# 1NC Palm Classic Dubs vs. Harker AS

## Offs

### NC

#### Permissibility negates – should in the plan implies an obligation but permissibility is a lack of obligation which means the neg met their burden of disproving the aff.

#### Presumption negates – a] statements are more often false than true – a pen can be red in only one way but it can be not red in an infinite amount of wayys b] contradictions – would justify saying both p and not p if you knew nothing about p

#### Only constructing ethics from our rational agency can explain the sources of normativity –

#### A] Bindingness – Any obligation must not only tell us what is good, but why we ought to be good or else agents can reject the value of goodness itself. That means ethics must start with what is constitutive of agents since it traces obligations to features that are intrinsic to being an agent – as an agent you must follow certain rules. Only practical agency is constitutive since agents can use rationality to decide against other values but the act of deciding to reject practical agency engages in it.

#### B] Action theory – every moral analysis requires an action to evaluate, but actions are infinitely divisible into smaller meaningless movements. The act of stealing can be reduced to going to a house, entering, grabbing things, and leaving, all of which are distinct actions without moral value. Only the practical decision to steal ties these actions together to give them any moral value.

#### That justifies universalizability.

#### A] The principle of equality is true since anything else assigns moral value to contingent factors like identity and justifies racism, and the principle of non-contradiction is true since 2+2 can’t equal 4 for me and not for you meaning ethical statements true for one must be true for all.

#### B] Ethics must be defined a priori because of the is ought gap – experience only tells us what is since that’s what we perceive, not what ought to be. But it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises, so there needs to be additional a priori premises to make a moral theory. Applying reason to a priori truth results in universal obligations.

#### Coercion isn’t universalizable—willing your own freedom while violating someone else’s is a conceptual contradiction.

#### Prefer –

#### A] performativity – argumentation requires the assumption that freedom is good – else agents would be unable to make arguments

#### B] prerequisite – condoning any action requires condoning the freedom required to take that action – so my theory’s a prerequisite to theirs and my offense acts as a side-constraint to your framework.

#### C] culpability – absent a conception of free will, people can just claim they were acting of desires they can’t control.

#### The universality of freedom justifies a libertarian state. Otteson 09

Otteson 09 brackets in original James R. Otteson (professor of philosophy and economics at Yeshiva University) “Kantian Individualism and Political Libertarianism” The Independent Review, v. 13, n. 3, Winter 2009

In a crucial passage in Metaphysics of Morals, Kant writes that the “Universal Principle of Right” is “‘[e]very action which by itself or by its maxim enables the freedom of each individual’s will to co-exist with the freedom of everyone else in accordance with a universal law is right.’” He concludes, “Thus the universal law of right is as follows: **let your external actions be such that the free application of your will can co-exist with the freedom of everyone in accordance with a universal law**” (1991, 133, emphasis in original).5 **This** stipulation **becomes** for Kant **the grounding justification for the existence of a state**, its raison d’être, and the reason we leave the state of nature is to secure this sphere of maximum freedom compatible with the same freedom of all others. Because this freedom must be complete, in the sense of being as full as possible given the existence of other persons who demand similar freedom, it entails that **the state may**—indeed, must—**secure this condition** of freedom, **but undertake to do nothing else because any other** state **activities** would **compromise** **the** very **autonomy the state seeks to defend**. **Kant’s position** thus outlines and implies a political philosophy that **is broadly libertarian**; that is, **it endorses a state constructed with the sole aim of protecting** its citizens **against invasions of** their **liberty**. For Kant, individuals create a state to protect their moral agency, and in doing so they consent to coercion only insofar as it is required to prevent themselves or others from impinging on their own or others’ agency. In his argument, **individuals cannot rationally consent to a state that instructs them in morals, coerces virtuous behavior, commands them to trade or not, directs their pursuit of happiness, or forcibly requires them to provide for** their own or **others**’ pursuits of happiness. And except in cases of punishment for wrongdoing,6 **this** severe limitation on the scope of the state’s authority **must always be respected**: “The rights of man must be held sacred, however great a sacrifice the ruling power may have to make. There can be no half measures here; it is no use devising hybrid solutions such as a pragmatically conditioned right halfway between right and utility. For all politics must bend the knee before right, although politics may hope in return to arrive, however slowly, at a stage of lasting brilliance” (Perpetual Peace, 1991, 125). The implication is that **a Kantian state protects** against invasions of **freedom and does nothing else**; in the absence of invasions or threats of invasions, it is inactive.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with a libertarian state.

#### Prefer the standard –

#### 1] Aggregation fails – there is no one for whom aggregate good is good-for. Korsgaard:

Christine Korsgaard, “The Origin of the Good and Our Animal Nature” Harvard, n.d. RE

According to the second view I will consider, hedonism, the good just is pleasurable experience or consciousness and the absence of painful experience or consciousness. What makes a being capable of having a final good is simply that the being is conscious. Otherwise, its good is not relative to its nature. As is often noticed, on this theory it is a real question whether some of the other animals might not have a better life, or at least be capable of having a better life, than human beings, given their apparent enthusiasm for simple and readily available joys. Although I’ll treat it as a separate theory, hedonism, I believe, has an inherent tendency to collapse either into a version of the intrinsic value theory, or into a version of the third view I am about to describe. Obviously, it is possible to regard hedonism simply as a particular instance of the intrinsic value theory, one that singles out conscious experience as the only possible bearer of intrinsic value. But I think this way of looking at hedonism does not do justice to the intuition that has made hedonism seem plausible to so many thinkers, which is precisely the idea that the final good must have an irreducibly subjective or relational element. That is, what makes hedonism seem plausible is precisely the idea that the final good for a sensate being must be something that can be felt or experienced as a good by that being. It is something that can be perceived or experienced as welcome or positive from the being’s own point of view, and that is therefore relative to the being’s own point of view.9 The intrinsic value version of hedonism tries to capture the essentially subjective element of the final good by attaching objective intrinsic value to a subjective experience, but when this move is made the essentially relational or relative character of subjectivity tends to drop out. The goodness of the experience is detached from its goodness for the being who is having the experience, and instead is located in the character of the experience itself. This defect shows up most clearly in utilitarian versions of hedonism, which allow us to add the goodness of pleasant experiences across the boundaries between persons or between animals. There is no subject for whom the total of these aggregated experiences is a good, so the aggregate good has completely lost that relational character: the goods are detached from the beings from whom they are good. This relational element of value, I believe, is better captured by the third theory I am about to describe.

#### 2] Agency requires deliberation to choose what actions to take which creates a practical identity identical for every agent. It is the only form of ontology that can account for every individual, making it the only identity that can create obligations. Since obligations arise from a universal identity, they must be the same for all.

Christine M. Korsgaard, 1992

“The Sources of Normativity.” The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Cambridge University.

The Solution: Those who think that the human mind is internally luminous and transparent to itself think that the term “self-consciousness” is appropriate because what we get in human consciousness is a direct encounter with the self. Those who think that the human mind has a reflective structure use the term too, but for a different reason. The reflective structure of the mind is a source of “self-consciousness” because it forces us to have a conception of ourselves. As Kant argues, this is a fact about what it is like to be reflectively conscious and it does not prove the existence of a metaphysical self. From a third person point of view, outside of the deliberative standpoint, it may look as if what happens when someone makes a choice is that the strongest of his conflicting desires wins. But that isn’t the way it is for you when you deliberate. When you deliberate, it is as if there were something over and above all of your desires, something that is you, and that chooses which desire to act on. This means that the principle or law by which you determine your actions is one that you regard as being expressive of yourself. To identify with such a principle or law is to be, in St. Paul’s famous phrase, a law to yourself.6 An agent might think of herself as a Citizen in the Kingdom of Ends. Or she might think of herself as a member of a family or an ethnic group or a nation. She might think of herself as the steward of her own interests, and then she will be an egoist. Or she might think of herself as the slave of her passions, and then she will be a wanton. And how she thinks of herself will determine whether it is the law of the Kingdom of Ends, or the law of some smaller group, or the law of the egoist, or the law of the wanton that is the law that she is to herself. The conception of one’s identity in question here is not a theoretical one, a view about what as a matter of inescapable scientific fact you are. It is better understood as a description under which you value yourself, a description under which you find your life to be worth living and your actions to be worth undertaking. So I will call this a conception of your practical identity. Practical identity is a complex matter and for the average person there will be a jumble of such conceptions. You are a human being, a woman or a man, an adherent of a certain religion, a member of an ethnic group, someone’s friend, and so on. And all of these identities give rise to reasons and obligations. Your reasons express your identity, your nature; your obligations spring from what that identity forbids.

#### 3] Coherence – anything else is either repugnant or infinitely regressive, Boaz 15 bracketed for glang:

David Boaz, executive vice president of the Cato Institute, “The Libertarian Mind: A Manifesto for Freedom”, 2/10/15, <https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Libertarian_Mind.html?id=zs8NBAAAQBAJ>. //LHP AV \*Bracketed for gendered language\*

Any theory of rights has to begin somewhere. Most libertarian philosophers would begin the argument earlier than Jefferson did. **Humans**, unlike animals, come into the world without an instinctive knowledge of what their needs are and how to fulfill them. As Aristotle said, man is a reasoning and deliberating animal; humans use the power of reason to understand their own needs, the world around them, and how to use the world to satisfy their needs. So they **need a social system that allows them to** use their **reason,** to **act** in the world, and to **cooperate with others** to achieve purposes that no one individual could accomplish. Every person is a unique individual. Humans are social animals—we like interacting with others, and we profit from it— **but** **we** think and **act individually**. **Each** individual **owns himself or herself [themselves]**. **What other possibilities** besides self—ownership **are there?**  • **Someone** – a king or a master race – **could own others.** Plato and Aristotle did argue that there were different kinds of humans, some more competent than others and thus endowed with the right and responsibility to rule, just as adults guide children. Some forms of socialism and collectivism are—explicitly or implicitly—-based on the notion that many people are not competent to make decisions about their own lives, so that the more  talented should make decisions for them. **But** that would mean **there were no universal** human **rights,** only rights **that** some haveand others do not**, denying the** essential **humanity of those who are** deemed to be **owned**.  • **Everyone owns everyone**, a fully-fledged communist system. **In such** a system, **before any**one **could** take an **act**ion**, [t]he[y] would need to get permission from everyone** else. **But how could each** other person **grant permission without consulting everyone else**? **You’d have an infinite regress, making any action** at all logically **impossible**. ln practice, since such mutual ownership is impossible, this system would break down into the previous one: some- one, or some group, would own everyone else. That is what happened in the communist states: the party became a dictatorial ruling elite.  Thus, either communism or aristocratic rule would divide the world into factions or classe. **The only possibility** that is humane, logical, and suited to the nature of human beings **is self-ownership**. Obviously, this discussion has only scratched the surface of the question of self-ownership; in any event, I rather like Jefferson’s simple declaration: Natural rights are self-evident.

#### Negate –

#### 1] Injustice requires someone wronged, but initial acquisition doesn’t violate any entity’s rights– therefore, private appropriation of outer space cannot be unjust, Feser 05:

Edward Feser, [Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College] “THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION,” 2005 //LHP AV

The reason **there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition** of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of **justice**, that is to say, simply **does not apply** to initial acquisition. **It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place**. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that **external resources are initially unowned**. Consider the following example. **Suppose** **an individual** **A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R**. **For it to be** the case that A commits an **injustice** in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that **there is some individual** **B** (or perhaps a group of individuals) **against whom A commits the injustice**. **But for B to have been wronged** by A’s acquisi- tion of R, **B would have to have had a rightful claim over R,** **a right to R**. By hypothesis, **however**, **B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all**. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, **the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R**. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. **The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer**. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

#### 2] Submitting to international limits on power is a contradiction in will – it weakens the republic and has no binding force.

Waltz ’62 (Waltz, Kenneth N. "Kant, Liberalism, and War." The American Political Science Review 56, no. 2 (1962): 331-40. doi:10.2307/1952369.)

So long at least as the state "runs a danger of being suddenly swallowed up by other States," it must be powerful externally as well as internally. In international relations the difficulties multiply. The republican form is preferable, partly because republics are more peacefully inclined; but despotisms are stronger-and no one would expect or wish to bring the state into jeopardy by decreasing its strength.15 Standing armies are dangerous, arms races themselves being a cause of war, but in the absence of an outside agency affording protection, each state must look to the effectiveness of its army.'6 A freely flowing commerce is a means of promoting peace, but a state must control imports, in the interests of its subjects "and not for the advantage of strangers and the encouragement of the industry of others, because the State without the prosperity of the people would not possess sufficient power to resist external enemies or to maintain itself as a common- wealth."'7 Not only standing armies but also, indeed more so, the disparity of economic capacities may represent danger, occasion fear, and give rise to war. Kant's concern with the strength and thus the safety of the state is part of his perception of the necessities of power politics. Among states in the world, as among individuals in the state of nature, there is constantly either violence or the threat of violence. States, like "lawless savages," are with each other "naturally in a nonjuridical condition.'8 There is no law above them; there is no judge among them; there is no legal process by which states can pursue their rights. They can do so only by war, and, as Kant points out, neither war nor the treaty of peace following it, can settle the question of right. A treaty of peace can end only a particular war; a pretext for new hostilities can always be found. "Nor can such a pretext under these circumstances be regarded as un- just; for in this state of society every nation is the judge of its own cause."'19 More surely than those who extract and emphasize merely Kant's republican aspirations and peaceful hopes, Khrushchev speaks as though he had read Kant correctly. "War," in Khrushchev's peculiar yet apt phrase, "is not fatalistically inevitable." Kant does set forth the "shoulds" and "oughts" of state behavior.2' He does not expect them to be followed in a state of nature, for, as he says, "philosophically or diplomatically composed codes have not, nor could have, the slightest legal force, since the States as such stand under no common legal constraint.... 22 His intention clearly is that the "oughts" be taken as the basis for the juridical order that must one day be established among states, just as the rights of the individual, though not viable in a state of nature, provided the basis for the civil state.

#### 3] Taxation is theft – the plan creates royalties on the profits, which is a form of stealing that is bad because it would nullify the notion of property that stealing presupposes if everyone stole.