# 1AR – AT: Kant Turns

## --- 1AR – AT: Strake Turns

### AT – Forced Choices (Richman)

#### [A] No forced choices – it’s hindering a hindrance. That’s why laws banning slavery aren’t violating freedom because they maximize external freedom

#### [B] People don’t have a right to a specific piece or quantity just the ability to own things in general – changing property systems to accommodate isn’t immoral if it rectifies something not universalizable

#### [C] Your property rights affect other people since they conceded property rights are a relation between people – e.g. if I burn down a forest I own that will disrupt the biodiversity in your land which hinders your freedom

#### [D] A healthy environment is a prereq to property rights – that was the extension

### AT – Right to Exclusion (Loick)

#### [A] C/A the responses to the Richman card

#### [B] Government action isn’t interventionist – according to Kant’s system of property it’s the government that determines how property is valid in the first place so they can also change plans when the squo violates rights

#### [C] The “civil constitution” the card talks about means that you have to respect the property of others, but when you damage the environment, it causes spillover effects to other people’s land too which disrespects them

## --- 1AR – AT: Cho Turns

### [1] AT – Priorities Incoherent

#### Priorities are coherent – under Kant you can weigh by the strength of duty i.e. perfect or imperfect – e.g. if the res was I should prioritize keeping my promise over watching Netflix it’s clear that one option is true

### [2] AT – Legislative Ruler

#### [A] Our framework is contextual to Kant’s moral philosophy so this card doesn’t apply especially since it states that Kant believed God aligned with a priori moral principles so God’s will is the aff

#### [B] No other source of morality – if God determines what is good then morality is arbitrary but if God doesn’t determine what is morality that means God doesn’t guide actions and we use the framework

### [3] AT – Partnerships and Promise Breaking

#### [A] Hindering a hindrance – promises aren’t legitimate if they violate someone’s rights e.g. I can’t promise to kill you

#### [B] Their evidence does not say China promised anything just that they have done actions or that econ growth comes first. Promises go aff.

Whitling 10-17 Kate Whitling, 10-17-2022, "China's pollution pledge and other environment stories you need to read this week," <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/10/environment-stories-news-climate-change-17-october/> /SJJK

President Xi Jinping on 16 October said [China will give priority to environmental protection and promoting green lifestyles](https://www.reuters.com/world/china/xi-vows-prioritise-environment-protect-nature-promote-green-lifestyles-2022-10-16/), and that the conservation of nature was an essential part of building a modern socialist country. In a speech opening the twice-a-decade ruling Communist Party Congress, Xi said China had made progress in tackling environmental problems over the last 10 years and vowed to 'basically eliminate' heavy air and water pollution while bringing soil contamination under control.

### [4] AT – Society Growth

#### [A] No reason why society growth is good – they don’t have a warrant

#### [B] Economic growth is bad when it trades off with the aff since environmental protection is a perfect duty

### [5] AT – Act-Omission Distinction

#### [A] We haven’t justified act-omission distinction and neither have you – no new 2NR warrants since they’re new answers

#### [B] Property is a positive law – that was 1AC Breitenbach. The government also has a social contract to proactively take actions to ensure the freedom of its people

### [6] AT – Undemocratic

#### AC offense proves it’s hindering a hindrance

### [7] AT – Right to Business

#### [A] C/A hindering a hindrance – our offense is a priori question

#### [B] People don’t have a right to a specific piece or quantity just the ability to own things in general – changing property systems to accommodate isn’t immoral if it rectifies something not universalizable

#### [C] Your property rights affect other people since they conceded property rights are a relation between people – e.g. if I burn down a forest I own that will disrupt the biodiversity in your land which hinders your freedom

#### [D] A healthy environment is a prereq to property rights – that was the extension

### [8] AT – Uncertainty

#### We’re not consequentialist – it’s about the intent to destroy the environment not necessarily the consequences that follow

### [9] AT – Promise Breaking

#### This was answered with partnerships
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