## O/V

#### Interpretation – The negative must concede the affirmative framework or contention level offense.

#### It’s preemptive, you violate by reading turns or defense to my offense and reading an alternative framework.

#### Prefer –

1. Strat skew – A) It’s impossible for the 1AR to win both layers of framing and offense when you can frame me out and read a bunch of turns to the aff making the round impossible in 4min – especially since the 2n can collapse on either the framework or the contention for 6 minutes B) Neg reactivity advantage, aff disclosure, and 1n time allocation means they can craft a perfect 1nc – conceding one layer of substance solves since it gives me weighing recourse and strategic 1ar maneuvers without having to brute force both.

2. Depth of Clash – We pick and choose whether to debate offense or framework and when, which means we have more discussion of each one every round. Depth o/w since reading 1 page of 100 different books is useless and superficial. Breadth is solved across multiple rounds when people choose a different layer in each. And, hijacks solve all your offense since they contest both the framework and the offense, while maintaining the 1ar ability to win substance.

#### AFF theory is no RVI, Drop the debater, competing interps, under an interp that aff theory is legit A) infinite abuse since otherwise it would be impossible to check NC abuse B) the 2n can dump on a script to a CI and go for RVI’s making it impossible to check abuse C) The 1ar is too short to win theory and substance D) The 2n can always create infinite reasonability arguments the 2ar can’t get through E) New 2ar weighing is legit otherwise the 2n can collapse and sandbag one issue for 6 min and I’ll always lose.

## Fwk

#### The meta-ethic is consistency with transcendental form of subjects.

#### Moral Realism is true – there is an ethical truth that exists metaphysically: a) otherwise we could not make moral claims since we would merely claim disagreement rather than an absolute wrong, justifying any ethical statement b) relativism is circular since asserting relativism assumes its own universal truth, which concedes the authority of realism c) regressive moral debates always terminate in an endpoint of agreement, we just compare different values in an attempt to find the ultimate one.

#### And, that’s only accessible through procedural transcendental idealism – a) Is/ought gap – appeals to the empirical world merely explain how the world is rather than what it ought to be b) Motivation – empirical circumstances change based on each individual. individuals need a reason to sacrifice their self-interest and that’s only possible with transcendent moral truths which motivate all agents absent those features.

#### That transcendental truth is the forms – they are the essence of the world that transcend space and time. The material world inherently lacks a capability to manifest the form and cannot generate true reality, only the forms themselves understood by reason allow for true moral and epistemic knowledge. Heyüman 15, <http://ftp.oxfordphilsoc.org/Documents/StudentPrize/2015_H1b.pdf> //scopa

**Forms** can be thought of **as abstract entities** or qualities that **are the essence of sensible things**. Take, **for example, an apple: Roundness, color and weight of the apple are all the properties that make up that apple, each of which is a separate form in itself**. According to Plato, two apples are “round” because they both partake in the form of “roundness”. This “partaking” in any form is what makes things share similar attributes. **All material objects owe their existence to these forms; whereas each form exists by itself, independently of the object that exemplifies the particular form**. In Phaedo, which is widely agreed to be the first dialogue Plato introduced the forms, forms are “marked as auto kath auto beings, beings that are what they are in virtue of themselves1 .” **Forms are transcendent to our material world in that they exist beyond space and time, whereas material objects occupy a specific place at a specific time**. Atemporal and aspatial features of forms have very important implications. First, this explains why **the form of F does not change**, and remains stable beyond a spatio-temporal world while particulars are subject to continuous change. Second, **since F does not exist in space, it can be instantiated in many particulars at once or need not even be instantiated to exist**. The forms are also pure. The roundness of an apple is one of its properties and roundness is only “roundness” in its pure and perfect form. Unlike forms, **material objects are impure, imperfect**, and are complex combinations of several forms. **Being is the ontological relation that ties the form of F to its essence, and each form of F is of one essence** (monoeides). It follows from these principles that each form self-predicates; each form of F is itself F. The form of beauty is itself beautiful, and Helen would not be beautiful if the form of Beauty were not beautiful itself. **The forms are real, sublime entities that belong to an intelligible realm that can only be grasped by reason. They are not subject to change; are stable and enduring, while particulars/material objects belong to this material world of change**, becoming and perishing in a Heraclitean flux. The Idea Behind Platonic Forms As can be seen from his early and middle period dialogues, Plato both explored ethical concepts such as “virtue” and “justice” just like his mentor, Socrates, and he also elaborated upon the essence of the 1 Silverman, A., Fall 2014 Edition, ‘Plato’s Middle Period Metaphysics and Epistemology’, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, p. 10 1 Hilary 2015 Joint 1st Prize: Sinem Hümeydan universe by questioning what there really is in this world of appearances. Plato’s theory of forms, then, can be thought to explicate basically two vital concerns of philosophical inquiry. First, the theory explores the question of how everything seems both to be changing and permanent at the same time. We know that the physical world we perceive through our senses is exposed to continuous change by “becoming” and “ceasing to be2 ”. Nonetheless, there is also permanence beyond what seems to be changing and that can only be grasped by reasoning. Second, the theory of forms is an attempt to find the answer to the question of how people can live a happy and fulfilling life in a world that is ultimately defined with beginnings and endings, and is exposed to change in every possible respect. In the Republic, Plato poses questions about moral concepts in an effort to demonstrate that the life committed to knowledge and virtue will result in happiness and self-fulfillment. To achieve happiness, one should render himself immune to changes in the material world and strive to gain the knowledge of the eternal, immutable forms that reside in the intelligible realm. Indeed, Plato splits the existence into two realms: the visible realm and the transcendent realm (intelligible realm) of forms. **The visible realm is the physical world that is perceived through senses, and is susceptible to “becoming” and “ceasing to be”. On the contrary, the intelligible realm represents the ultimate reality, is enduring, and is accessible only via reasoning** or intellect. Furthermore, Plato believes that this visible world is an imperfect model of the transcendent realm of forms. As is depicted in his famous Allegory of Cave, he thinks that everything perceptible through senses is like the shadows on the Cave Wall, or merely imperfect representations of the reality. Since **what we perceive through our deceptive senses in this world of appearence are merely shadows of reality, one cannot have any genuine knowledge of these things, but can only have beliefs/opinions** about these objects. In other words, Plato thinks that one can only have “knowledge of forms and of Forms one can only have knowledge3 .” Because forms are the only objects of knowledge, individuals should endeavour to reach the intelligible realm and endow themselves with the knowledge of forms in order to achieve a happy and fulfilling life. Plato employs the Sun metaphor, which represents the form of “Good” to compare intelligible and visible realms. As the Sun provides the light to see the physical world, the “Good” provides the power to “know”, and is not only the ultimate cause of knowledge, but it is also the object of truth and knowledge. Being virtuous or pursuing good relies on having the knowledge of the Good, and because forms are the only objects of knowledge, one can only live a fulfilling life and pursue good if one knows the Form of Good. Plato’s Arguments for the Forms and Concluding Remarks According to Plato, reality is very much associated with objectivity. His argument from objectivity asserts that the more objective concepts are of higher reality, and that because **what we perceive via our senses is usually deceitful, the objects of experience cannot be real entities**. Besides, **it is possible to form different subjective views of the same objects; depending on the perceptual or mental states of the observer**. However, forms represent a higher objectivity, and thereby reality through a dialectic process, which is illustrated in the hierarchical system of forms and physical objects, “good” being first among others. Plato appeals to mathematical examples to further his arguments and states that the most definite knowledge is the knowledge of mathematics, and that this knowledge cannot be gained via senses or experience, but only by reasoning. For example, we know for certain that the sum of the interior angles of a triangle is 180 degrees, yet we also acknowledge that no such perfect triangle exists in the world. Then, he concludes, if these abstract entities do not reside in this world, there must a different realm of such perfect forms outside this world of experience that is ultimately real.

#### Prefer –

#### 1. Infinite regress – any question of empirical morality begs the question of a higher understanding which is the form of that object, otherwise we could always ask how to measure the good infinitely. At worst form is always a prior question since it’s what we refer a good material object to when we attempt to articulate its goodness.

#### 2. Performativity - thoughts and ideas can only exist insofar as the theory of the form is true since it is what defines our ability to generate those thoughts in the first place.

#### 3. Constitutivism – Transcendental forms are constitutive of every object and idea since there is necessarily an essence to their existence that extends beyond their physical manifestation, and that each tries to strive for by necessity since the form is what guides the material.

#### Next, ethics are split between the deontic and the aretaic. Deontic theories guide ethics by looking at the actions of moral actors, whereas aretaic theories guide ethics by looking at the character of moral actors themselves.

#### Prefer the aretaic:

#### [1] Descriptively – The aretaic provides an infinitely richer vocabulary for evaluating actions that extends beyond goodness and badness. For example, deontic fwks can’t distinguish admirable vs praise worthy actions.

#### [2] Deontic theories collapse – If agents were conditioned properly, they would independently take the right actions, which proves there cannot be a net benefit to deontic theories.

#### [3] Motivation – A. The aretaic improves citizens’ moral standing. People can always opt-out of a deontic theory but by focusing on the aretaic we improve the moral character of citizens, causing them to act ethically out of their own volition. B. The aretaic allows people to understand the intrinsic nature behind their actions; they are no longer following an abstract theory but making the choice they think is correct.

#### Next, the only ethics consistent with the aretaic is a virtue paradigm: This does not presuppose descriptive normative claims; we rather focus on developing agents to make them virtuous. Reader.

Reader 2k (Reader, Soren. Late Professor of Philosophy, Durham University “New Directions in Ethics: Naturalism, Reasons, and Virtue.” Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, Vol. 3, No. 4, Dec. 2000. [https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/27504153.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aaa918fd169e9f997f07277695e199e80] SHS ZS  
**Virtue is a** free **disposition to act in certain ways under certain conditions**. Virtue ethics claims that **what is to count as a good action** or what is a good outcome **is** conceptually **dependent on claims about** **the virtue of an agent**. How is this dependence supposed to work? Where those after an explanatory account seek a conceptual connection with something like a normative 'in itself,’ **virtue ethicists** instead **explore the** concrete **dependence of moral activity on the possibility of learning from** already **virtuous agents**. They hold that **the key to moral rationality is** found **in moral education**. Ethics begins with the apprentice moral agent: the child, or the foreigner, or the damaged person in rehabilitation are all examples. These **beginner-agents learn from** the experienced, **wise moral agent by copying**, by mimicking in **their actions** the actions of the virtuous agent. This mimicking, or 'going on in the same way', does not presuppose that the learner agent acquires any representations of how the world is (i.e., beliefs), nor that they acquire the ability to report on or provide justifications for what they do. **Virtue is learned by cottoning on to virtuous ways of doing things**, going on to do the same, **then going on to do the same in new ways**, once they have mastered the skill.16 The way virtue and character is supposed to be basic here is simply displayed in the analogy: **there is and can be nothing 'behind' the expertise of** the phronimos **which can explain or justify it** (any more than there is anything 'behind' the expertise of the doctor or the navigator, to use Aristotle's examples at NE 1104b7-l 1). Of course, plenty more can be said about it, and shortcuts can be found to aid the learn ing of those who have already mastered other skills (so competent rule-fol lowers can learn from being given rules, just as competent grammarians can learn a new language from the grammar). But we should not confuse what it is possible to say about the skill of being moral, with what constitutes it.

#### Solipsism is true - We can only verify that our consciousness exists. Only virtue solves because even if only one subject exists, only virtue resolves the problem of acting for another because it’s a question of developing the self to be good, otherwise we couldn’t generate obligations.

#### Thus, the standard is promoting virtue.

#### Impact Calc: 1) The framing evaluates offense based on whether or not an action allows for the procedural cultivation of virtues— takes out calc indicts since we don’t need to know what a virtue is, we just need to have humans making decisions. 2. Reject calc indicts – a) just proves being virtuous is hard but moral practice is the point, so it just proves the aff is necessary b) actions aimed toward the good are virtuous resolved by intuitions. Anything else collapses to skepticism since we can’t trust our own judgements about morality.

## Offense

#### I defend Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

**[1] Spacecol demonstrates hubris – to take control and appropriate space is to believe that you are above nature itself, which is arrogance.**

**Sparrow 21** (Robert Sparrow, Professor at Monash University; At the highest level of description my research interests are political philosophy and applied ethics; I am interested in philosophical arguments with real-world implications. More specifically, I am working in or have worked in: political philosophy, bioethics, environmental ethics, media ethics; just war theory; and the ethics of science and technology., 1999, accessed on 12-12-2021, Environmental Ethics 21, " Robert Sparrow, The ethics of terraforming - PhilPapers", [https://philpapers.org/rec/SPATEO)[bracketed](https://philpapers.org/rec/SPATEO)%5bbracketed) for gen lang]//phs st recut

IV. THE SIN OF HUBRIS **The other vice which terraforming might involve us in is the sin of hubris.** Hubris is a vice, discussed in classical Greek literature and mythology, which is popularly thought to involve excessive pride before the gods.'9 **It occurs when humans willfully ignore their limits and seek to become like gods.**2° Hubris is traditionally punished by disaster. The excess of pride is the undoing of those who possess it and they are put in their place, usually roughly. **The paradigmatic example of hubris can be found in the legend of Icarus, who flew too close to the sun in the attempt to reach heaven and lost his son as a result**.21 **Planetary engineering strikes** me as **a good candidate for the sort of project which would demonstrate hubris. We would be playing god.** This sentiment is never far from the literature. The rhetoric of **terraforming is quite self-consciously a rhetoric of transformation and transcendence. Terraforming is not just another project. It** is a project that **would make us world makers** **.22 It would mark the next stage of human destiny and the beginning of the conquest of space.** But what about someone who denies that there are any limits on human activity? Someone who holds that there are no gods, no one to challenge, and that human beings can and should forge a glorious destiny? It is obviously unsatisfactory to rely on theistic claims about the proper place of humanity. For the argument to be convincing in modern circumstances, **we must be able to give a non-theistic account of hubris.** There are two strategies we may pursue to develop such an account. **The first and the easiest is to focus on the character and phenomenology of the vice of hubris. To do so, we must provide a description of hubris as an attitude and show that the project of terraforming is** both **the result of and a source of such attitudes.** As noted above, the proponents of terraforming often seem to demon-strate an attitude which is a good prima-facie candidate for hubris. Classically, **hubris involves glorying in one's own powers, a false optimism about them, and a haste to put them to the test. A lack of self-knowledge and self-reflection is also characteristic of hubris**, as is a dismissive attitude toward both critics and past failures. **All of these traits are** sometimes **evidenced in the discussion of terraforming. The project attracts interest simply because it is so dramatic and because of the proof it could provide of the supremacy of human spirit and engineering skill. This enthusiasm** for terraforming **looks particularly damning in the light of past technological disasters on Earth.** There is little self-reflection going on in the debate about terraforming, which is largely a technical debate about feasibility and methods and which allows little room for questions about why we would want to engage in such a project.23 Thus, the attitudes surrounding and driving terraforming seem to fit the phenom- enology of hubris. But this strategy will not, I suspect, prove effective against an entirely serious (including morally serious) and reflective advocate of terra- forming who denies that any of the above attitudes are involved and who challenges the conservative and parochial consequences of the critique. Although the attitudes described above are all, as a matter of contingent fact, demon- strated by current advocates of terraforming, it remains to be argued that they are always likely to be so. In order to meet objections of this type, we need to try to show that the sin of hubris involves a reference to certain sorts of projects. The above attitudes are all part of the burning desire to transgress our limits. We need to give some account of our limits and to show that terraforming is outside of them. **The second strategy is thus to try to formulate a (non-theistic) account of humanity's place in the cosmos and of appropriate limits to human activities, in order to show that projects which transgress these demonstrate hubris**.24 It is important to understand that this argument is an attempt to show that **seeking to transcend certain limits demonstrates hubris; and is therefore wrong, rather than an attempt to show why seeking to transcend certain limits is wrong, and therefore demonstrates hubris. It is intended to remain within an agent-based framework.** We need an account of our limits in order to better show when people are trying to overcome them. Nevertheless, the fact that trying to do so is wrong is solely a function of whether it demonstrates hubris or not, which also depends on any other number of things.25 How do we distinguish these limits? Again it seems to me that there are two ways we might seek some guide to the limits of proper human action. The first moves indirectly toward an account of our limits by fodusing on the nature of our actions and by arguing that certain features are characteristic of projects which seek to transcend our proper limits. **There is often a significant relation between our actions and the projects they are part of. In the case of hubris, acts of hubris are usually large, dramatic, and unprecedented acts.** They are usually punished by disaster. The pride and the fall go hand in hand. The possibility of disaster, then, of failure which would bring us low, operates as a sign of hubris. **Terraforrning certainly involves the possibility of catastrophic failure. Given the scale of the project and the amount of energy involved, failures are likely to be disastrous.** Instead of a habitable planet, we may produce .one with a poisonous atmosphere or without water or lashed by continual typhoons. Indeed, given the amount of resources and human effort which would need to be dedicated to terraforming, anything other than complete success would be a disaster. **Note that it is the possibility of disaster rather than its probability which is important here. I am not arguing that the risks are too great or that the costs of failure are too high. Instead, the possibility of a catastrophic failure which would reveal our ambitions as arrogant and futile acts as an indication that the project is one which oversteps the limits of our wisdom and abilities.** Second, we might attempt more directly to flesh out the idea of our own proper human place. We could try to gain a sense of possible limits to the ambitions which are appropriate to human beings. When considering terraforming, because the limit we are considering here is the physical limit of being confined to a single planet, it seems fair to invoke the metaphor of our proper place in a spatial sense. However, this metaphor can also be understood more generally to pose the question of our proper place in the scheme of things or the limits of the sphere of human activity.26 **To say that some location or area is our proper place is not an empty thought. It implies a certain relation of appropriateness in our presence there. A proper place is one in which one can flourish without too much of a struggle. It is one that we can live in and sustain. It is a place in which one fits and does not appear uncomfortable or out of place.** It is prima facie implausible'to suggest that Mars is our proper place. **The vast amount of effort required for us to sustain a presence there, even to the point of entirely transforming the planet, indicates that it is not a natural environment for us.** Our presence there would be **analogous to that of a penguin in the Sahara or a rabbit underwater. If we have to wear space suits to visit** and to completely remodel it in order to stay, **then it's simply not our place.** Another way to try to understand our proper place is by relating •it to the idea of a home. It seems natural to say of most creatures, at least as individuals and perhaps as species, that they have a home. This is a place which nurtures them, in which they grow up, reproduce and which offers them some semblance of safety. It is difficult to say of human beings collectively, who have colonized all reaches of the globe, where our homeis. But "Earth" looks like a plausible answer. Planets seem to have a certain status as possible homes for creatures because of their nature as whole systems on which life can evolve. The relation between the idea of a home and the idea of our proper place that I am suggesting is an ethical one. Our proper place is at home until we have shown that we are mature enough to leave it. Whether or not people are ready to leave home depends on how well they live at home and how they look after that home. On this test, **the human species does not look well qualified to start moving out to other planets.** We must show that we are capable of looking after our current home before we could claim to have any place on another. For the moment, at least, our proper place is on Earth and the desire to colonize other planets is indicative of hubris.

#### Hubris and human mastery destroys life.

**Dodds 12** - Joseph Dodds, MPhil, Psychoanalytic Studies, Sheffield University, UK, MA, Psychoanalytic Studies, Sheffield University, UK BSc, Psychology and Neuroscience, Manchester University, UK, Chartered Psychologist (CPsychol) of the British Psychological Society (BPS), and a member of several other professional organizations such as the International Neuropsychoanalysis Society, 2012 [“Psychoanalysis and Ecology at the Edge of Chaos” p 70 \*gender mod] cdm // recut emi

Here there are echoes of Freud's (1916) idea of 'anticipatory mourning' and the associated attacks and spoiling that we will study below (see p. 72). However, for Searles the natural world is not just a space for externalizing our conflicts. Rather, a healthy relationship to the non-human environment is essential for human psychological well-being. Furthermore, one consequence of our **alienation from nature is an omnipotent longing for** fusion with our **technology**, and a powerful anxiety should this fully occur. Over recent decades we have come from dwelling in an outer world in which the living works of nature either predominated or were near at hand, to dwelling in an environment dominated by a technology which is wondrously powerful and yet nonetheless dead ... [T]his technology-dominated world [is] so alien, so complex, so awesome, and so overwhelming that we have been able to cope with it only by regressing, in our unconscious experience ... to a degraded state of nondifferentiation from it ... [T]his 'outer' reality is psychologically as much a part of us as its poisonous waste products are part of our physical selves (Searles 1972: 368) **The further we are alienated** from nature, **the more we are driven into** primitive regressive identification and omnipotent fascination with our technology, a powerful positive **feedback loop**. The inner conflict between our human and non-human selves, and our animal and technological natures, is projected onto the environment, further rupturing the relationship and **leading to a spiral of destructiveness as we** 'project this conflict upon, and thus unconsciously **foster**, the war in external reality between the beleaguered remnants of ecologically balanced nature and \*(hu)man's technology which is ravaging them' (ibid.). Here we are in Klein's paranoid-schizoid world, with a primitive ego unable to differentiate between good and bad mother. While ecologists portray a good eco-mummy doing battle with bad techno-mummy, things are not so simple. As we have seen, civilization (and its technology) is a defence, a 'good mother' to protect us from capricious and uncaring mother nature (Freud 1930), but, as Searles suggests, we are supposed to accept that 'our good mother is poisoning us' (Searles 1972: 369). For Searles (1972), behind both **nuclear danger and ecological catastrophe** lies the raw destructiveness Kleinians link to Thanatos, or what Erich Fromm (1992) understands in terms of necrophilia. Searles (1972: 370) argues that at this level of functioning we project 'our own pervasive, poorly differentiated and poorly integrated murderousness, bora of our terror and deprivation and frustration, upon the hydrogen bomb, the military-industrial complex, technology.' We may find the slow, more controllable death from pollution preferable to 'sudden death from nuclear warfare' or we might yearn for the quick relief of a nuclear blast to the 'slow strangulation' of environmental devastation (Searles 1972: 370). Living with such apocalyptic threats leads to a kind of ultimate version of the defence Anna Freud (1936) described as identification with the aggressor. At an unconscious level we powerfully identify with what we perceive as omnipotent and immortal technology, as a defense against intolerable feelings of insignificance, of deprivation, of guilt, of fear of death ... Since the constructive goal of saving the world can be achieved only by one's working, as but one largely anonymous individual among uncounted millions ... it is more alluring to give oneself over to secret fantasies of omnipotent destructiveness, in identification with the forces that threaten to destroy the world. This serves to shield one from the recognition of one's own guilt-laden murderous urges, experienced as being within oneself, to destroy one's own intrapersonal and interpersonal world. (Searles 1972: 370) In this view, we are seeing a kind of repetition on a planetary level of an early intrapsychic anxiety situation. In childhood 'a fantasied omnipotence protected us against the fUll intensity of our feelings of deprivation, and now **it is dangerously easy to** identify with seemingly limitless technology and to **fail to cope with the life-threatening scarcity** **of usable air, food, and water** on our planet' (ibid.). Unfortunately our technological powers have outstripped our emotional maturity, and the omnipotent phantasies of infancy now have a frightening objectivity. In place of a religion we no longer believe in, or hopes for future generations we no longer have meaningful contact with, we identify with our immortal, inanimate technology. In this realm of omnipotent fantasy ... mother earth is equivalent to all of reality ... a drag ... to our yearnings for unfettered omnipotence ... It may be not at all coincidental that our world today is threatened with extinction through environmental pollution, to which we are so strikingly apathetic, just when we seem on the threshold of technologically breaking the chains that have always bound our race to this planet of our origin. I suspect that we collectively quake lest our infantile omnipotent fantasies become fully actualized through man's becoming interplanetary and ceasing thereby to be man ... [W]e are powerfully drawn to suicidally polluting our planet so as to ensure our dying upon it as men, rather than existing elsewhere as ... gods or robots ... **[T]he greatest danger lies** neither in the hydrogen bomb ... nor in the more slowly lethal effect of pollution ... [but] **in** the fact that the world is in such a state as to evoke **our** very earliest **anxieties** and at the same time to offer the delusional 'promise' ... of assuaging these anxieties, effacing them, by fully externalizing and reifying our most primitive conflicts ... In the pull upon us to become omnipotently free of human conflict, **we are in danger of bringing about our extinction.** (Searles 1972: 371-372)

**[2] Commodifying nature strips value away from our form – the correct way to respond to nature is to conform to it instead of restructuring it to fit us. Space colonization is just a method to conquer more parts of nature.**

**Lewis** **21 -** (C.S. Lewis, Clive Staples Lewis was a British writer and lay theologian. He held academic positions in English literature at both Oxford University and Cambridge University., 1943, accessed on 12-12-2021, Samizdat.qc, "The Abolition of Man", [http://www.samizdat.qc.ca/cosmos/philo/AbolitionofMan.pdf)[bracketed](http://www.samizdat.qc.ca/cosmos/philo/AbolitionofMan.pdf)%5bbracketed) for gen lang]//phs st recut

My point may be clearer to some if it is put in a different form. Nature is a word of varying meanings, which can best be understood if we consider its various opposites. **The Natural is the opposite of the Artificial, the Civil, the Human, the Spiritual, and the Supernatural.** The Artificial does not now concern us. If we take the rest of the list of opposites, however, I think we can get a rough idea of what men have meant by Nature and what it is they oppose to her. **Nature seems to be the spatial and temporal**, as distinct from what is less fully so or not so at all. She seems to be **the world of quantity**, as **against** the world of **quality**; of objects as against consciousness; of the bound, as against the wholly or partially autonomous; of that which knows no values as against that which both has and perceives value; of efficient causes (or, in some modern systems, of no causality at all) as against final causes. Now I take it that **when we understand a thing analytically and** then **dominate and use it for our own convenience, we reduce it to the level of ‘Nature’** in the sense that **we suspend our judgements of value about it, ignore its final cause (if any), and treat it in terms of quantity.** This repression of elements in what would otherwise be our total reaction to it is sometimes very noticeable and even painful: **something has to be overcome before we can cut up a dead [hu]man or a live animal in a dissecting room.** These **objects resist the movement of the mind whereby we thrust them into the world of mere Nature.** But in other instances too, **a** similar **price is exacted for our analytical knowledge and manipulative power, even if we have ceased to count it. We do not look at trees either as Dryads or as beautiful objects while we cut them into beams:** the first man who did so may have felt the price keenly, and the bleeding trees in Virgil and Spenser may be faroff echoes of that primeval sense of impiety. The stars lost their divinity as astronomy developed, and the Dying God has no place in chemical agriculture. **To many**, no doubt, **this process is simply the** gradual **discovery that the real world is different from what we expected**, and the old opposition to Galileo or to ‘body-snatchers’ is simply obscurantism. But that is not the whole story. It is not the greatest of modern scientists who feel most sure that the object, stripped of its qualitative properties and reduced to mere quantity, is wholly real. Little scientists, and little unscientific followers of science, may think so. **The great minds know very well that the object, so treated, is an artificial abstraction, that something of its reality has been lost.** From this point of view the conquest of Nature appears in a new light. **We reduce things to** mere Nature in order that we may **‘conquer’ them**. We are always conquering Nature, because ‘Nature’ is the name for what we have, to some extent, conquered. The price of conquest is to treat a thing as mere Nature. **Every conquest over Nature increases her domain.** The stars do not become Nature till we can weigh and measure them: the soul does not become Nature till we can psychoanalyse her. **The wresting of powers from Nature is also the surrendering of things to Nature. As long as this process stops short of the final stage we may well hold that the gain outweighs the loss. But as soon as we take the final step of reducing our own species to the level of mere Nature**, the whole process is stultified, **for this time the being who stood to gain and the being who has been sacrificed are one and the same.** This is one of the many instances where to carry a principle to what seems its logical conclusion produces absurdity. It is like the famous Irishman who found that a certain kind of stove reduced his fuel bill by half and thence concluded that two stoves of the same kind would enable him to warm his house with no fuel at all. **It is the magician’s bargain: give up our soul, get power in return. But once our souls, that is, ourselves, have been given up, the power thus conferred will not belong to us.** We shall in fact be the slaves and puppets of that to which we have given our souls. **It is in [hu]Man’s power to treat himself [oneself] as a mere ‘natural object’ and his own judgements of value as raw material for scientific manipulation to alter at will.** The objection to his doing so does not lie in the fact that this point of view (like one’s first day in a dissecting room) is painful and shocking till we grow used to it. The pain and the shock are at most a warning and a symptom. The real objection is that if man chooses to treat himself as raw material, raw material he will be: not raw material to be manipulated, as he fondly imagined, by himself, but by mere appetite, that is, mere Nature, in the person of his de-humanized Conditioners. We have been trying, like Lear, to have it both ways: to lay down our human prerogative and yet at the same time to retain it. It is impossible. **Either we are rational spirit obliged for ever to obey the absolute values of the Tao, or else we are mere nature to be kneaded and cut into new shapes for the pleasures of masters who must, by hypothesis, have no motive but their own ‘natural’ impulses.** Only the Tao provides a common human law of action which can over-arch rulers and ruled alike. A dogmatic belief in objective value is necessary to the very idea of a rule which is not tyranny or an obedience which is not slavery.

#### [3] Privatization restricts the benefits to be exclusive to the rich who dominate the industry which exacerbates divides and prevents human flourishing.

#### [4] Privatization is incoherent - Everything material intrinsically has a form that’s universally accessible to all people. That means individuals can’t claim ownership to something everyone has access to.

#### [5] Property rights are based on the notion of an individual mixing a unique aspect of themselves with a physical property that justifies a deserving of ownership, but space is not created by individuals, but rather, is discovered. That means we’d be providing arbitrary ownership of an idea to an agent that didn’t create it.

## method

[1] Psychology – Agents intuitively don’t like util. Botti et al 09, Botti, Simona, Kristina Orfali, and Sheena S. Iyengar. "Tragic Choices: Autonomy and Emotional Responses to Medical Decisions." *J Consum Res Journal of Consumer Research* 36.3 (2009): 337-52. 2009. Web. Specifically, we study how making a tragic choice, versus having the same tragic choice externally made, affects individuals’ desire for autonomy and their emotional reactions to the same decision outcome. Prior research has shown that the sense of agency and internal locus of control associated with the act of choosing lead to perceptions of personal causality, whereas the imposition of a choice is removed from the idea of personal causality because it presupposes an external, rather than internal, locus of control (Brehm 1966; deCharms 1968; Deci and Ryan 1985; Langer 1975; Seligman 1975; Taylor and Brown 1988). Stronger causal ascriptions, in turn, have been found to magnify the intensity of emotional responses to an event, so that perceptions of personal causation intensify positive affect from desirable outcomes but also enhance negative affect from undesirable outcomes (Gilovich, Medvec, and Chen 1995; Landman 1987; Ritov and Baron 1995; Weiner 1986). Thus, we hypothesize that a decision outcome following a tragic choice will generate more extreme negative emotions when it is personally chosen because of a greater sense of causality; in contrast, when the same tragic choice is externally determined, negative emotions will be lessened by the per- ceived absence of a causal link with the aversive experience. Yet the torments of making tragic choices do not necessarily reduce people’s desire for autonomy. Prior research has shown that consumers confronted with choices that detrimentally affect their well-being still prefer making these choices themselves rather than having the same choices made for them by somebody else (Botti and Iyengar 2004; Botti and McGill 2006). This desire for choice in spite of its negative consequences can be attributed to consumers’ belief that they will maximize subjective utility by selecting the option that best matches personal preferences (Hotelling 1929). Even when individuals are unaware of their preferences, choosing activates a psychological immune system that facilitates preference matching by subjectively bolstering the value of a personally selected outcome (Gilbert et al. 1998). Through subjective bolstering decision makers are able to reduce the emotional discomfort of decisions that may not be consistent with individual preferences by con- vincing themselves and others that they had chosen the best- matching option (Brehm 1966; Festinger 1957; Shafir et al. 1993).

#### [2] Ks aren’t normative – can’t negate

Stahl 17 - Titus Stahl, The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Theory, 2017 “The metaethics of critical theories” [https://pure.rug.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/39253969/Stahl\_The\_Metaethics\_of\_Critical\_Theories\_authors\_version.pdf] Accessed 7/8/21 SAO

Critical theories have traditionally had an ambivalent relationship to metaethical questions. One of the few claims that all critical theorists agree upon, beginning with Marx and extending to the later generations of the Frankfurt School, is that their critical analysis of society is not a form of “applied ethics”. In other words, such theorists do not first philosophically justify moral principles which are valid everywhere and at all times and then, in a second step, apply such principles to concrete circumstances. As far as they make normative claims about what is wrong with society, these claims are not justified by appealing to an independent moral theory. In contrast to contemporary liberalism, critical theories are instead engaged in “immanent critique” (Stahl 2013a). That is, they do not depart from philosophical principles or moral intuitions but from normative expectations endorsed by empirically existing social contradictions or social movements and, therefore, they believe that they do not need independent moral premises. At least for Marx and the first generation of the Frankfurt School, this methodological choice is based on the belief that moral standards not only are an insufficient basis for the relevant kind of critique, but that the very existence of a moral domain in social practice and philosophical discourse is a symptom of something that is wrong with current societies. First, they assume that societies form a totality, that is, a whole in which everything is only fully comprehensible if one understands its function within this whole. The conceptual structures that govern our thinking are part of this social whole and do not remain unaffected when the social totality is one of domination. Any form of thinking, including moral thinking, will mirror the oppressive structure of society and thus will in some sense be defective. Second they agree that we cannot simply use moral standards to evaluate society if we understand morality as part of a social totality. If moral standards are shaped by society, they do not provide an appropriate point of departure for critique. Although later critical theorists such as Habermas and Honneth reject the idea of society as a totality and consequently also the negative view of morality that results from it, they still subscribe to a more modest version of the same claim: Because they continue to see the very existence of the domain of the moral as a result of the historical evolution of social practices, they also tend to offer analyses of morality in terms of a more basic social theory, rather than themselves engaging in moral theorizing. Consequently, critical theories often take up an external perspective towards moral discourse, treating its existence as a social fact to which their insights could be applied rather than using moral claims to make their normative arguments. Of course, this does not preclude theorizing about the meaning of moral language or the structure of moral motivation (although, other than Habermas, critical theorists have rarely engaged in such projects systematically). But an external perspective on morality that does not engage in moral discourse, but instead merely describes its function, at least need not consider the metaphysical worries about moral properties and moral facts very pressing that are at the center of contemporary analytic debates about metaethics. It is not completely clear, however, that this rejection of morality is consistent with the evaluative stance of critical theory. Critical theorists by no means remain normatively neutral about society: they provide normative arguments for social change that, at least on the surface, look very much like moral arguments (Finlayson 2009, 15). This leads to two questions: First, can critical theorists make plausible that the normative considerations they advance to criticize society are not moral considerations? And what understanding of “morality” is presupposed when they make that claim? Second, if critical theories make normative claims, can they draw on a metaethical theory (even if it does not concern moral judgments in a narrow sense) that can help us to understand how these claims can form the basis of a radical critique of society while still being compatible with the idea that all forms of normative discourse are part of a social totality that might be substantially deformed by oppression and domination? While the claim concerning the embedding of normative discourse in a social totality suggests to many some form of moral relativism, the aspiration of critical theories to transcending moral critique seems to necessitate a commitment to some kind of objectivity in the moral domain that is impossible to square with such an understanding. In order to more make sense of the relationship between critical theories and morality, this chapter will take a close look at the metaethical commitments of the major critical theorists (Marx, Adorno, Habermas and Honneth) in the light of their explicit discussions of morality, in order to find out whether we can make sense of the claim that critical theories develop a fundamental normative, but non-moral critique of society

#### [3] Consequences empirically impossible to predict. Menand 05, Louis Menand (the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of English at Harvard University) “Everybody’s An Expert” The New Yorker 2005 <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2005/12/05/everybodys-an-expert//> FSU SS “Expert Political Judgment” is not a work of media criticism. Tetlock is a psychologist—he teaches at Berkeley—and his conclusions are based on a long-term study that he began twenty years ago. He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. By the end of the study, in 2003, the experts had made 82,361 forecasts. Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate. Tetlock got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, [e.g.] economic growth), or less of something (repression, [e.g.] recession). And he measured his experts on two dimensions: how good they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and how accurate they were at predicting specific outcomes. The results were unimpressive. On the first scale, the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability to all three outcomes—if they had given each possible future a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world, in other words, are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices.

#### [4] Utilitarianism is a bad rule to use.

Card and Smith 20 - Dallas Card & Noah A. Smith, Stanford University & the University of Washington, January 2020“On Consequentialism and Fairness” [https://arxiv.org/pdf/2001.00329.pdf] Accessed 2/5/20 SAO \*We don’t endorse the authors conclusions or rhetoric

Although utilitarianism is highly influential, there are fundamental problems with it. First, aggregating well-being requires measuring individual welfare, but it is unclear that it can be measured in a way that allows for fair comparisons. Even if we restrict the set of morally relevant entities to humans, issues of subjectivity, disposition, and self-reporting make it difficult if not impossible to meaningfully comparison across individuals (Binmore, 2009). Second, even if there were a satisfactory way of measuring individual well-being, there are computational difficulties involved in estimating these values for hypothetical worlds. Given that well-being could depend on fine-grained details of the state of the world, it wis unclear what level of precision would be required of a model in order to evaluate well-being for each entity. Thus, even estimating the overall value of a single state of the world might be infeasible, let alone a progression of them over time. Third, any one-number summary of the distribution of preferences will fail to distinguish between dramatically different distributions. Using the sum, for example, will treat as equivalent two states with the same total value, but with different levels of inequality. While this failing is not necessarily insurmountable, most solutions seem to undermine the inherent simplicity of the utilitarian ideal.9 Fourth, others have challenged the premise of impartiality on the grounds that it is subtly paternalist or patriarchal, emphasizes individual autonomy over relationships and care, and ignores existing relations of power (Friedman, 1991; Driver, 2005; Kittay, 2009). Undoubtedly, there is a long and troubling history of otherwise enlightened philosophers presuming to know what is best for others, and being ~~blind~~ to the harms of institutions such as colonialism, while believing that certain classes of people either don’t count or are incapable of full rationality (Mills, 1987). Ultimately, it seems inescapable to conclude that there is no universally acceptable evaluation function for consequentialism. Rather, we must acknowledge that every action will entail an uneven distribution of costs and benefits. Even in the case where an action literally makes everyone better off, it will almost certainly benefit some more than others. As such, the most credible position is to view the idea of valuation (utilitarian or otherwise) as inherently contested and political. While we might insist that an admissible evaluation function conform to certain criteria, such as disinterestedness, or not being self-defeating (Parfit, 1984), we must also acknowledge that advocating for a particular notion of value as correct is fundamentally a political act.