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#### Link 1: The aff replicates anthropocentrism by discounting the onto-epistemological power of outer space to shape post-human relations

Ferrando 16 - Francesca Ferrando, Liberal Studies Program, New York University, in the Book “The Ethics of Space Exploration” pgs 147-149, edited by Schwartz and Milligan, published 2016 “Chapter 10: Why Space Migration Must Be Posthuman” [Space and Society, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-39827-3\_10] Accessed 12/1/21 SAO

It is now time to consider the impact of space encountering on human identity and existential insights, by delving into the specific change of perspective brought along by space traveling. This radical shift, known as the overview effect, consists of a series of epiphanies experienced by astronauts looking at the Earth from outer space. In his book The Overview Effect: Space exploration and human evolution (1998), Frank White relates such a shift in consciousness to that specific geographical perspective, stating: “Mental processes and views of life cannot be separated from physical location” (3). Humans are embodied beings; their materiality is a process supported and deeply affected by their surroundings. White further asserts this point by emphasizing the fact that the astronauts in Earth orbits and the lunar astronauts have different types of epiphanies: “The orbital astronaut sees the Earth as huge and himself or herself as less significant. The lunar astronaut sees the Earth as small and feels the awesome grandeur of the entire universe…Both programs change the astronaut’s perception of the Earth and of his or her own identity, but in quite different ways” (ibid., 36). To White, the overview effect is so significant, that he affirms: “It is possible to grasp the true implications of this evolutionary process only by seeing it from the viewpoint of the universe as a whole, and from that perspective, the Overview Effect may point to humankind’s purpose as a species” (ibid., 5). **The overview effect is of key** importance **to space ethics, allowing us to approach the topic of space migration not** only **from the** usual **utilitarian perspective, but** also **from an onto-epistemological standpoint:** resonating with Heidegger, **space physically becomes “a way of revealing**”. 10.5 Conclusions The affects and effects of space travel are life-changing, as Valentina Tereshkova remarks: “As soon as I begin staring into the starry ways in the sky, I physically realize how close they are. Those who have already been in space, yearn with all their hearts and souls to haste there again and again” (2015, 10). Tereshkova recently volunteered for a one-way trip to Mars, believing in a project which, even though not accomplished yet, may soon enough become actual. This chapter responds to the urgency for reflecting on the large-scale ethical implications, socio-political challenges and technological preconditions of space migration. In the first section of this chapter we have demonstrated that in the ancient world astronomical insights had a direct impact on social events, architectonical structures and religious beliefs: knowledge of space was crucial to the understanding of the Earth and to the development of human civilizations. In the second section we have underlined how, in the space race, humans lost their ontological primacy. While humanistic categories such as gender, race, nationality, among others, are still affecting the practices of going to space, the anthropocentric ontological primacy of the human has been challenged. On one side, non humans animals were launched first and have preceded humans in space. On the other side, robots are better suited to survive to outer space conditions.28 Thirdly, space migration brings to the bioethical debate on human enhancement new terrain of discussion by addressing, among other controversial issues, the search for alien life and the possibility of creating hybrids and chimeras between human animals and non-human animals, who may be better fitted to live on planets other than Earth, with all the bioethical concerns that crossing such species boundaries may raise. In the third section we have highlighted how outer space cannot be thought separate from Earth: space technology is already causing space debris, an environmental hazard both for spacecrafts as well as for life on Earth. Space pragmatics should be revised by developing sustainable space technology in order to comply with the theoretical premises based on the “Outer Space Treaty” (1967), expanding the beneficial vision of space exploration and space migration, from humans and Earth, to non-human beings and non-human agents, including other planets, stars, natural satellites and asteroids, approaching outer space under specific environmental regulations. Space exploration and interstellar traveling are setting the conditions for a socio-cultural, bio-technological and geo-political evolution, which is radically challenging the notion of the human, of the cosmos and of life itself. From an onto-epistemological perspective, the narratives of outer space are feeding a posthuman paradigm shift by decentering the Earth from the center of the known universe, and placing hypothetical human and non-human beings on other celestial bodies; furthermore, space migration and the adaptation to extraterrestrial conditions may eventually bring along the evolution of posthumanities. Outer space represents a literal and physical place beyond anthropocentrism, Earth-centrism, biocentrism and life-centrism, although these discriminatory categories are reappearing in human activities and pragmatics in space: this is why space is crucial to Posthumanism as much as Posthumanism is necessary to space. Outer space can finally be seen as the becoming29 of the human, not only linguistically (as a “posthumus”, the etymological root of the term “human”), but also ontologically. Outer space has historically performed and continues to manifest as a way of revealing in the processual constitution of human and posthuman identities. Through a comprehensive analysis of past, present and future legacies, this chapter stresses the importance of adopting a posthumanist approach in space migration, in order to manifest, instead of old habits and new wars, desirable futures for humans and non-humans alike.

#### Link 2: The question posed by the resolution presents the unknown of space as a form of separated otherness to be eradicated though mediated debate. This project is impossible.

Ferrando 16 - Francesca Ferrando, Liberal Studies Program, New York University, in the Book “The Ethics of Space Exploration” pgs 139-141, edited by Schwartz and Milligan, published 2016 “Chapter 10: Why Space Migration Must Be Posthuman” [Space and Society, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-39827-3\_10] Accessed 12/1/21 SAO

Before accessing the topic of space migration, we shall start our reflection by asking the question: “should we go to space?”. A common answer given to this question is that humans should first take care of the problems characterizing planet Earth, before going somewhere else.4 The counter-argument to this point has been mostly utilitarian, that is: we will never go to space, if we wait until we resolve all the problems on Earth. Or, alternatively: we will resolve problems on Earth by going to space and finding new resources. Instead of an utilitarian view based on a linear progression of time, which has been criticized both from a scientific (Gould 1996) as well as from a philosophical perspective (especially, within the post-modern frame), we will approach this subject from an onto-epistemological standpoint inspired by Heidegger’s definition of technology (1953; Engl. Trad. 1977); space will be thus accessed as “a way of revealing” (ivi, 12), allowing for an original understanding of the notion of space. Let’s start with the problematics related to our initial question by asserting a basic and still informative point: we have always been in space. Humans have originated on planet Earth, which is part of a solar system located, among many others, in the Milky Way galaxy**. Asking if we should go to space,** more than looking for a real answer, **reflects the human-centric dualistic attitude of presenting the unknown as a form of separated otherness**. A more precise question could then be: “should humans migrate to outer space?”. The term “outer space” is defined by the Oxford Dictionary as “the region of space beyond the earth’s atmosphere or beyond the solar system. In extended use: a place or region beyond the usual limits of awareness or accessibility” (2015). It can be seen as an extended and somehow confused framework, comprehensive of a wide variety of spaces, such as the solar system as well as the regions beyond the solar system. The notion of “outer space” implies the one of “inner space”, which would be the Earth and the earth’s atmosphere: these dualistic premises become disputable when realizing that outer space is crucial to the understanding of life on Earth and to the development of the notion of the human itself. From the origin of human civilizations to the contemporary world, the skies have played a crucial role in the **formation of human identity**. Astronomy5 is considered the oldest of natural sciences, dating back to the Upper Paleolithic (cf. Brady 2013); its relevance to many ancient cultures went so far as becoming focal part of their social identity and architectonical outfits.6 The large majorities of the temples across world civilizations were built in accordance with astronomical alignments: think, for instance, of the solstitial orientation of the sarsen monument at Stonehenge (Ruggles 2006) or the early Maya urban planning architectural complexes (Šprajc et al. 2009). The connection between knowledge of the skies and the sacred were deeply intertwined, and it is broadly believed that the astronomers of the ancient times were also the spiritual guides or priests of their communities (cf. Hayden and Villeneuve 2011). In Ancient Egypt, astronomical imagery was an essential part of their religious pantheon, with Ra, the Sun God and the raising sun as symbols of creation; his daughter, Goddess Maat, represented the Order of the Universe and was the wife of the Moon god Thoth. In the words of archaeoastronomer Giulio Magli: “…celestial matters were, for the ancient Egyptians, deeply and intimately connected with the most important things of all: preserving Maat, the cosmic order, on Earth. Such an order was anchored to the celestial cycles: the cycle of the sun, the calendar, the succession of the hours of the night, the reappearance of Sirius and of the other stars” (2013, 2). The star Sirius, sometimes called “the Dog star” due to its location in the constellation of Canis Major (Latin for the “Greater Dog”), still has a special meaning in the creational myth of the Dogon, an indigenous tribe of southeastern Mali in West Africa (Griaule 1965). The prehistory and early history of humanity do not treat space as otherness, but as an integral part of the human genealogy, providing knowledge of great relevance for social functioning and daily survival. Similarly, on a scientific level, **a strict division between the Earth and the heavens cannot be placed either**. Scientific hypotheses such as exogenesis and panspermia7 postulate that life did not originate on Earth, but formed somewhere else extraterrestrially.8 A consideration of Earth ejecta and the hypothesis of lithopanspermia, that is, the potential for organic molecules preserved in space as a consequence of “the collision of kilometre-scale bodies with Earth, comets or asteroids” (Reyes-Ruiz et al. 2012, 777), also plays an important role in the disruption of a strict division between Earth and outer space. With these premises, we can now go back to our question: “should humans go to outer space?”. Here we shall refresh another simple, yet important and multilayered piece of information: humans have already been in outer space in a series of successful launches achieved as the result of the space race between the Soviet Union and the US during the Fifties and Sixties of the twentieth century (cf. Cadbury 2005). The modalities of the space race will be analyzed in order to show how humans have lost in it their ontological primacy.

#### Impact: A Dualistic understanding of the material world freezes action which negates. Dualism is disproved by experimentally verified observational feedback loops. Emergent consciousness is a side constraint on action, obligation, and motivation.

Maldonado 18 - Carlos Eduardo Maldonado, Full Professor, School of Medicine, Universidad El Bosque, Bogotá – Colombia, 2018 “Quantum physics and consciousness: a (strong) defense of panpsychism” [http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&pid=S0101-31732018000500101] Accessed 4/23/21 SAO

**Observation both creates and modifies reality**. This is the famous problem of measurement in quantum physics. Such a problem was mathematically formalized as quantum mechanics. The trouble, though, is that along history, numerous interpretations of that mathematical formalism have arisen. Indeed, quantum mechanics allows for over fifteen different interpretations – many of them totally incongruent with the others (see, for instance, the Wikipedia entry on “interpretations of quantum theory”). The many interpretations of quantum mechanism are to be seen a sign of the importance and vitality of the core questions implicated therein. Due to reasons of space, I shall omit discussion of the panorama of the different interpretations. Not all concern themselves with the role of consciousness or conscious observation in quantum phenomena; however, they all are intrinsically pervaded by the role of consciousness and life vis-à-vis the economy of the universe, so to speak. The crux of the matter is conscious observation. Transcendence or **transcendentalism is** likely **the wrong way to explain quantum quandaries**, even though, as religion, it has been the dominant worldview in the history of the western world. Quantum physics hints at the opposite approach to the issue, namely **immanence**, i.e. the universe itself is mindful. We just do not encounter reality “out there”. This is exactly what makes of consciousness an epiphenomenon in the context of Physics. Instead, we have an experience of reality that is open-ended, unceasingly – that is exactly the story of evolution. We do experience reality in a manifold of ways, but all of those ways are still modes of experience. There is only experience, but experience may finally be the subjective side of what we have otherwise named quantum entanglement. Living beings really do not go out of themselves in order to experience nature and reality. On the contrary, they are **constantly experiencing an universe in the process of becoming**. The complexity of life and the world consists exactly in the fact that there are only open systems – namely open to matter, energy and information. Nature at large is not a realm external and different from living beings – that is, consciousness or life. Quite on the contrary, nature and the universe may be the ways in which living beings experience themselves, their history, their environment and habitat. The universe and reality are immanent unfolding realities to life and consciousness. Surprisingly, immanence has been a minor perspective in the history of science, philosophy and culture; it can be stated also as an alternative worldview. Table 2 presents some of the most important authors that have defended immanence. Table 2 presents the landmarks of immanence in the history of philosophy or science. However, some other names could be included. Notwithstanding, there is barely any mention in the literature about the relationship between quantum physics and immanence in the three authors considered in Table 2. It should be clear that the authors included in Table 2 never deal with quantum theory, either because of historical reasons or also because they are not concerned with the theory. It is my contention that immanence does take place in the corpus of quantum science via or thanks to or based on entanglement. An entangled state is an intertwining that is more than the parts entangled. Succinctly, it can be safely said that, at the end of the day, quantum physics consists of three intrinsically related layers: quantum mechanics, quantum waves, and entanglement. Entanglement can be understood as **the strongest argument against** mechanism and **determinism**, for it supersedes individuality. In the literature there is nearly no reference to the relationship between quantum physics and immanence, except for Thiele (2016), who is not rigorous in his understanding. Some floppy assessments are introduced here and there without any further justification. Indeed, the rationale for transcendence is the assumption of overcoming individuality. A singular entity exists to some extent on its own, but is entirely incomplete; so it seeks to transcend itself – to realize itself in a different stance. In other words, transcendence is a fulfillment of individuality onto a realm that is extrinsic to the existence of the entity considered. Bell’s inequality has shown that quantum entanglement does take place over large distances (ASPECT et al., 1982; YIN et al., 2017), and for more than between two entities. Quantum entanglement has been **experimentally proven** among three or four entities, originally by Fuchs (2003). Entanglement is an immanent relationship, i.e. an intrinsic, deeply interwoven interplay. Yet, an interpretation of entanglement as immanence has never been openly set out in the literature. Quantum science can be said to be a science of immanence, over against the entire history of science. Reality and consciousness are closely and deeply entangled stances, so they do not exist isolated. The measurement problem, or also the act of observation is grasped and explained differently once entanglement is incorporated in the corpus of science. This is probably the most fundamental achievement of quantum science (STAPP, 1993). In other words, **the universe cannot be explained in the absence of life**; moreover, the universe and life are deeply intertwined. To be sure, quantum entanglement is a much more robust relationship than, say, correlation. An immanent view of the world and reality means that consciousness cannot be merely an epiphenomenon and must have (serious) consequences in shaping the reality process. This claim is not to be taken as indicating consciousness creates reality. Instead, consciousness is in an entangled state with the physical universe, so much so that neither can be explained without the other. It is this relationship that gives meaning to any further phenomenon – the entangled relationship between subjective experience (i.e. consciousness) and the physical universe is life. Generally speaking, quantum entanglement brings out a networked view of reality and the universe in which there is no center no matter what, for what is truly relevant is the clustered relationship that acts as a map, as a graph or hyper-graph, and in which the entire web is much more meaningful than a single clear-cut part of the map or web. Properly speaking, the part highlighted is an abstraction and most probably a mistake vis-à-vis the global view gained or obtained. From this perspective, there are no hierarchies in the universe. The focus or emphasis on individual entities constitutes a serious hurdle for getting maps, networks or graphs. Individuality, moreover, entails centrality and hierarchy. In contrast, a quantum view of reality and the universe is an alternative to hierarchical comprehensions of reality, or also to individualized explanations of the world. Immanence can said to be the philosophy of quantum theory – when “philosophy” is taken in the broadest sense meaning logics or basis. Be that as it may be, the issue can be stated in different ways, as it has been, indeed, namely as the relationship between mind and matter, or between quantum physics and consciousness or also between mind and brain (or consciousness and brain) (SONG, 2018). In any case, entanglement allows for an intrinsically intertwined relation in which neither one extreme nor the other is fundamental or self-consistent. Matter, the universe, the brain, for instance, are subjects of experience, very much as the mind, consciousness or life are experiences themselves – hence they appear as having a rationale in one time, place or circumstance, and a different meaning and significance according to the way and depth of our experiences. Briefly said, quantum theory modifies radically the very conception and experience of matter, the world and the universe – as any other science, theory or philosophy has ever done. In other words, the universe experiences itself as a living organism via consciousness or intelligence, but intelligence or consciousness exists in a manifold ways. This leads us on to the next section. 4 Levels of consciousness and reality and the processing of information Consciousness can be explained not so much in ontological terms (“it is this or that”), but in terms of what it does. I shall claim that consciousness processes information, and it processes information in non-algorithmic ways. Processing information is an act, and action, an experience – a process. Strikingly but meaningfully, the human mind can understand what cannot be done algorithmically. Moreover, the mind is ultimately not algorithmic (KAUFFMAN, 2016; MALDONADO; GÓMEZ-CRUZ, 2017). Yet, vice versa, the universe, nature or the world are constantly looking (or caring) about itself and its environment – if one considers the responsive nature of Earth’s environment (LOVELOCK, 2000). The difference between consciousness and the universe is a difference of time scales – whence the differences between the types of information processing. The universe can be considered a living being; in this case, nature is alive. This means that there is no life in nature, as if nature (= the Earth) was a container of living beings. This is the crux of the argument. The argument that supports the life of nature can be traced back to geomorphology (THOMPSON, 1992), geochemistry (VERNADSKY, 1997), and the Earths’ physiology (LOVELOCK, 2000). However, within the framework of quantum science a clear support can be found in Kauffman (2016). A different approach to the issue can be brought out in the following terms: information processing, learning, memory, decision making, choice, predictive modeling, associative memory, sensory integration and control of behavior are all aspects of biological intelligence (BALUSKA et al., 2006). Still, consciousness and the mind pervade reality. Biology, thus, encompasses much more than the study of living beings, so much so that quantum science does not follow common sense. Consciousness and reality are closely entangled and the processing of information is the way in which the entanglement takes place. It should be stressed that consciousness – or mind - is not a singular human feature. Consciousness has been rightly associated with living beings at large, and not only, and not mainly, the great mammals – for it comes all the way down into the lowest levels of nature. Yet, within the framework of quantum science, consciousness is a feature that arises already from the very particles and waves (CONWAY; KOCHEN, 2006) that constitute it. To be sure, the strong free will theorem is certainly a strong defence for anthropocentric worldviews. It shows that particles and waves behave exactly in the way in which subjects of behavioral sciences behave; as a consequence, they are free in the strongest sense of the word; that is, they read the environment and act upon it by choice, and are not just unconscious responses to a stimulus. Free agency pervades nature (SOLÉ; GOODWIN, 2000). From the human point of view, as people grow up and learn new ways of processing information are developed (PENROSE; HAMEROFF, 2011). The very development of information processing occurs according to the evolution – of the individuals or the species. The nonlinearity of life means that living beings gain information – although not necessarily memory. Living is thus the process by which we gain information, and this is the very condition for learning. Any system that is capable of learning can adapt to the environment. Quantum entanglement is the process by which new information is gained and processed at the same time. All in all, the reality of the world depends on our observation. It is the theory what determines what we can see (Einstein). The observation is conscious, and consciousness transforms data into information, and information into knowledge. The physical reality of an object depends on how we choose to observe it (GILDER, 2009). Shortly said, we create our own reality. 5 Panpsychism, reconsidered Panpsychism adopts a twofold way, thus: on the one side, it is about the role of consciousness in reality, whereas, on the other side, it deals with life and its place in the economy of the universe. The second assumption is known as the question about the anthropic principle (BARROW; TIPLER, 1989). The first take is the most “orthodox” within the framework of quantum physics. Here I do not argue in favor of the anthropic cosmological principle, in neither its weak nor its strong version. The biases have been severely criticized and the consequences lead always to some form of religion or pseudo-science (WARD; BROWNLEE, 2000). Panpsychism turns out to be nearly identical to hylozoism and pantheism, and biocentrism . What appears in Figure 1 above as four different stances is after all a united framework. The name of such a framework is “life”. In simple words, consciousness can be here grasped as life. Classically stated, the question is whether consciousness affects reality by the act of observation. More radically, the question then becomes how life affects the universe by being and becoming. Quantum theory is after all, it seems, about the role of freedom in the universe. The universe is conscious and alive, simply because consciousness and reality are entangled, which therefore means that one does not exist without the other. Quantum science shows that quantum phenomena rely on superpositions – in other words, on possibilities. In the framework of the quantum world, possibilities are real, i.e. ontologically real. As S. Kauffman (2016) puts it, life is a physical property of the universe itself, very much as temperature, mass, energy, gravity, etc. Life and consciousness are not even emergent phenomena, but ever-present aspects of reality. In the same way, consciousness is a physical property of the brain, just very much like synapsis, the system of glands, or electro-chemical impulses. The question then about how consciousness or the mind arises from the brain or how life appears in the universe are wrong questions, for they are posed in terms of causality and its variants – emergentism (POPPER, 1995), and superseded relations (CHALMERS, 1996). If freedom is to make any sense at all in the universe, then **consciousness is not an epiphenomenon,** and life cannot be understood in terms of transcendence. Quantum science sets out the ground for freedom hereafter. 6 CONCLUSIONS This paper argues for a strong defense of panpsychism. However, by all means mysticism must be discarded here, even though panpsychism has been associated with mysticism. The claim here has not never been that consciousness creates reality. Rather, the contention of this paper is that reality is a living system – whence a conscious stance. Yet, reality as such (überhaupt) does not really exist. There are levels of reality – hence also levels of consciousness. The classical understanding of consciousness conceives of it **as just witnessing the world**. The world happens, and consciousness tries, as hard as possible, to grasp what has happened or what is going on “out there”. Quantum theory, on the contrary, allows understanding that **consciousness acts upon reality – in acausal ways**. To be sure, causality is not the only way in which action happens in the universe. It is not even the main way; it is just the way the classical science of western civilization says it happens. **In a world in which consciousness is a mere witness freedom does not exist**, it is an illusion. Consciousness is then a mere product of the objective world. In such a reality predestination, determinism and fatalism naturally predominate – very much as, for instance, the Laplace’s demon. However, if one assumes that consciousness and free will do not emerge with life, but as part of the universe, whence panpsychism is entirely justified, freedom is possible – moreover and paradoxically, freedom is unavoidable, inescapable. The universe or nature is the very realm of freedom, very much as consciousness is the unceasing experience of freedom. It should be highlighted that freedom coincides with randomness – a most radical openness, which goes against the notion that randomness is chaotic. Quantum mechanics tells us about the ultimate randomness of nature in more than fifteen different interpretations. Dealing with randomness and life are two sides of one and the same token. Nonetheless, one should not conclude that life is totally random; instead, randomness pervades life to some extent. Panpsychism disallows any form of determinism. It is freedom, after all – freewill, if you wish – that is finally at stake in this discussion. Life, it is claimed here, is about gaining degrees of freedom, and enhancing, enlarging or deepening the degrees of freedom already attained. As it is well known, the complexity of a system is proportional to the degrees of freedom the system has or exhibits. The more degrees of freedom a system has, the more complex it is. The mechanist interpretation of the world is wrong - very much as the deterministic interpretation of the world is wrong, too. Quantum science opens up the doors to a view of the world where freedom is possible – hence life is possible as well, not just an emergent property of matter.

#### The alternative is a method of phenomenological inquiry. The role of the ballot is voter for the scholarship which embraces powerful experience. NO perms, they are trapped by mechanistic cooption.

Brown 7 - Charles Brown Professor of Philosophy Emporia State University 2007 [“Nature’s Edge, Boundary Explorations in Ecological Theory and Practice” Chapter titled: “Respect for Experience as a Way Into the Problem of Moral Boundaries” Page 81-83]cdm

Ever since Aldo Leopold' mused that extending the boundaries of the moral community to include the land was both an evolutionary possibility and an ecological necessity, environmental thinkers have searched for principled reasons to justify locating the boundaries of the moral community in new and different places. Efforts to redraw the boundaries of the moral community have frequently centered around the general thesis that core elements or beliefs within our worldviews have served to legitimate and encourage our reckless domination of the natural world resulting in the massive harm to nature known widely as the environmental crisis. According to their specific diagnoses, various thinkers have offered suggested cures involving some kind of revolution in thinking that would produce the kinds of attitudes and moral commitments needed to develop and sustain socially just and environmentally benign practices? Common to this entire genre of philosophical analysis is the claim, or perhaps hope, that by identifying the elements in our Worldview that are responsible for ecological destruction, it may be possible to develop alternative and ecologically benign worldviews that would free us of the seemingly historical inevitability of the mass production of destructive technologies that undo, rip, wound, and tear away at the biotic structure of the natural world. A well-known version of this strategy, widely associated with the Deep Ecology movement, argues that it is the anthropocentric character of our traditional Worldview that is largely responsible for ecological destruction and exploitation. According to this line of thought, our traditional anthropocentricism must be replace with a biocentric or ecocentric worldview that extends the notion c intrinsic value, traditionally limited t humans, to all ecological forms an structures. Ecofeminists, on the other hand, have argued that environment; domination results not from a anthropocentric worldview but from a androcentric worldview that reduce nature to 'a "feminine other," thus capturing nature within its project of masculine domination. The project of unmasking ecodestructive elements in or worldview does not end, however, with the development of new, alternative, and ecofriendly worldviews, but rather in the more radical possibility of shifting power within our worldviews away from the controlling power of fixed concepts and categories and toward an openness to the manner in which the world unfolds. My defense of this claim is grounded in an interpretation of the promise and the legacy of the kind of phenomenological philosophy that has dominated a good bit of continental thinking throughout the twentieth century. One of the primary achievements of phenomenological philosophy has 'been the steady unmasking of the pretensions of metaphysical concepts and abstractions that serve as corner stones or building blocks of any worldview. For the most part, our thinking has been directed by sets of concepts and categories that are external to thinking itself. Our various concepts, understandings, and attitudes toward nature are deeply influenced, some might even say predetermined or prefigured, by historically constructed concepts and categories. To attempt to think without a radical questioning of the historical and contingent nature of the concepts and categories controlling thought is simply to articulate the combinatorial possibilities of fixed semantic regimes. Rather than give in to this prepackaged manner of thinking, we must hold out for a kind of thinking that is open to the world, a kind of thinking that is able to take the world in, to be available to the revelation that the world may offer. As such thinking accepts what the world offers. At its best, I am referring to what may be described as rational insight and, at worst, a kind of cheap mysticism. Such thinking would be characterized by its intrinsic revisability in the face of an always open future. If we reflect on the basic impulse of Edmund Husserl's original phenomenological philosophy and the subsequent development of that tradition, we find a steady critique and unmasking of the taken for granted status of concepts and categories of the reductive metaphysical naturalism that results from Descartes's privileging of extension as; the metaphysical essence of matter and nature. Husserl argued that such naturalistic metaphysics was essentially a mass appropriation of culturally constructed, idealized, and abstract objects of a mathematized physics, which purports to be not only a faithful representation of reality itself, but the only possible one. By the construction of scientifically respectable, measurable properties as "the real" and rationality as "scientific method," reason has become trapped in the success of its own natural sciences. With the further interpretation of rationality as "value- free," **reason losses the ability to confront problems of value**. Husserl's reaction to reductive metaphysical naturalism helps us to see the consequences of a view of nature consisting "entirely of extensional properties externally related to each other within a causal matrix. Reason becomes computational and instrumental at best, and nihilistic at worst. Such a value-free mechanistic conception of nature inevitably leads to moral, social, political, and ecological crises as the value-free conceptions of rationality supporting such a naturalism dismiss the good as mere subjective preference, thus removing all questions of value from rational discourse. Such a dismissal of the good from the real and the rational generates intractable problems for moral philosophy in general and environmental philosophy in particular. Phemenology’s specific contribution to ecological philosophy is an attitude of respect for experience that it shares with much of ecological philosophy and many environmental activists in general. Unlike naturalism, phenomenology does not seek to dismiss experience as subjective, nor does it wish to replace or reduce experience to a more fundamental or more basic mode of being. Phenomenological description and articulation of the structures of experience are an attempt to, as Husserl puts it. return to the things themselves, ralther than simply taking for granted hgher-level, culturally sedimented idealizations and abstractions that often pass for ahistorical metaphysical discoveries. Such attention to and respect for the way the structure' and meaning of our involvement with the world unfolds within everyday experience, and thus is the great stuff of phenomenological description, provides a kind of corrective to the kind of thinking controlled by a worldview-that is, the kind of thinking that always reinterprets ordinary experience according to the concepts and categories occupying positions of power within such a worldview.

## 2

#### The 1AC framework has no account of axiology. They argue that pain is irreducible, but they don’t explain why human pain is the only important value. Their syllogism skips a step

Watson 16 - Paul Watson, environmental activist and founder of Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, The Outdoor Journal, June 8th, 2016 “Human Lives Are Not More Important Than Animal Lives” [https://www.outdoorjournal.com/blog/human-lives-are-not-more-important-than-animal-lives/] Accessed 9/10/18 SAO

Is a human life worth more than a gorilla, a whale or any other species? I’m going to tread on some very sensitive toes with this commentary but I think it needs to be said. My perspective is biocentric, whereas most of humanity looks on reality from an anthropocentric point of view. I do not expect the anthropocentric mind to understand my position. My position is that a human life is not more important than the life of a gorilla or a whale. This is is going to make some people angry as hell, but that does not concern me. What concerns me is the reality of our relationship with the natural world. Columnist Dave Bry recently wrote in The Guardian: As much as I love animals – and I love them very much – the idea that the life of a cat or a dog or a lion or a gorilla is as important as the life of a human is a terrible one, a wrong one, an insulting one. [There] are powerful, important things about being a human being … Yes, I would save the life of Ted Kaczynski, Idi Amin or Donald Trump over any animal you could name. (Yes, even my beloved childhood pets: the cats Love and Honey, the dog, Yvette. Sorry, guys, RIP.) Personally I think this statement by Bry is asinine, insensitive and absurd. Idi Amin was a mass murderer. His life was not worth the life of a mosquito and if someone had shot the bastard, thousands of people’s lives would have been spared not to mention the slaughter of African wildlife under his authority. Would Bry say the same about Hitler, and if not, why not, how is he any different than a mass murdering dictator like Idi Amin? So I think Brys’ position has not been thought out, and if it has, it is he who holds a terrible idea with a wrong position and insulting to every person who was slaughtered in WWII or in Africa under Amin. Bry is saying his cats and his dog are expendable but a vicious dictator is not, simply on the basis of being a member of the human species. The reality is that some human lives are simply not worth more than other humans and also not more important than many animals. A few years ago when I was teaching at UCLA I asked my students this question: If you had to choose between a human life and the survival of an unknown species, what choice would you make? And to make the question a little easier for them, I said the human life is a cute little baby and the species is a type of bacteria. “So,” I said, “Does the baby live in exchange for the eradication of the species or do we save the species and allow the baby to die?” They answered without hesitation and chose the life of the baby. “What if I ask you to save 200 species of unknown bacteria in exchange for the baby?” Again they chose the baby. “Can anyone tell me why you made that choice?” I inquired. “Because human lives are more important.” One student answered. Another said, “The life of a baby is more important than some germs, how could you even ask such a thing?” she said with a look of disgust. “Congratulations everyone,” I said. “Your choice just caused the extinction of the human race.” This is because there are anywhere from 700 to 1,000 different species of bacteria residing in the human gut and without them we could not digest our food or manufacture vitamins for our bodies. This was part of a lesson I was trying to teach on the law of interdependence, that all species need each other and without some species we cannot survive. Are phytoplankton and zooplankton less important than human lives? If it was a choice between diminishing human numbers and diminishing worldwide populations of phytoplankton what choice would we make? Again I put the question forth, this time to some die-hard anti-abortionists. If the choice is between forcefully preventing abortions and allowing the births of millions of unwanted babies or watching the disappearance of phytoplankton, what choice would you make? They said that the lives of the babies were more important even if it meant the babies would not be properly cared for, nurtured, educated and loved. One person asked me what a phytoplankton was? “It’s a tiny marine plant,” I answered. “You mean like seaweed?” “Yes but much smaller.” “So you’re saying that seaweed is more important than babies?” The man asked with a look of disgust on his face. “Yes, that’s what I am saying.” I answered. “You’re a sick man,” he literally shouted at me. And of course he was not interested in my explanation. And the truth is that we have already made that choice to eradicate phytoplankton in exchange for increasing human populations. Since 1950, the Ocean has suffered a 40% decline in phytoplankton populations and phytoplankton produces over 50% of the oxygen for the planet. This is a serious problem but one which most people remain blissfully ignorant of. Phytoplankton has been diminished because of pollution, climate change, acidification and the slaughter of the whales. Why the whales? Because whales provide the nutrients essential for the growth of phytoplankton, especially iron and nitrogen. These nutrients are spread to the phytoplankton in the form of whale feces similar to a farmer spreading manure on his crops. A single Blue whale defecates three tons a day of nutrient rich fecal material which makes the whales the farmers of the sea and a key species for the survival of phytoplankton. Diminishment of whales means diminishment of phytoplankton means diminishment of oxygen. **There are many species** much **more important than we are.** Bees and worms, trees and plankton, fish, ants and spiders, bacteria, whales and elephants amongst many others. They are more important for a very simple reason**. Most** of them **can live** quite happily **without humans but humans cannot live without them.** A world without bees and worms would be a world where we could not feed ourselves. A world without phytoplankton and trees would be a world where we could not breathe. A world without yeast (an animal) would be a world without beer and wine which I mention only because this is a loss that may get some people’s attention. Nature has three very basic ecological laws. 1. Diversity, meaning that the strength of an eco-system is determined by the diversity within it. 2. Interdependence, meaning that the species within an eco-system are dependent upon each other and 3. Finite resources, meaning that there is a limit to growth, a limit to carrying capacity. As human populations grow larger they literally steal carrying capacity from other species, leading to diminishment of other species which leads to diminishment of diversity and diminishment of interdependence. In other words, no species is an island entire unto itself and that includes our own human species. Humans have created a fantasy world called anthropocentrism, the idea that all of reality, all of nature exists only for humanity, that we are the only species that matters and human rights take priority over the rights of all other species. In other words we look upon ourselves as divinely created superior beings when in reality we are simply overly conceited arrogant, ecologically ignorant, naked apes who have become divine legends in our own limited minds. This anthropocentric view of the world has made us selfish, self-centred and extremely destructive to all other forms of life on the planet including our own. Our fantasies have allowed us to destroy the very life support systems that sustain us, to poison the waters we drink and the food we eat, to amuse ourselves with blood sports and to eradicate anything and everything we do not like, be it animal, plant or other human beings. We demonize each other and we demonize the entire living world. This fantasy world we have invented has witnessed our creation of Gods out of whose mouths we can give voice to our fantasies with the moral authority to justify our destructive behaviour. Over the years I have risked my life and my crews have risked their lives to protect whales and seals, sharks and fish. I am often asked how can I ask people to risk their lives for a whale? Very easy, is my answer because fighting for the survival of whales or fish means fighting for our own future. The mystery however to me is how people can question risking our lives for a whale yet accept that young people are routinely asked to risk their lives for real estate, oil wells, religion and for a coloured piece a cloth they call a flag. Apparently risking their lives to protect property is acceptable whereas taking risks to defend non-human lives is not. This was very neatly summed up once by a ranger in Zimbabwe who was attacked by human rights groups after killing a poacher who was about to kill an endangered Black rhino. The accusation was, how could you take the life of a human being to protect an animal? His answer revealed the hypocrisy of human values. He said, “If I was a policeman in Harare and a man ran out of a bank with a bag of money and I shot him dead on the street, I would be called a hero and given a medal. My job is to protect the future heritage of Zimbabwe and how is it that an endangered species has less value than a bag of paper?” Humanity slaughters some 65 billion animals every year for meat and takes even greater numbers of lives from the sea, much of which is discarded callously as by-catch. We kill animals for fun or because we consider them to be pests. There has never been a species as mercilessly destructive as the human primate. We kill wilfully, viciously and relentlessly and we do so because we feel entitled to do so. Anthropocentrism is an incredibly delusional conceit by a single species to lift ourselves above in value and importance over all other living things. Humanity is so entrenched in this view of the world that we have stifled all empathy to the feelings and interests of all other species. We view them as expendable, as property, as nuisances, as sources of amusement, as slaves. In an anthropocentric world only humans matter and this has absurdly led to beliefs that this entire planet was created just for us, that we are the pinnacle of evolution and the masters of the universe. Every single anthropocentric religion places human beings at the centre of everything and above all other species. We have fashioned God in our image in order to justify our superiority and woe be it to any one of that questions this fantasy. Anthropocentrism is a form of ecological insanity and is leading us towards self destruction, because only so many species can be removed before the laws of diversity, interdependence and finite growth lead to our own extinction. Are humans the most intelligent species on the planet? Yes. because we define what intelligence is and therefore declare ourselves to be the most intelligent species. **We define ourselves as mora**l, ethical, benevolent and wise **despite the fact that our actions reveal that we are anything but** moral, ethical, benevolent and wise. I would define intelligence as the ability to live in harmony with nature and within the boundaries of ecological laws. We willfully ignore that dolphins and whales have larger more complex brains and we dismiss any speculation that animals think, make choices, dream and have emotions. We also dismiss the reality that trees communicate through chemicals and fungal networks. We pride ourselves on our art, our science, our religions, our politics, our cultures and totally reject that other species have their own cultures, their own realities completely independent of our hominid vanities. Recently a 17-year old gorilla named Harambe was shot dead because zoo-keepers determined that he was a threat to the life of a four year old child despite the indications that the gorilla was actually attempting to protect the child. The primary justification was that the life of a gorilla is of less value than the life of a human child and thus expendable without hesitation. Never mind that in two previous incidents, one in Chicago and another on the island of Jersey a child’s life was saved by a captive gorilla. The Cincinnati zoo was most likely motivated by the threat of a lawsuit unless they shot Harambe and ended the drama with a bullet to the head of a sentient being that although confused and disoriented was displaying real concern for the child that fell into his prison cell. Very few thought of the trauma this would cause to the other gorillas or the fact that the killing was a horrific betrayal to the good intentions of Harambe. After all he was just an animal and no animal is worth the life of a single human. Instead of acknowledging that her child was not hurt by Harambe, the mother of the child thanked God for the child not being hurt with the assumption being that her God could not have cared less about a gorilla. Harambe and the child were together for ten minutes before Harambe was murdered. There are 7.5 billion of us and every year there are fewer and fewer of everything else except for the slaves we breed for food and amusement. Gorillas do not contribute to climate change, to pollution of the ocean to deforestation, to war and habitat destruction. They are gentle, vegetarian, shy, and intelligent self-aware sentient beings whose existence benefits the planet and gives hope for the future. What human being can equal a gorilla for the virtues of harmlessness, sustainable living, peacefulness and ecological intelligence? Not one of us. So in my opinion the life of a gorilla is not only of more value than the life of a human being, it is a hundred times more valuable, as are whales, and snails, bees and trees. Why? Because we cannot live on this planet without them.

#### Human life is categorically violent to animal life which outweighs under util

Best 7 - Dr. Steven Best, Associate Professor, Departments of Humanities and Philosophy, University of Texas, El Paso in the Animals Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal, 2007 “Book review of Charles Patterson, The Eternal Treblinka: Our Treatment of Animals and the Holocaust” [http://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/JCAS-Vol-5-Issue-2-2007.pdf] Accessed 1/10/22 SAO

This said, it is nonetheless crucial to understand the concerns of oppressed human groups when being compared to animals, not only because they often feel their experience is being exploited for the purposes of another group, however sincere or valid (and most critics did not feel the intentions of PETA were honorable or respectful), but also because **a key cause of** their **oppression was being likened to animals** in the first place. But the comparisons done by PETA, Patterson, and a host of Jewish writers and activists are hardly the same as those made by racists, anti-Semites, and Nazis, as PETA (as true of animal rights people in general) is not ideologically reactionary but rather wants to overcome all forms of hierarchy, domination, exploitation, bias, prejudice, and violence to develop a more, not less, comprehensive ethic and principle of equality (as based on sentience, **not arbitrary, circular, and self-serving human appeals to human reason**). Moreover, the point of the exhibit – as true of Patterson’s book – is not to reduce humans to animals, but rather to raise animals up into humans in the sense that they are accorded respect, granted their proper intrinsic value, and endowed with the rights relevant for them to lead lives based on freedom from pain and suffering and freedom to happiness and pleasure. Finally, whether critics acknowledge it or not, there simply are commonalities among modes of oppression, they do co-constitute and reinforce one another, and these need to be analyzed as one holistic complex of hierarchy, domination, and oppression, one that, as argued all along, has important roots in the domination of animals. As Matt Prescott eloquently explains: "The very same mindset that made the Holocaust possible - that we can do anything we want to those we decide are 'different or inferior' - is what allows us to commit atrocities against animals every single day. ... The fact is, all animals feel pain, fear and loneliness. We're asking people to recognize that what Jews and others went through in the Holocaust is what animals go through every day in factory farms." 36 To give Dr. Martin Luther King a significantly broader reading that extends beyond the narrow limits of the human community to include all sentience life: “No one can be free until all are free.” There is a moral hypocrisy and speciesist double-standard informing heated attacks on PETA’s attempts to draw parallels between animal and human suffering, one that desperately needs to be transcended in favor of a broader ethic. For while groups such as the NAACP and the Anti-Defamation League ask PETA to be sensitive to human oppression, understanding that Blacks and Jews often accused PETA of barging into communities with their display and not appreciating how oppressed peoples might feel used or exploited to make moral arguments on behalf of animals. While these criticisms no doubt were valid in many cases, it must also be said that there were few attempts by oppressed people to make the effort from their side to try to sympathize with and understand animal oppression. While PETA may use images of Jewish and Black exploitation in ways they object to, it is more to the point to note that they eat animals in their private lives and groups functions, a considerable more grievous offense than a well-intended, possible misappropriation of images of suffering to expand the moral community. Indeed, the NAACP’s shameless public defense of serial dog torturer and killer Michael Vick was despicable and displayed a grotesque lack of moral sympathy to non-human animals, not fundamentally different from the detachment (if not pleasure) white racists showed toward those Blacks victimized by their violence Too many people with pretences to ethics, compassion, decency, justice, love, and other stellar values of humanity at its finest resist the profound analogies between animal and human slavery and animal and human holocausts, in order to devalue or trivialize animal suffering and avoid the responsibility of the weighty moral issues confronting them. The moral myopia of humanism is blatantly evident when people who have been victimized by violence and oppression decry the fact that they “were treated like animals” – as if it is acceptable to brutalize animal, but not humans. If there is a salient disanalogy or discontinuity between the tyrannical pogroms launched against animals and humans, it lies not in the fallacious assumption that animals do not suffer physical and mental pain similar to humans, but rather that **animals suffer more than humans, both quantitatively (****the intensity of their torture, such as they endure in fur farms, factory farms, and experimental laboratories) and qualitatively (the number of those who suffer and** die). And while few oppressed human groups lack moral backing, sometimes on an international scale, one finds not mass solidarity with animals but rather mass consumption of them. As another Nobel Prize writer in Literature, South African novelist writer J. M. Coetzee, forcefully stated: “Let me say it openly: we are surrounded by an enterprise of degradation, cruelty, and killing which rivals anything the Third Reich was capable of, indeed dwarfs it, in that **ours is an enterprise without end,** self-regenerating,**bringing** rabbits, rats, poultry, livestock ceaselessly into the world for the purpose of killing them.” 37 Every year, throughout the world, over 45 billion farmed animals currently are killed for food consumption.38 This staggering number is nearly **eight times the present human population.** In the US alone, over 10 billion animals are killed each year for food consumption – 27 million each day, nearly 19,000 per minute. Of the 10 billion land animals killed each year in the US, over 9 billion are chickens; every day in the US, 23 million chickens are killed for human consumption, 269 per second. In addition to the billions of land animals consumed, humans also kill and consume 85 billion marine animals (17 billion in the US). 39 Billions more animals die in the name of science, entertainment, sport, or fashion (i.e., the leather, fur, and wool industries), or on highways as victims of cars and trucks. Moreover, ever more animal species vanish from the earth as we enter the sixth great extinction crisis in the planet’s history, this one caused by human not natural events, the last one occurring 65 million years ago with the demise of the dinosaurs and 90% of all species on the planet

#### No Impact: Lots of species can survive a nuclear war

Franco 22 - Louise Franco, Nature World News, March 27th, 2022 “Survival 101: Here are 7 Animals That Can Survive a Nuclear War” [https://www.natureworldnews.com/articles/50073/20220327/survival-101-here-7-animals-survive-nuclear-war.htm] Accessed 4/20/22 SAO

Survival is one of the most basic yet fundamental mechanisms that all living organisms do to preserve their species. However, there are instances where survival is not possible in the case of an extinction-level event. With this, it is important to mention the potential survivors in case a nuclear war happens. Some animals are known to possess physical characteristics and biological features that allow them to escape from predators or even withstand harsh environments-even radiation from nuclear fallout. Early 2022 has shown that nuclear war is one of the threats that can be a reality, especially after Russia invaded Ukraine on February 24. With regional tensions and political threats to likely fail decades of nuclear deterrence, humans are at risk-but not for some bacteria, fish, insects, arthropods, or microscopic organisms that are likely to still live even in our absence. Below are seven animals that are likely to survive in case of a nuclear war: 1. Tardigrade Tardigrade Tardigrades are famously known for their resemblance to some large animals of today. This eight-legged microscopic animal is tough as it looks. Also called 'water bears' or 'moss piglets,' scientists have claimed that tardigrades can withstand both extremely hot and cold temperatures. According to NBC News, tardigrades have been used for widespread scientific research since they can survive harsh environments. Depicted as nearly indestructible, water bears are said to survive inside a pot of boiling water or even in the vacuum of space. 2. Cockroach You see them in your closet, your ceiling, or even on the streets, cockroaches are known for their reputation as invasive home pests. However, a cockroach is indeed one of the candidates that can survive during a nuclear fallout. Cockroaches have been around for more than 300 million years and are considered to be one of the oldest insects in the world. They have roamed the planet long before humans, and roaches will likely be here for a long time, as per the Smithsonian Magazine. 3. Scorpion Scorpions are one of the sturdiest animals on the planet. Various research has shown that these six-legged arachnids can take high levels of ultraviolet (UV) radiation from the sun. It is likely they can also survive the theoretical nuclear winter. 4. Fruit Fly Fruit flies are also evidently able to survive the heat from a nuclear explosion. In a study conducted by researchers from the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, as cited by Science Daily, it was found that even weak doses of gamma radiation can prolong the life of fruit flies. 5. Braconid Wasp The parasitic braconid wasps are known for laying their eggs on caterpillars and worms, as well as plants. They are also known for withstanding almost 20 times the radiation level of the Hiroshima bomb during World War II. An experiment reportedly had to use 180,000 rads to kill a braconid. Therefore, it is no wonder that it can survive a potential nuclear war. 6. Mummichog Mummichogs, also called Atlantic killfish, are tiny marine fry that can adapt to their environment, including surviving from a high amount of radiation in the water. These fish reside in the Atlantic Ocean coastal areas of the United States and Canada. According to NASA, two mummichog fish were sent to space on the Skylab as part of an experiment in the 1970s. The small fish was chosen as a candidate for their unique adaptive capabilities. After being flown into the vacuum of nothingness, the fish were seen still swimming in a circular pattern. 7. Deinococcus Radidurans Even the Guinness Book of World Records has reportedly listed the microscopic bacteria Deinococcus Radidurans as the "world's toughest bacterium" since it can withstand extreme temperatures and even dehydration. There is no known limit of radiation level that the bacteria can take.

## 3

#### A: Interp – Debaters must disclose al judges for every round they have debated on the NDCA LD debate wiki.

#### B: Violation – You say “panel” under the judge section of elim rounds.

A screenshot of a computer
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#### C: Standards –

#### 1. Strategy Education – Judge reports are key to novices getting a sense of what judges can judge which types of positions, when to split panels between types of judges, and encourage reaching out to the debater and ask for prefs if they think the debater got a favorable panel – that evens the playing field with debaters who have coaches to teach them those skills.

#### 2. Pre-Round Prep – Contextual strategy decisions are key to A) Preparing for this round since it helps predict what type of judge you read what type of position in front of and what you tend to go for in front of those judges which is key to predictability since I can compare paradigms between judges to get a sense of strategy and B) Preparing for other rounds since I gain knowledge of what judges will listen to what arguments passively through wiki scrolling which saves pre-round time since I don’t have to read entire paradigms.

#### And, responses to the shell have to prove why specifically disclosing panels are bad since you already disclose particular judges for prelims – general reasons you win disclosing judges are bad is a reason to vote you down since you’d be winning offense to an interp that you violate.

#### Drop the debater –

#### 1. Deterrence – Prevents reading the abusive practice in the future since it’s not worth risking which is k2 norm setting indefensible practices die out.

#### 2. TS – Otherwise you’ll read a bunch of abusive practices for the time trade off.

#### 3. Epistemic Skew – The round has already been skewed so it’s impossible to evaluate the rest of the flow.

#### Competing interps –

#### 1. Reasonability encourages a race to the margins of what counts as sufficiently fair which incentivizes as much abuse as possible

#### 2. Norm setting – it encourages the most fair rule through debating competing models

#### 3. Judge intervention – Reasonability begs the question of what the judge thinks is sufficient which takes the round out of the debaters hands.

#### No RVIs –

#### 1. It deters legitimate theory vs good theory debaters because you will lose on a shell even if it’s a good norm

#### 2. Baiting – incentivizes people to be abusive and script counter-interps to win on the RVI which increases the existence of bad norms

#### 3. It forces debaters to argue for bad practices even if they realize their interp is wrong which kills substance debate and norm setting since we have bad theory debates we agree on.

#### Use a norm setting model – 1. It solves long term abuse whereas IRA only matters one round at a time 2. It’s best for the activity since it encourages deep reflection and debate about what the best world of debate looks like and strives toward it.

## Case

### Util Fails

#### [1] Pleasure and pain aren’t additive or aggregatable just like two headaches don’t equal a migraine.

#### [2] Self Defeating: Always trying to maximize as much X as possible prevents us from actually using X, which means we never experience pleasures goodness.

#### [3] Masochism Objection: There are different standards for what a good sensation is (IE some people like pain), so knowing what end state is desirable under util is impossible

#### [4] Util can never deem certain actions as uniformly prohibited as the only morally relevant feature is whether an action maximizes utility in that situation.

#### [5] Assigning blame is impossible as consequences always trigger more consequences, and there is no brightline for when culpability ends.

#### [6] Induction is circular because it relies on the assumption that nature will hold uniform and we could only reach that conclusion through inductive reasoning based on observation of past events

#### [7] Util is incoherent: If I punch two people its impossible to determine who felt more pain from the action or if either felt pain internally at all.

### K

#### Utilitarianism is morally repugnant:

#### [1] Util creates a moral obligation to oppress people, when their suffering would cause a greater amount of happiness for the majority.

Jeffrey **Gold**, Utilitarian and Deontological Approaches to Criminal Justice Ethics

According to utilitarianism, an action is moral when it produces the great-est amount of happiness for the greatest number of people. A problem arises, however, when the greatest happiness is achieved at the expense of a few. For example, **if a large group were to enslave a very small group, the large group would gain certain comforts and luxuries (and the pleasure that accompanies those comforts) as a result of the servitude of the few**. **If we were to follow the utilitarian calculus** strictly, **the suffering of a few (even intense suffering) would be outweighed by the pleasure of a large enough majority**. A thousand people’s modest pleasure would outweigh the suffer-ing of 10 others. Hence, utilitarianism would seem to endorse slavery when it produces the greatest total amount of happiness for the greatest number of people. This is obviously a problem for utilitarianism. **Slavery and oppression are wrong regardless of the amount of pleasure accumulated by the oppressing class. In fact, when one person’s pleasure results from the suf-fering of another, the pleasure seems all the more abhorrent.** The preceding case points to a weakness in utilitarianism, namely, the weak-ness in dealing with certain cases of injustice. Sometimes it is simply unjust to treat people in a certain way regardless of the pleasurable consequences for others. A gang rape is wrong even if 50 people enjoy it and only one suffers. It is wrong because it is unjust. To use Kant’s formulation, it is always wrong to treat anyone as a mere means to one’s own ends. When we enslave, rape, and oppress, we are always treating the victim as a means to our own ends.

#### [2] Because only consequences determine if specific actions are good or bad, utilitarianism justifies horrific conclusions since no state of affairs could ever be intrinsically bad in and of itself.

**Vallentyne**, Peter. *Against Maximizing Act-Consequentialism*. **2006**, mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/10174/AgainstMaximizingActConsequentialism.pdf?sequence=1.

**If** core **consequentialism is true, then any action with maximally good consequences** (in a given choice situation) **is permissible**. The main argument in favor of this claim is the following: **P1: An action is morally permissible if it is best supported by insistent moral reasons for action. P2: The value of consequences is always an insistent moral reason for action. P3: The value of consequences is the only insistent moral reason for action. C: Thus, an action is morally permissible if it maximizes the value of consequences.** This is the same argument given in the previous section for the impermissibility of actions that do not have maximally good consequences, except that (1) the appeal to insistent reasons has been made explicit, (2) the necessary conditions of the original P1 and C have been converted to sufficient conditions, and (3) the qualification in P3 that allowed the possibility of some prior constraints has been dropped. P1 is highly plausible. An action that is best supported by insistent moral reasons is surely permissible. P2 can be challenged, as I did earlier, on the ground that beyond some point the value of consequences ceases to be an insistent moral reason (once consequences are good enough, their value may only be a non-insistent reason). For the present purposes, however, we can grant this claim. The crucial claim is P3. It is implausible, because there are insistent moral reasons other than the value of consequences. There are also deontological insistent reasons, and these, or at least some of these, are lexical prior to the value of consequences. In particular**, individuals have certain rights that may not be infringed simply because the consequences are better.** Unlike prudential rationality, morality involves many distinct centers of will (choice) or 15 **interests, and these cannot simply be lumped together and traded off against each other.**16 **The basic problem with standard versions of core consequentialism is that they fail to recognize adequately the normative separateness of persons.** Psychological **autonomous beings** (as well, perhaps, as other beings with moral standing) are not merely means for the promotion of value. They **must be respected and honored**, and this means that at least sometimes certain things may not be done to them, even though this promotes value overall. An innocent person may not be killed against her will, for example, in order to make a million happy people slightly happier. This would be sacrificing her for the benefit of others.

#### Two Impacts:

#### [1] It triggers permissibility since they can’t generate a correct moral obligation that justifies affirming. That negates: B) Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### [2] They read morally repugnant arguments. Thus the alternative is to drop the debater, to ensure that debate remains a space safe for all – the judge has a proximal obligation to ensure inaccessible practices don’t proliferate. Accessibility is a voting issue since all aff arguments presuppose that people feel safe in this space to respond to them.

### Hedge

#### Reject 1AR Theory – a) double bind – either you can put minor ink next to answer of my responses and extend your arguments to auto-win or the judge has to intervene to see if the 2ar answers to the 2n are good enough. Intervention o/w since it takes the round out of debater’s hands b) they have 2 speeches on theory while I have 1 which means they can structurally preempt my answers and respond to them and I can’t do either c) infinite abuse in the context of aff abuse doesn’t make sense since you can read 1ac theory and uplayer with other 1ar offs like Ks