**Permissibility Negates:**

**1. The resolution says justice *requires* open borders, it doesn’t make sense to say you’re required to do something you have no obligation to do.**

**2. Absent permissibility, the negative burden is ridiculous. I.e. If I can’t just win that immigration restrictions are justified but have to win they are *proactively obligated* that kills core neg ground.**

**Every person has an innate right to independence.**

**Ripstein** , Arthur. *Force and Freedom*. E-book ed., London, England, Harvard UP, 20**09**. [Bracketed for Gendered Language] ICWNW

Your sovereignty, which Kant also characterizes as **your quality of being your “own master** (sui juris),” **has as its starting point your right to your own person,** which Kant characterizes as innate. As innate, this right contrasts with any further acquired rights you might have, because innate right does not require any affirmative act to establish it; **as a right, it is a constraint on the conduct of others, rather than a way of protecting some nonrelational aspect of you. It is a precondition of any acquired rights because those capable of acquiring them through their actions already have the moral capacity to act in ways that have consequences for rights, that is, for the conduct of others.** That any system of rights presupposes some basic moral capacities that do not depend on antecedent acts on the part of the person exercising them does not yet say what the rights in question are, or how many such rights there might be. Kant writes that there is “only one innate right.” Freedom (independence from being constrained by another’s choice), insofar as it can coexist with the freedom of every other in accordance with a universal law, is the only original right belonging to every human being by virtue of his humanity.10 The innate right is the individualization of the Universal Principle of Right, applied to the case in which only persons are considered. The Universal Principle of Right demands that each person exercise his or her choice in ways that are consistent with the freedom of all others to exercise their choice; the innate right to freedom is then each person’s entitlement to exercise his or her freedom, restricted only by the rights of all others to do the same under universal law. No issues of right would arise for someone who succeeded in “shunning all society,”11 and if there were only one person in the world, no issues of independence or rightful obligation would arise.12 Kant offers different formulations of innate right, each of which elaborates an aspect of the idea that **one person must not be subject to the choice**13 **of another,** which Kant glosses in terms of one person being a mere means for another. This familiar Kantian theme is explained in terms of the classic distinction, from Roman law, between persons and things. **A person is a being capable of setting its own purposes. A thing is something that can be used in the pursuit of whatever purposes the person who has it might have. The classic example of a person being treated as a mere thing is the slave, for a slave is entirely at the disposal of his or her master.** The slave’s problem is that he is subject to the master’s choice: the master gets to decide what to do with the slave and what the slave will do. **The slave does not set his own ends, but is merely a means for ends set by someone else.** To call it “the” problem is not too strong: if the other problems a slave has—low welfare, limited options, and so on—were addressed by a benevolent master, the relationship of slavery would perhaps be less bad, but it would not thereby be any less wrong. **The right to be your own master is neither a right to have things go well for you nor a right to have a wide range of options. Instead, it is explicitly contrastive and interpersonal: to be your own master is to have no other master.** It is not a claim about your relation to yourself, only about your relation to others. The right to equal freedom, then, is just the right that no person be the master of another. The idea of being your own master is also equivalent to an idea of equality, since none has, simply by birth, either the right to command others or the duty to obey them. So the right to equality does not, on its own, require that people be treated in the same way in some respect, such as welfare or resources, but only that no person is the master of another. **Another person is not entitled to decide for you even if [t]he[y] know**s **better than you what would make your life go well, or has a pressing need that only you can satisfy.** The same right to be your own master within a system of equal freedom also generates what Kant calls an “internal duty” of rightful honor, which “consists in asserting one’s worth as a human being in relation to others, a duty expressed by the saying do not make yourself into a mere means for others but be at the same time an end for them.”14 Kant says that this duty can be “explained . . . as obligation from the right of humanity in our own person.”

**The state has a unique obligation and is key to making sure rights exist which gives them the authority to take certain coercive actions.**

**Ripstein 2**, Arthur. *Force and Freedom*. E-book ed., London, England, Harvard UP, 2009.  ICWNW

Kant characterizes the state of nature as a system of private rights without public right. The apparatus of private rights applies to transactions in it, but subject to three defects that make that application merely provisional. Each of the defects reflects difficulties of unilateral action. **Objects of choice cannot be acquired without a public authorization of acquisition; private rights cannot be enforced without a public mechanism through which enforcement is authorized by public law; private rights are indeterminate in their application to particulars without a publicly authorized arbiter.** Even **the innate right of humanity is insecure in such a condition, both because no remedy is possible in case of a completed wrong against a person, and because even the protective right to defend your person against ongoing attack is indeterminate in its application. These problems can only be solved by a form of association capable of making law on behalf of everyone, and authorizing both enforcement and adjudication under law.**

**Thus, the standard is consistency with a system of equal and reciprocal freedom.**

**Impact Calc:**

**Everyone is entitled to an innate right to not be dependent on the will of others and it is the government's job to enforce that. The government can authorize things like property because they are an omnilateral will, meaning they represent everyone.**

**Contention 1)**

**Borders that restrict migration aren’t inconsistent with the innate right as long as you have somewhere else to live.**

**Ripstein 3**, Arthur. *Force and Freedom*. E-book ed., London, England, Harvard UP, 2009. ICWNW

**Restrictions on your right to reside in another state do not compromise your cosmopolitan right, because they limit only your ability to achieve what you wish, rather than your ability to use what you have to set and pursue your own purposes. Kant’s equation of need with mere wish explains why the fact that some countries are much wealthier than others does not, without more, constitute a wrong against the residents or citizens of the poorer countries.**46 Although citizenship is a hereditary status, it is not objectionable, so long as every human being is a citizen of some country. **The cosmopolitan analogue of the duty to support the poor is not world citizenship, but the division of the world into states in a way that guarantees that each person has a home state to return to.** The right to refuse visitors or attach terms to their visits has one internal limit: a state can only turn a foreigner away if it can do so “without destroying him.” In ordinary circumstances, **to be refused entry to a country is simply to need to return to some other country, however difficult your existence there might be. The state, through its officials, can decide whether to admit you. Whatever decision they make is fully consistent with right, provided only that it is open to you to return to your home state.** Your home state is the place on the Earth’s surface where you can be in a rightful condition with others. It is also the place where you can demand as a matter of right to have some space that you do no wrong by occupying, and to the support of your fellow citizens if you cannot provide for yourself. **If your own state will not take you back, because it has stripped you of your citizenship, or you cannot safely return because its rulers are making war on their own people in some other way, the right of any other state to exclude you runs up against its own internal limit. Your ability to do anything at all—to use your own bodily powers or whatever personal property you have with you—is entirely subject to the choice of the officials of the state you seek to enter.** As a foreigner, you do not need to share a general will with the officials, or with the legislature that sets their mandate, but any power they exercise over you must finally be consistent with your innate right of humanity in your own person, which includes the right to “disjunctive” possession of the Earth’s surface, the right to be wherever nature or chance has placed you. **Just as property in land is consistent with this innate right provided that it does not give another person the right to decide whether you may occupy space, so, too, the establishment of national borders is consistent with your innate right provided that you have someplace else to go.**47 Only if you have nowhere else to go does the state’s right to restrict your entry make you subject to the choice of another. So the officials have to let you stay, simply in your capacity as a citizen of the world. Once you are in, you are subject to their laws, and so to the preconditions of lawmaking powers, even to the point of being provided for if you are unable to provide for yourself, and being entitled to become an active citizen rather than merely a passive resident.48

**This impacts back to my framework because states aren’t required to open their borders because they have no obligation to and they have the jurisdiction to control their borders.**

**Contention 2) States have control over their internal affairs, e.g. why Sweden can’t just start creating speed limits in Norway.  Open borders interfere with this political self determination.**

**Cole**, Phillip, and Christopher Heath Wellman. Debating the Ethics of Immigration: Is There a Right to Exclude? (Debating Ethics). 20**11**. Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews, ndpr.nd.edu/reviews/debating-the-ethics-of-immigration-is-there-a-right-to-exclude/. Accessed 2 Mar. 2023.

To recapitulate the highlights of what has been a relatively long discussion: Invoking **individual human rights will not enable one to explain why it is in principle wrong for an external body such as Sweden or the EU to forcibly annex a legitimate state like Norway; an adequate explanation requires affirming that corporate political entities such as Norway are entitled to freedom of association.** But **if legitimate political regimes enjoy a sphere of self-determination that allows them to refuse relations with foreign countries and international organizations, it seems only natural to conclude that they are similarly entitled to reject associating with individual for-eigners.** Thus, any regime that satisfactorily protects and respects human rights is entitled to unilaterally design and enforce its own immigration policy. In sum, **just as an individual has the right to determine whom (if anyone) he or she would like to marry, a group of fellow-citizens has a right to determine whom (if anyone) it would like to invite into its political community.** And **just as an individual’s freedom of association entitles him or her to remain single, a corporate political entity’s freedom of association entitles it to exclude all foreigners.**

**Two impacts**

**a) Violations of a state's self determination is a violation of their rights i.e. to not be dependent on the will of other states and b) it interferes with the omnilateral will because self determination is key to rights enforcement. I.e. the U.S. can’t be a functioning omnilateral will of Canada just enforces their own laws in the U.S.**