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## 1NC

### 1NC – OFF

#### **Kantian Deontology necessitates violence – it universalizes ethics based on western assumptions of the “rational subject” which ignores that the “rational subject” is meaningless in all non-western discourses. The attempt to ascribe universal values is a kind of moral imperialism wherein the west systemically and violently eliminates those who it deems as “evil” or “bad actors” via endless genocides. The alternative is to reject the affirmative’s universal ethics in order to develop another line of interpretation which breaks from the solipsistic delusion that we live in a history of our own making.**

Valencia, 2010, Professor of cultural studies. Sayak Valencia, *Gore Capitalism,* p. 111-120, print -zc- <3

In her call for a deontological ethics (made via an adaptation of the Kantian categorical imperative), Adela Cortina writes: “The first commandment is to do no harm”. That said, we turn to an analysis of the constant tendency to forget that History – or at least historical discourses – is grounded in uneven development. If we fail to consider History’s uneven development, we quickly forget that certain concepts of humanism, ethics, and other Western discourses – which are thought to be unquestionable, desirable, and morally acceptable in the first world – lack their status in other contexts and political geographies. This means that in other societies (with distinct histories of development and distinct conceptual frames) these categories are considered empty, abstract, and removed from everyday realities. We should not elide the fact that the establishment of concepts like *equality, liberty, and fraternity* emerged during a specific historical context in a specific culture. And yet these concepts are exported into other cultures (or there is an attempt to do so) and subsequently these cultures are asked to conform to a homogeneous code of conduct based on the thought and practices of the West.12 Nor should we naturalize or erase the fact that the acceptance and adoption of theses concepts in the West has not always been consensual – that these concepts are not inherent but the results of a process of education and legitimation enacted through performative utterances and metaphors that produce that with which they purport to describe. Namely, “that which has been known since the days of Cicero as humanism in the narrowest and widest sense a consequence of literacy” (Sloterdijk, 2009, 12). We cannot expect the same results from the same variable in disparate contexts. We must break with the “solipsistic delusion that [we] live in a history solely of [our] own making” (Davis, 2002, 2) To do so, we need geopolitically situated forms of knowledge. All of this is relevant to understand the brutal effects of extreme violence on us. The interesting thing is not that this violence affects us in a clear and unequivocal manner, but rather that it surprises us – a fact that should alert us that our inattention to the Other in our theorizations is exacting a price. We are unable to confront other dynamics because we are ignorant of them and because our efforts are wedded to the project of legitimating the West as the only reality and possibility. Namely, while the West lives under a *pharmacopornographic and/or biopolitical* capitalism of microcellular surveillance, immersed in a high-tech and high-speed hypermodernity, subjects in other spaces live, theorize, and act based on their own realities. These realities are not disconnected from a West that they are in fact increasingly influencing and reconfiguring; when we get news of these other realities, they explode in our faces and we are horrified. It is as if we lived in interconnected wormholes, a metaphor that interconnects space and time despite them being out of sync: a patchwork of Histories in which temporal tectonic plates interlock and crash against one another in the context of uneven development. In light of this we can argue that Cortina’s words – and her deontological maxim, Do No Harm – are embedded in the reasoning and context of a First World reality governed (or which at least boasts of being governed) by a rule of law that enforces compliance with ethical norms. Notwithstanding this fact, we should remember that: “For the last five centuries, the (relative) prosperity and peace of the ‘civilized’ West was attained through the export of ruthless violence and destruction into the ‘barbarian’ Outside: the long story from the conquest of America to the slaughter in the Congo” (Zizek, 2002, 6). Cortina’s maxim is reformulated and over-turned by the realities of gore capitalism, which are not limited to the Third World but rather are rapidly expanding with globalization and the unification of world capital across the entire planet. Cortina’s affirmation is relativized and brazenly questioned: if the first commandment (for the west) is *Do No Harm*, the response from the deprived is a question: Do No Harm? and an affirmation: Receive no more harm, or Participate in harm as agents and no longer (only) as victims. This affirmation is posited as another – an Other’s – form of empowerment (inconceivable from the viewpoint of Western Ethics). In this sense, Roberto Saviano, reflecting on the breach between ethical judgements and actions, writes: “For some reason one stupidly thinks a criminal act has to be more thought out, more deliberate than an innocuous one. But there’s really no difference. Actions know an elasticity that ethical judgements ignore” (Saviano, 2008, 14). The furious speed of capitalisms transfiguration into gore has subverted the ethical agreements that have governed Western humanism until now. This hardcore version of capitalism has blasted them apart and projected them far outside of its own limits. Ethics have become an accessory in this hyper-consumerist, ultracapitalist world, since they are perceived as “the limit of the loser, the protection of the defeated, and the moral justification for those who haven’t managed to gamble everything and win it all” (Saviano, 2008, 112). The categorical imperative has been displaced by the economic imperative. In this context of systemic exclusion and uneven development, the concept of justice has also been reinterpreted. First, it has been separated from the concept of law. For endriago subjects in gore capitalism the terms are not equivalent, since the law has pre-established codes that do not permit criminal practices. Justice as an abstract concept allows greater malleability around the interpretation of non-stigmatized acts of extreme violence, since for these subjects justice only has a meaning in concrete circumstances. Thus a sort of alternative axiology arises, one approving of all those methods and actions used by gore capitalism as just, because its notion of justice is focused on two basic goals: wealth accumulation and victory over all competitors. We can thus speak of uneven development in the pertinence and applicability of humanist discourse in the territories decontextualized from it. In the case of the Third World we can say “[its] developments over the long term, its rapid deviations and temporalities [and effects] of long duration are not necessarily separate, nor simply overlapping. Some fit inside of others, some stand in for others; at times some cancel others out, while at other times some multiply the effects of others” (Mezzadra, 2008, 168). With the previous quote, we seek to show that the appropriations and repercussions of humanist discourse in the Third World are diverse, affecting it in a multi-vectored and non-hegemonic fashion. We do not deny the impact of humanist discourse on the actions of endriago subjects, or claim that the Third World is entirely removed from it; we merely affirm that its applicability and repercussions are in a state of total becoming and constant reinterpretation. Ethics in the Third World, more than a process, are an *in situ* action. Such reinterpretations will be incomprehensible if our efforts at understanding remain tied to a Western and hierarchical posture that only allows us to perceive them with an exoticizing lens. This approach can lead only to a total rejection, whereby we denigrate and underestimate these practices by labeling them as practices common in underdeveloped and barbaric cultures. On the other hand, artificial glorification of difference – a romanticization that treats these practices as emancipatory responses to First World dynamics – ignores their drawbacks and all that is problematic about them and remains blind to their inflection points. An example of this romanticization – although not an acritical one – is Negri and Cocco’s defense of the Third World as “a laboratory for new experiments in the relations between governments and social movements” (Negri and Cocco, 2007, 3). These theorists claim that Third World subjects – whether they live in the so-called Third World countries, on the borders of the First World, or in the socially-peripheral spheres inside the First World – are the driving force for reorienting the political management of the states governmentality: The insurrection in the French banlieues or the Brazilian favelas, the flight from the countryside, are already sketching radically open and new horizons: show us that the inhabitants of the countryside are the raw material, the flesh of the multitude from which the globalized world is made. (Negri and Cocco, 2007, 1) But their idealizing enthusiasm does not allow them to show us the hidden and complex side of the actions undertaken by these (masculine) peripheral subjects. They do not analyze the impact these practices have on the normalization of dystopian and criminal practices since they leave out an important sector of the insurrectionist subjects created and nurtured by globalization: criminal subjects, the endriagos of gore capitalism. Consequently it is crucial to develop another line of interpretationto understand destruction of ethical norms by endriago subjects, since they toe the line of the most radical dictates of the market. We are forced to leave behind the dichotomy of good versus evil – so familiar to criticism – even when it is expressed in hyper-specialized and grandiose terms. We must learn to speak about things in other ways, as subjects divorced from Manichean logic, without falling into facile celebrations of a “light” Third-Worldism that “combine[s] the most disparate and passing fads, the most contradictory inspirations” (Finkielkraut, 1995, 111). We know that every culture justifies itself and its practices according to its own needs and internal contexts. But this does not mean that the modes of empowerment that result should be accepted at any price, especially if they have been achieved by dystopian means. Nor does it mean that *everything is cultural and therefore all cultures are equally legitimate*, since speaking of the concept of culture as universal erases the specificity of cultures as well as their forms of agency. For this reason, we cannot indiscriminately employ the terms culture and multiculturalism to refer to a hyperconsumerist social formation that understands difference not as a right to be defended but as a synonym for *an ample range of consumer options.* We wish to make it clear that – though perhaps difficult to detect at first glance – humanism has a complex, important, and undeniable role in the logic of gore. The foundation of gore is humanism itself, and their relationship makes the concept of gore relevant for discussions of contemporary capitalism. This is not a linear or singular relationship, but rather gore capitalism participates in the discourse of humanism even as it subverts it or dissents from it, for the discourse of humanism is not applicable to the everyday economic and political conditions of the Third World,13 given that “neoliberalism has no model for social integration” (Negri and Cocco, 2007, 2).

#### There’s a top level double-bind – either a) they were ignorant of Kant’s racial implications and so they’ll concede that you should reject their framework or b) they weren’t which is obviously bad.

#### The ROB is to evaluate competing ethical positions & the ROJ is to be an intellectual.

#### 1. Predictability—resolved implies firm decisions so it’s the only resolutional burden & comes first

#### 2. Fiat can’t overcome inherency & our rhetoric is the only thing that leaves the room because the policies we learn about become outdated by the time we can do anything about them.

#### 3. Precedes arguments about topic education—we’ve impact turned their conception of the topic if we’ve proven their orientation wrong.

#### 4. They chose their assumptions—they should be prepared to defend them & it means no limits explosion nor arbitrariness because it’s reciprocal--- we’re a critique of ideal theory

### 1NC – OFF

#### Private sector doing space now

Diakovska 20 [Halyna Diakovska and Olga Aliieva, Ph.D.s in Philosophy, Associate Professors, Donbass State Pedagogical University, “Consequentialism and Commercial Space Exploration,” 2020, *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Vol. 24, pp. 5-24, https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/24/1, EA]

The experience of the USA showed that leadership in space exploration, which is maintained solely through public funding, could be erroneous. Since 1984, the share of public funding has gradually decreased in space telecommunications, commercial space transportation, remote sensing, etc., while the share of participation of non-state enterprises has increased rapidly. A legal and regulatory framework has been modified to stimulate space commercialization. The stages of space law development are discussed in the research of Valentyn Halunko (Halunko, 2019), Larysa Soroka (Soroka & Kurkova, 2019), etc. Larysa Soroka and Kseniia Kurkova explored the specifics of the legal regulation of the use and development of artificial intelligence for the space area (Soroka & Kurkova, 2019). As a result of changing the legal framework and attracting private investors to the space market, the US did not lose its leadership in space exploration, but rather secured it. Private investment along with government funding have significantly reduced the risk of business projects in the space industry. The quality and effectiveness of space exploration programs have increased. In 2018, Springer published an eloquent book The Rise of Private Actors in the Space Sector. Alessandra Vernile, the author of the book, explores a broad set of topics that reveal the role of private actors in space exploration (Vernile, 2018). The book covers the following topics: “Innovative Public Procurement and Support Schemes,” “New Target Markets for Private Actors,” etc. In the “Selected Success Stories,” Vernile provides examples of successful private actors in space exploration (Vernile, 2018). The current level of competition, which has developed on the space market, allows us to state the following fact. Private space companies have been able to compete with entire states in launching spacecraft, transporting cargo to orbital stations, and exploring space objects. The issue of mining on space objects, the creation of space settlements and the intensive development of the space tourism market are on the agenda. In the 21st century, the creation of non-governmental commercial organizations specializing in the field of commercial space exploration, is regarded as an ordinary activity. They are established as parts of the universities around projects funded by private investors. For example, Astropreneurship & Space Industry Club based on the MIT community (Astropreneurship, 2019). Large-scale research in the field of commercial space exploration, as well as the practical results achieved, led to the formation of a new paradigm called “New Space” ecosystem. The articles of Deganit Paikowsky’s (Paikowsky, 2017), Clelia Iacomino (Iacomino & Ciccarelli, 2018) et al. reveal its key meanings and the opportunities it offers in the space sector. The “New Space” ecosystem is a new vision for commercial space exploration. It is the formation of a cosmic worldview, in which the near space with all the wealth of its resources and capabilities, becomes a part of the global economy and the sustainable development of the society. The “New Space” ecosystem offers the following ways for commercial space exploration (Iacomino & Ciccarelli, 2018): 1. Innovative public procurement and support schemes, which significantly expand the role of commercial actors in space exploration. 2. Attracting new entrants in the space sector. First of all, these are companies working in the domain of Information and communications technology, artificial intelligence, etc. that are expanding their research in space markets. They offer innovative business models and new solutions to space commercialization. 3. Innovative industrial approaches based on new processes, methods, and industrial organization for the development and production of space systems or launchers. 4. Disruptive market solutions, which significantly reduce commercial space exploration prices, increase labor productivity, provide new types of services, etc. 5. Substantial private investment from different sources and involving different funding mechanisms. For instance, these are private fortunes, venture capital firms, business angels, private equity companies, or banks, etc. 6. Involvement of an increasing number of space-faring nations investing in the acquisition of turnkey space capabilities or even in the development of a domestic space industrial base. This expands the space markets and makes it more competitive. The analysis of the research and advances in commercial space exploration allows us to draw the following conclusions: 1. In fact, the space market has already been created. It is currently undergoing continuous development that will integrate the resources and capabilities of the near space into the global economy over the next decade. 2. A new paradigm, denoted by the term “New Space” ecosystem, is at the heart of the created space market. The “New Space” ecosystem is a step towards the formation of cosmic thinking, in which outer space, with its resources and capabilities, is considered as a sphere of human activities. 3. Space market regulates space law, which is constantly evolving. The space law develops within the bounds of international law. In essence, the space market is integrated into the international legal field and is governed by its laws.

#### But appropriation is key to transform short-term goals into settlement.

Jonckheere 18 [Evarist Jonckheere, Master of Laws, Ghent University, “The Privatization of Outer Space and the Consequences for Space Law,” 2018, Master’s Thesis, https://libstore.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/002/479/330/RUG01-002479330\_2018\_0001\_AC.pdf, EA]

The reality is that private enterprises are already moving in a direction that will need a similar regime. So, the big legal uncertainties concerning space property should be dealt with sooner rather than later.194 Legal certainty on an international level would greatly benefit the space industry. The existing risks of space ventures would be minimized as private companies would know what they are up against. This could give a boost to private enterprises to be more technologically innovative and entrepreneurial when it comes to outer space exploration. The prospect of gaining property rights might push them to undergo more fully realized expeditions for larger and fixed rewards. The legal regime should however ensure fairness and order between the competing space entrepreneurs.195

#### That prevents other-wise inevitable extinction – independently creates massive tech spillover, global coop, and new resources.

Green 21 [Brian Patrick Green, director of technology ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, “Space Ethics,” 2021, Rowman, pp. 4-5, EA]

In favor of going into space are such basics as gaining scientific knowledge and developing beneficial new technologies, both of which space exploration and use have already begun to accomplish with dramatic and sometimes unexpected effects for humankind. Scientific advancements include astronomical and cosmological knowledge from various orbiting experiments and telescopes that have let us gain unprecedented understanding about our universe. But space activities have also contributed to a great deal of scientific knowledge about our Earth, including measurements of environmental status, habitat conversion and destruction, detailed knowledge of anthropogenic climate change, and much about Earth’s chemistry and geology. We have also learned a great deal about our local planets, for example, that a runaway “greenhouse effect” in the atmosphere of Venus makes the surface scorchingly hot, while too little greenhouse effect on Mars leaves the surface quite cold. There have also been significant contributions made to medical science, especially concerning the behavior of the human body when subjected to radiation, microgravity, nutritional restrictions, and so on. On the technological side, everything with American global positioning system (GPS), Russian Glonass, or other global navigation systems—from smartphones to military vehicles—relies on a network of satellites above us, placed there by rocketry and painstakingly tracked with instruments developed for the task. So many technologies have been pioneered by space exploration and use that it is hard to list them all, but some of the more important ones include weather satellites (which are not only convenient but also allow preparation for and evacuation from severe weather), communication satellites, solar photovoltaic (PV) cells, advances in electronics and computers, advances in materials science, and so on. Space is also an important location for the contention of national interests in a geopolitical and military sense. As the ultimate “high ground” in battle, space allows certain asset classes such as spy satellites to exist in a position unassailable by many or most opponents. While permanent weapons stations and weapons of mass destruction are banned from space by the United Nations Outer Space Treaty (OST), 6 that has not stopped the development of weapons that are impermanent (such as missiles, missile interceptors, and antisatellite weapons) or the research and development of possible space-based weapons platforms, such as were envisioned by U.S. president Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, nicknamed “Star Wars.” While military and political interests may ultimately seem to be a less noble reason to explore and use space, relative power, safety, and security certainly are very human interests and are valuable to those who feel they are being protected by them. Space activities are also a key way of promoting international cooperation and global awareness. While the international competition of the “space race” fueled one nation all the way to the Moon, shortly afterward, the Apollo-Soyuz program announced a thawing of this competition and commenced a period of cooperation between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Currently the International Space Station continues this cross-national cooperation in space, with five space agencies (representing Canada, the European Space Agency nations, Japan, Russia, and the United States) participating. In addition to cooperation in space exploration itself, the perspective given from space has itself helped to produce some feelings of unity on Earth, with the famous “Blue Marble” and “Earthrise” pictures showing Earth’s oneness and scientific discoveries supported by space science, such as those related to climate change, helping to promote international cooperation to address these problems. Gaining access to new critical resources may be another reason to go into space. Earth is a finite planet, and certain elements on Earth are very rare in the planetary crust, particularly platinum group metals that are very dense and siderophilic (iron-loving) and so have tended to sink toward the core over the natural history of the planet. However, asteroids and other objects in space (for example, planets, comets, and moons) can sometimes have these elements in abundance and in more available locations, making them potentially excellent sources for these valuable materials. Now-defunct asteroid-mining startup Planetary Resources once estimated that one “platinum-rich 500 meter wide asteroid contains . . . 1.5 times the known world-reserves of platinum group metals (ruthenium, rhodium, palladium, osmium, iridium, and platinum).” 7 In addition to returning elements to a resource-hungry Earth, further exploration and development of space will require access to resources that are not purely sourced from Earth. In particular, it will be necessary to gain access to water, which is relatively rare in the inner solar system and which would be far too costly to transport in any significant amounts from the Earth’s surface. Another reason that humans may want to explore space would be to create a “backup Earth” to hedge against global catastrophic and existential risks (risks that may cause widespread disaster or human extinction, respectively) on our home planet. 8 Earth has always been a dangerous place for humans, with asteroid impacts, supervolcanic eruptions, pandemic disease, and other natural hazards threatening civilization. Now, in addition to these natural threats, human-made hazards such as nuclear weapons, climate change, biotechnology, nanotechnology, and artificial intelligence may threaten not only the viability of technological civilization but perhaps the survival of human life itself. A serious global-scale catastrophe could set back civilization many decades or centuries, and the worst disasters could cause human extinction. In one scenario, in which 100 percent of humanity dies, all of human effort for all of history would be for nothing. However, were the same global catastrophe to happen to Earth, yet humans were a multiplanetary species with just one self-sustaining settlement off-Earth, it would not result in the end of human civilization or human extinction. Instead while the same unimaginable fate would befall the Earth (certainly no mere triviality, with perhaps the deaths of 99.999 percent of all humans and possibly the destruction of the ecosphere and everything in it), at least all of human and planetory history would not be for nothing. Human life and culture would go on elsewhere, as well as other Earth species. This is a dire fate, but less terrible than the first.

#### Immeasurable expected value also outweighs.

Baum 16 – Executive Director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute [Seth D. Baum, “The Ethics of Outer Space: A Consequentialist Perspective,” 2016, Springer, pp. 115-116, EA]

Space colonization is notable because it may be able to bring utterly immense increases in intrinsic value. Early colonies might start small, given that other planets and moons have inhospitable environments. However, it may be possible to build large indoor colonies or create more hospitable outdoor environments (i.e., terraforming). Even just on other planets and moons in the Solar System, space colonies could multiply the total area available for human habitation. And there are many more planets around other stars, as ongoing research on exoplanets is now learning. One recent study estimates 22 % of Sun-like stars have Earth-like exoplanets (Petigura et al. 2013), implying billions to tens of billions of potentially habitable planets across the galaxy. Opportunities at any given star may also be quite a bit greater than those available only on planets. Earth only receives about one two-billionth of the Sun’s radiation. To collect all the Sun’s radiation, humanity would need a Dyson swarm (named after Dyson 1960), which is a series of structures that surrounds a star, collecting its radiation to power a civilization. A Dyson swarm around the Sun could potentially enable a civilization a billion times larger than is possible on Earth. Likewise, Dyson swarms around one billion stars would bring humanity approximately 1018 (one billion–billion) times more energy per unit time. Space colonies could also increase the amount of time available for human civilization. Earth will remain habitable for a few billion more years (O’Malley-James et al. 2014). Stars will continue shining for about 1014 more years (Adams 2008). That gives us an additional 105 times more energy, for a total of 1023 times more energy than is available on Earth. After the stars fade, other energy sources may be available. And even if our current universe eventually becomes uninhabitable, it may be possible to move to other universes (Kaku 2005). The physics here is speculative, but it cannot be ruled out, and hence there is a nonzero chance of a literally infinite opportunity for space colonization (Baum 2010a). Whether the opportunity is infinite or merely, say, 1023 times larger than what can be done on Earth, the opportunity is clearly immense. As long as space colonization is an improvement (Sect. 8.3.1), then it would seem that the consequentialist should prioritize space colonization. The sooner space colonization begins, the more of its immense opportunity can be gained. Indeed, Ćirković (2002) estimates 5 × 1046 human lifetimes are lost for every century in which space colonization is delayed. There can also be large value for space colonization under ecocentric intrinsic value. It is sometimes argued that Earth would be better off without humans. For example, the Voluntary Human Extinction Movement states that “Phasing out the human race by voluntarily ceasing to breed will allow Earth’s biosphere to return to good health” (http://vhemt.org, accessed 25 October 2015). However, this makes sense only if extraterrestrial locations are not intrinsically valued. Otherwise, exterminating humanity ruins the opportunity for humans to bring flourishing ecosystems into outer space. Terraforming other planets or bringing ecosystems into Dyson swarms could bring immense amounts of ecosystem flourishing.

### 1NC – OFF

#### Interpretation: debaters must refrain from the usage of fiat

#### The usage of fiat is uniquely bad and a voting issue:

#### A] Presumption – the affirmative doesn’t do anything; they just suggest actions from an external actor, meaning they resolve none of their impacts, meaning you vote neg on presumption

#### B] Strat Skew – fiat allows affirmatives to spike out of answers under the guise of “we can fiat past this” – decks neg solvency deficits and ground which is more often than not already unfairly skewed because of an aff-biased resolution

### 1NC – Util

#### [1] Utilitarianism is the only predictable method of debate--- categorial imperatives and maxims are unique to individuals and therefore proliferate infinite tiny affirmatives with different imperatives--- that makes neg prep impossible and kills clash

#### No RVIs--- illogical, you shouldn’t win for being fair, and good theory debaters will read abusive positions to bait theory and dump on an RVI Phil debates justify performative contradictions--- impossible to garner ground on a yes/no question

#### [2] Prefer consequentialist util--- it turns Kant because “objective morality” can’t assume modern day structural issues, international conflicts etc which imposing one morality over can’t solve

#### [3] Existential threats outweigh – all life has infinite value and extinction eliminates the possibility for future generations – err negative, because of innate cognitive biases

-- must preserve infinite lives and generations

-- question of intergenerational equity

-- existential threats are underestimated: global public good, intergenerational, unprecedented, scope neglect

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>, Accessed 7/22/2017, Kent Denver-jKIM)

1.2. THE ETHICS OF EXISTENTIAL RISK In his book Reasons and Persons, Oxford philosopher Derek Parfit advanced an influential argument about the importance of avoiding extinction: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. ... The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second.65 In this argument, it seems that Parfit is assuming that the survivors of a nuclear war that kills 99% of the population would eventually be able to recover civilisation without long-term effect. As we have seen, this may not be a safe assumption – but for the purposes of this thought experiment, the point stands. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is that they would “destroy the future,” as another Oxford philosopher, Nick Bostrom, puts it.66 This future could potentially be extremely long and full of flourishing, and would therefore have extremely large value. In standard risk analysis, when working out how to respond to risk, we work out the expected value of risk reduction, by weighing the probability that an action will prevent an adverse event against the severity of the event. Because the value of preventing existential catastrophe is so vast, even a tiny probability of prevention has huge expected value.67 Of course, there is persisting reasonable disagreement about ethics and there are a number of ways one might resist this conclusion.68 Therefore, it would be unjustified to be overconfident in Parfit and Bostrom’s argument. In some areas, government policy does give significant weight to future generations. For example, in assessing the risks of nuclear waste storage, governments have considered timeframes of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even a million years.69 Justifications for this policy usually appeal to principles of intergenerational equity according to which future generations ought to get as much protection as current generations.70 Similarly, widely accepted norms of sustainable development require development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.71 However, when it comes to existential risk, it would seem that we fail to live up to principles of intergenerational equity. Existential catastrophe would not only give future generations less than the current generations; it would give them nothing. Indeed, reducing existential risk plausibly has a quite low cost for us in comparison with the huge expected value it has for future generations. In spite of this, relatively little is done to reduce existential risk. Unless we give up on norms of intergenerational equity, they give us a strong case for significantly increasing our efforts to reduce existential risks. 1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75

#### [4] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only consequences explain why the second is worse. Intuitions outweigh—they’re the basis for any action even if we can’t deductively determine why. Universalization misunderstands the contingency of human actions--- I.e. if my maxim says stealing is wrong I wouldn’t steal a penny from jeff bezos to stop a genocide

#### 5] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen

#### 6] Reject calc indicts:

#### A] Empirically denied—both individuals and policymakers carry out effective cost-benefit analysis which means even if decisions aren’t always perfect it’s still better than not acting at all

#### B] Theory—they’re functionally NIBs that everyone knows are silly but skew the aff and move the debate away from the topic and actual philosophical debate, killing valuable education

#### Their “if you debate me I’m right” argument is self serving--- they have to win debate allows for zero freedom without the aff which is objectively untrue

#### Korsegaard agrees that if humans have unconditional value it’s a question of who has the most humans left at the end of the day

#### [7] A Posterori reasoning is good a] Drawing conclusions from individual events questions how and why actors act which is the only reasonable question to access solvency b] No is/ought gap--- its not in the rez c] A priori ethics devolve minority’s agency insofar as their personal experiences are viewed as outside the “objective truth” like how victims of rape are denied legal agency because we view “innocent before guilty” as an objective truth

### 1NC – Case

#### [1] Extinction outweighs under Kant and flourishing flips impact calculus

Green 21 [Brian Patrick Green, director of technology ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, “Space Ethics,” 2021, Rowman, pp. 21, EA]

With regard specifically to space exploration and use, there are two deontological ethical systems that are particularly relevant. The first is Hans Jonas’s imperative of responsibility that he originally developed as an environmental ethic for Earth but that has profound relevance for space.15 In this form of deontological ethics, Jonas asserts that the only truly categorical imperative is not the one that Kant asserted but rather a more fundamental one that underlies Kant’s imperative, that we ought to “act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuinely human life.” 16 Because every ethical rule is premised upon human existence, the first ethical rule logically should be that humans ought to exist.

The second deontological system oriented toward space is Richard Randolph and Christopher McKay’s principle focused on “protecting and expanding the richness and diversity of life.” 17 This rule is meant to guide future human exploration and use of space toward both protecting the diversity of life in the universe, if we happen to find extraterrestrial life, and expanding life, be it Earthly or otherwise, in the universe. In both cases life also ought to be enriched—given the opportunity to flourish, further develop, and evolve into new forms.

#### [2] Kantian logics have a structural problem insofar as it’s too totalizing--- establishing a core moral set of logics over everything else erases centuries of native spiritualities, black culture etc and their logics--- I.E. their categorical imperative can’t account for what the world actually looks like

#### [3] the attempt towards creating a singular perfect ideology is impossible and nonprescriptive of subjective experience--- this drive to a singular objective knowledge results in seeking falsehoods and justifying bad action under the guise of objectivity which allows for the creation of infinite abhorrence

#### [4] If space has no real property rights it means there’s no impact--- aliens won’t view it and its only a legal development question--- means the DA is true

#### [5] The Ferrero evidence is bad because it results in hyperconformity and is unable to question why people do things. The aff doesn’t get fiat in this debate which means there’s no solvency. Vote negative for the only explanatory power on why people do things not if they should

#### [6] No risk of aliens or by the time they advance we’re all dead an its nonunique

Moynihan 20

(10/20/20, Thomas Moynihan is a researcher at Oxford University with a focus on existential risk analysis, “X-RISK: How Humanity Discovered Its Own Extinction”, pages 3-4, print zc)

By the time scientists sit down to eat in the mess hall, housed inside a sizeable log cabin on the Los Alamos site, one of their number has turned the conversation to more serious matters. ‘Where, then, is everybody?’ he asks. They all know that he is talking about extraterrestrials – and that, as far as he is concerned – this urgent question is no laughing matter.8 The question was asked by Enrico Fermi. It has since come to be known as the Fermi Paradox, and is perhaps the single greatest conundrum of our modern scientific world view. The basic idea is that a growing number of well-established factors lead us to expect that we should see at least some evidence of intelligent activity beyond the Earth. Superabundant evidence, in fact. And yet, bin-stealing UGO visitations notwithstanding, we’ve found absolutely nothing. This fact, according to Fermi’s line of thought, has chilling implications. Assuming a naturalistic origin to life and mind, and taking into consideration the titanic size and age of the universe, so the argument goes, there should be other, much older – and thus more advanced – civilizations ‘out there’. And there are good reasons to presume that such extremely advanced civilizations would be visible to us in one way or another. All of this reasoning is founded upon solid science.4 To put it as simply as possible, inorganic matter on our own planet eventually developed into civilization capable of broadcasting its existence into outer space, so wouldn’t we expect this to have happened elsewhere as well? And yet we see no evidence of spacefaring empires, no obvious superstructures, no grand feats of astroengineering, not even a lonely radio transmission. Just canopying silence. So where is everybody? With recent discoveries revealing innumerable terrestrial exoplanets, the discovery on earth of extremophile lifeforms that thrive in inhospitable environments, and the realisation that our own planet is a relative latecomer on the galactic scene, the urgency of the paradox has only intensified since Fermi’s time. Bringing the Paradox Home The Eerie silence of the skies above, many have since argued, may well tell us something ominous about the future course of our own civilisation down here. Fermi, one of the chief architects of the atom bomb, seems himself to have immediately made the inference that perhaps we don’t see interstellar colonization efforts because ‘technological civilization doesn’t last long enough for it to happen’.5

#### [7] Cordelli flows neg--- agrees unilateral will is bad and thus the aff shouldn’t impose it on others--- we read Green

Chiara Cordelli 2016, University of Chicago, Political Science & the College [cordelli@uchicago.edu](mailto:cordelli@uchicago.edu) https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/What-is-Wrong-With-Privatization\_UCB.pdf

The intrinsic wrong of privatization, I will suggest, rather consists in the creation of an institutional arrangement that, by its very constitution, denies those who are subject to it equal freedom. I understand freedom as an interpersonal relationship of reciprocal independence. To be free is not to be subordinated to another person’s unilateral will. By building on an analytical reconstruction of Kant’s Doctrine of Right, I will argue that current forms of privatization reproduce (to a different degree) within a civil condition the very same defects that Kant attributes to the state of nature, or to a pre-civil condition, thereby making a rightful condition of reciprocal independence impossible. Importantly, this is so even if private actors are publicly authorized through contract and subject to regulations, and even if they are committed to reason in accordance with the public good. The reason for this, as I will explain, derives from the fact that private agents are constitutionally incapable of acting omnilaterally, even if their actions are omnilaterally authorized by government through some delegation mechanism, e.g. a voluntary contract. Omnilateralness, I will suggest, must be understood as a function of 1) rightful judgment and 2) unity. By rightful judgment I mean the capacity to reason publicly and to make universal rules that are valid for everyone, according to a juridical ideal of right, as necessary to solve the problem of the unilateral imposition of private wills on others. By unity I mean the capacity to make rules and decisions that change the normative situation of others, as a part of a unified system of decision-making. The condition of unity is crucial, as I shall later explain, insofar as there might be multiple interpretations compatible with rightful judgment, which would still problematically leave the definition of people’s rightful entitlements indeterminate. Further, the practical realization of the juridical idea of an omnilateral will, I will contend, requires embeddedness within a shared collective practice of decision-making. In practice, rightful judgment can only obtain when certain shared background frameworks that structure practical reasoning and confer unity to that reasoning are in place. The rules of public administration and the authority structure of bureaucracy should be understood as playing this essential function of giving empirical and practical reality to the omnilateral will, as far as the execution of rules and the concrete definition of entitlements are concerned. Together, these two requirements are necessary, (whether they are also sufficient is a different question), to make an action the omnilateral action of a state, which has the moral power to change the normative situation of citizens, by fixing the content of their rights and duties in accordance with the equal freedom of all. The phenomenon of privatization thus raises the fundamental questions of why we need political institutions to begin with, and what makes an action an action of the state. Insofar as private agents make decisions that fundamentally alter the normative situation (the rights and duties) of citizens, and insofar as, by definition, private agents are not public officials embedded in that shared collective practice, their decisions, even if well intentioned and authorized through contract, cannot count as omnilateral acts of the state. They rather and necessarily remain unilateral acts of men. Hence, I will conclude, for the very same reasons that we have, following Kant, a duty to exit the state of nature so as to solve the twofold problems of the unilateral imposition of will on others and the indeterminacy of rights, we also have a duty to limit privatization and to support, on normative grounds, a case for the re-bureaucratization of certain functions. Therefore, my paper provides foundational reasons to agree with Richard Rorty’s nonfoundational defense of bureaucracy as stated in the opening epigraph, since only agents who are appropriately embedded within a bureaucratic structure, properly understood, are, in many cases, capable of acting omnilaterally. The “bosses” I am here concerned with are not primarily those who 5 can unilaterally impose their will on us in their capacity as private employers, but rather any private actor who acts unilaterally while in the garb of the state.

### U/V

#### No new 1AR theory--- underviews give them time to prempt any argument and justifies kicking the 1AC for 1AR RVIs--- plus no substantive 1NC abuse proves they have no offense on this. 2AR isn’t too short--- 3 minutes is enough time if you’re right--- plus theory undermines their maxim--- what people owe each other means reciprocity--- that’s a back and forth not tacked on hidden arguments

#### Neg theory first--- they get first and last speech which justifies saying “weigh the round after the 1NC” which decks clash and education over moral imperatives

#### 2] Permissibility negates--- a] Ought is not in the topic wording and therefore unapplicable b] none of the “proactive justification or anything is permissible”--- individual moral frameworks allow us to question bad actors and go away from loopholes--- I.E. if I say an omnilateral imperative is to punish all those who say something mean to me it jusitifes infinite murder--- it’s nonsensical

#### 3] Presumption negates--- it’s a question of if the aff has sufficiently met a solvency burden of proof and because they can’t fiat a philosophical affirmation it’s a neg presumption ballot--- common logic and offense all negates the “true before false” and “Illogicality” arguments

#### And questioning reasons are good—key to in round clash and debate as a whole--- if an aff has to rest on not being questioned its bad