### 4] Uncertainty – inability to know others’ experience make other theories unreliable for ethics. Outweighs since it would be escapable since people could say they don’t experience the same. Hijacks, roles of the ballot since only a solid basis is enough to convince people to follow their theory.

#### 5] Culpability – ethics assumes the agential ability for self-reflection – otherwise we could never determine whether someone was responsible for their actions meaning it’s the only way to generate a normative force.

#### Reason is universal and applies to everyone – it doesn’t make sense to say 2+2=4 for me but not for anyone else.

#### The counter-methodology – vote neg for a liberation strategy of universal reason. This entails a starting point where we abstract from individual perspectives to understand the universal and use this starting point to apply it to empirical circumstances.

#### No perms in a method debate – a] It assumes fiat which doesn’t make sense. Their ROB forefronts the performance and method which a perm steals away b] non-T affs can defend anything – the burden is on them to prove their advocacy is the best solution to their problem c] you should hold them to the method they defended in the 1AC since anything else is severance which endorses bad scholarship as it’s a debate of methods.

#### Prefer Additionally –

#### 1] Performativity – when you enter debate, you presume that you will be free in round because of reciprocally enforced constraints which means objections are impossible and should be ignored on face.

#### 2] Ideal Theory Good – a] Sequencing – we need an ideal world to envision to work towards so only ideal theory can guide action b] Relativity Problem – We can’t assign universal obligation since non-ideal theory commits us to understanding individual circumstances which is radically different for each person

#### 3] Consistent action through egalitarian recognition of humanity solves oppression – viewing others through equal personhood along with adoption of principles of universality are key to mutual recognition.

**Mills 18** Charles W. Mills. “Black Radical Kantianism.” Res Philosophica, Vol. 95, No. 1, January 2018, pp. 1–33 https:// doi.org/ 10.11612/ resphil.1622 SJCP//JG

So the common theme is the demand for equal recognition, equal dignity, equal respect, equal personhood, in a white-supremacist world where disrespect rather than respect is the norm, the default mode, for blacks. A racesensitive Kantianism not merely purged of Kant’s own racism but attuned (in a way nominally color-blind Kantianism is not) to these racially demarcated particularities for the different sub-sections of the human population— a black radical Kantianism—will thus understand the need to “universalize” the categorical imperative in a very different way to register the crucial differences between those socially recognized as persons and those socially recognized as sub-persons. I suggest that we divide the different moral relations involved into two categories based on whether one is a member of the privileged race, the R1s, or the subordinated race, the R2s. That gives us the following six-way breakdown: (1) one’s duty as an R1 to give respect to oneself, (2) one’s duty as an R1 to give respect to one’s fellow-R1s, (3) one’s duty as an R1 to give respect to R2s, (4) one’s duty as an R2 to give respect to oneself, (5) one’s duty as an R2 to give respect to one’s fellow-R2s, and (6) one’s duty as an R2 to give respect to R1s. Historically, each of these will have been affected by race (as racism), leaving an ideological and psychological legacy, habits of disrespect, that will shape the “inclinations” most likely to be determinative and most imperatively to be resisted. Instead of (what could be graphically thought of as) “horizontal” relations of reciprocal and symmetrical race-indifferent respect among equal raceless persons, the R1s will have historically respected themselves and each other as R1s, while “vertically” looking down on, disrespecting, R2s as inferiors. In turn, the R2s will have been required to show racial deference to the R1s, looking up to them as R2s, and—having most probably internalized their lower ontological status—will have been prone to regard both themselves and their fellows with racial contempt.

#### 4] Freedom implies an innate right to determine the course of your actions. In the state of nature, power controls this. Absent of a public authority, rights violations are inevitable. Thus we need an omni-lateral will.

Varden 10“A Kantian Conception of Free Speech” by Helga Varden Chapter from: “Freedom of Expression in a Diverse World” edited by Deirdre Golash 2010

“The first important distinction between Kant and much contemporary liberal thought issues from Kant’s argument that it is not in principle possible for individuals to realize right in the state of nature. Kant explicitly rejects the common assumption in liberal theories of his time as well as today that virtuous private individuals can interact in ways reconcilable both with one another’s right to freedom and their corresponding innate and acquired private rights. All the details of this argument are beyond the scope of this paper. It suffices to say that ideal **problems of assurance and indeterminacy** regarding the specification, application and enforcement of the principles of private right to actual interactions **lead Kant to conclude that rightful interaction is** in principle **impossible in the state of nature**.5 **Kant argues that** only a public authority can solve these problems in a way reconcilable with everyone’s right to freedom. This is why we find Kant starting his discussion of public right with this claim: however well disposed and right-loving men might be, **it** still **lies a priori** in the rational idea of such a condition (one that is not rightful) **that before a public law**ful condition **is established individual[s]** human beings... **can never be secure against violence from one another, since each has her own right to do what seems right and good to her and not be dependent upon another’s opinion** about this (6: 312).6 There are no rightful obligations **in the state of nature**, since in this condition **might** (‘violence’, or arbitrary judgments and ‘opinion’ about ‘what seems right and good’) **rather than right** (freedom under law) **ultimately governs interactions.** According to Kant, therefore, **only** the establishment of **a public authority can enable interaction in ways reconcilable with each person’s innate right to freedom**. Moreover, only a public authority can ensure interaction consistent with what Kant argues are our innate rights (to bodily integrity and honor) and our acquired rights (to private prop- erty, contract and status relations). The reason is that only the public authority can solve the problems of assurance and indeterminacy without violating anyone’s right to freedom. The public authority can solve these problems **because it** represents the will of all and yet the will of no one in particular. Because the public authority is representative in this way – by being “united a priori ” or by being an “omnilateral” will (6: 263) – it can **regulate[s] on behalf of everyone rather than on behalf of anyone in particular.** For these reasons, civil society is seen as the only means through which our interactions can become subject to universal laws that restrict everyone’s freedom reciprocally rather than as subject to anyone’s arbitrary choices.” (46-47)

#### Negate –

#### 1] not defending the topic is non-universalizable b/c if nobody defended the topic than a topic wouldn’t have even been created in the first place which is a contradiction.

#### 2] The aff has a deontological obligation to be topical.

**Nebel 15** Jake Nebel,"The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel," Briefly, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/>

A second strategy denies that such pragmatic benefits are relevant. This strategy is more deontological. One version of this strategy appeals to the importance of consent or agreement. Suppose that you give your opponents prior notice that you’ll be affirming the September/October 2012 resolution instead of the current one. There is a sense in which your affirmation of that resolution is now predictable: your opponents know, or are in a position to know, what you will be defending. And suppose that the older resolution is conducive to better (i.e., more fair and more educational) debate. Still, it’s unfair of you to expect your opponents to follow suit. Why? Because they didn’t agree to debate that topic. They registered for a tournament whose invitation specified the current resolution, not the Sept/Oct 2012 resolution or a free-for-all. The “social contract” argument for topicality holds that accepting a tournament invitation constitutes implicit consent to debate the specified topic. This claim might be contested, depending on what constitutes implicit consent. What is less contestable is this: given that *some* proposition must be debated in each round and that the tournament has specified a resolution, no one can reasonably reject a principle that requires everyone to debate the announced resolution as worded. This appeals to Scanlon’s contractualism. Someone who wishes to debate only the announced resolution has a strong claim against changing the topic, and no one has a stronger claim against debating the announced resolution (ignoring, for now, some possible exceptions to be discussed in the next subsection). So it is unfair to expect your opponent to debate anything other than the announced resolution. This unfairness is a constraint on the pursuit of education or other goods: it wrongs and is unjustifiable to your opponent.

#### 3] The ban is intervention in the market – restricting the free economic choices of individuals i.e. to set and pursue the end of exchanging goods.

**Wolfe 19** Frank Wolfe, December 2, 2019, “Companies Developing Lethal Autonomous Weapons, As Groups Seek Ban, Report Says” <https://www.aviationtoday.com/2019/12/02/companies-developing-lethal-autonomous-weapons-as-groups-seek-ban-report-says/> //LHP AV

**Dozens of defense companies** are **develop**ing lethal autonomous weapons (**LAWS**), as humanitarian groups seek to build international support for a treaty to ban them, according to a recent report. LAWS, so-called "killer robots," would rely on artificial intelligence (AI) to remove the human from targeting decisions, but how close such systems are to mature development and deployment readiness is a matter of debate in technology circles. "As part of an imminent arms race to develop increasingly autonomous weapons, **states rely on and involve arms producing companies in those efforts**," according to Slippery Slope: The Arms Industry and Increasingly Autonomous Weapons by the Dutch non-governmental organization, PAX for Peace. "While digital technology, especially artificial intelligence, can be beneficial in many ways, countless AI and robotics experts have warned that the technology must not be used to develop lethal autonomous weapons. The research however shows the clear proliferation of increasingly autonomous weapon systems. Not only is there a growing number of companies in a growing number of countries developing such weapons, these technologies are also applied to an ever-expanding range of military systems, in the air, on the ground and at sea."

### 1NC- Procedural (Short)

#### We are in the midst of a race war and [Insert Team] has refused to definitively align themselves with militant revolution on the NDCA LD Wiki

#### Hesitation in the Race War is a voting issue:

#### (1) Survival Planning – debate is not a safe space proven by debaters calling the cops on black students playing music and labeling native debaters cheaters for publishing their scholarship in journals to read in debates. [X school] must be clear on where they stand on the race war so colored debaters can navigate hostile spaces – remedies violence- that outweighs since every other impact assumes the ability to access the debate space. Pre-round side disclosure is key to planning out survival tactics and circumventing racial violence by mapping coalitions and enemies.

#### (2) Wolves in Sheep’s Clothing – White Being supervises Reconstructionist politics sustaining supremacist institutions while repackaging liberal politics as change. Think of affirmative action policies that layers bodies in institutions while continuing to sustain those very structures that recreate violence. Pre-round specification is key to cross-checking their specification with their content to fight back against supremacies implantation in resistance. Anything else allows for in round flip-flops and lying that allow them to sustain supremacist structures while not being held accountable for violence in the race war.