**1AC – Framework**

#### Theories cannot be static because we are constantly learning. Historical moral progress proves we shift our norms but only adaptable theories can withstand the test of time.

#### Thus, the meta ethic is constructivism. Prefer –

#### 1] Temporality – It is impossible to construct perfect theories because they’re debunked by the future when we realize it doesn’t perfectly fit our way of life

#### 2] Epistemology – Formulating correct theories requires an understanding of the mind which means the construction of knowledge over time is valuable.

#### 3] Subject Formation – experiences shape identity because we construct our thoughts based on how we feel.

University at Buffalo Center for Educational Innovation **(U@Buffalo CEI)**. (**2020**, December 08). Constructivism. Retrieved April 14, 2021, from http://www.buffalo.edu/ubcei/enhance/learning/constructivism.html

**Constructivism** is the theory that **says learners construct knowledge rather than** just **passively take in information.** **As people experience the world and reflect** upon those experiences, **they build their own representations and incorporate new information into their pre-existing knowledge (schemas).**

Related to this are the processes of assimilation and accommodation.

* **Assimilation** refers to the process of taking new information and fitting it into an existing schema.
* **Accommodation** refers to using newly acquired information to revise and redevelop an existing schema.

**For example, if I believe** that **friends are always nice, and meet a** new **person who is** always **nice to me I may call this person a friend, assimilating them into my schema.** **Perhaps, however, I meet a different person who sometimes pushes me to try harder and is not always nice.** **I may decide to change my schema to accommodate** this person by deciding a friend doesn’t always need to be nice if they have my best interests in mind. **Further, this may make me reconsider whether the first person still fits into my friend schema.**

Consequences of constructivist theory are that:

* Students learn best when engaged in learning experiences rather passively receiving information.
* Learning is inherently a social process because it is embedded within a social context as students and teachers work together to build knowledge.
* Because knowledge cannot be directly imparted to students, the goal of teaching is to provide experiences that facilitate the construction of knowledge.

This last point is worth repeating. A traditional approach to teaching focuses on delivering information to students, yet constructivism argues that you cannot directly impart this information. Only an experience can facilitate students to construct their own knowledge. Therefore, the goal of teaching is to design these experiences.

#### **Only a pragmatic deliberative model accepts ongoing confrontation as legitimate rather than oppositional.** Thus, the standard is promoting pragmatic deliberation.

Serra 1 [Juan Pablo Serra. What Is and What Should Pragmatic Ethics Be? Some Remarks on Recent Scholarship. EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PRAGMATISM AND AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY. 2009. Francisco de Vitoria College, Humanities Department, Faculty member]

This separation of theory and practice runs parallel to another split, namely, that of ethics and morals or, better put, of ethical theory and moral practice. Peirce denies that morality is subject to rationality and thinks that ethicsisvaluable as a science in a broad sense. But he also regards ethics as a science which bears on human conduct only indirectly, through the examination of past actions and the self-correction of the self in view of future action. In addition, ethics would be a normative knowledge only in so far as it analyzes the adjustment of actions to ends and in so far as it studies the general way in which a good life can be lived. In morals Peirce appeals to instinct and sentiment, and in ethics he recommends the use of logical thinking —just as scientists do. However, even within the framework of his system, it’s not obvious that scientists may so easily set aside their instincts —in fact, instinct (or ‘rational instinct’ as he called it in 1908) plays a significant role in the economy of re- search. Moreover, the statement that in moral issues there may be no possibility of carrying out an inquiry that is truth-oriented is not an uncontroversial one. After all, moralinquiryisperformedin a deliberativeway**,** weighing up argumentations, beliefs andprinciples**,** andcomparingthem either with their probable or conceivable consequences or with lived as well as possible experiencesthatcan be forceful or impingeuponthe deliberative subject in such a way as to acquire the compulsory resistance due to reality. As Misak puts it succint- ly, “the practice of moral deliberation is responsive to experience, reason, argument, and thought experiments... Suchresponsivenessispartofwhatitistomakea moral decision and part of what it is to try to live a moral life” (2000: 52)3. Likewise, this same deliberativeactivityimpliesanefforttoacquirehabits**,** beliefs and principles thatcontributeto a truly freedeliberation which, in turn, can result in creative conclusions. For Peirce, as you get more habit-governed, you become more creative and free, and your selfhood acquires plas- ticity and receptiveness to experience4. Vincent Colapietro has referred to Peirce’s description of human reason in terms of a deliberative rationality (1999: 24). Also, in another place he has explained that deliberation for Peirce is a process of preparation for future action which has to do with the checking of previous acts, the rehearsal in imagination of different roads to be followed by possible conduct and the nurturing of ideals (Colapietro 1997: 270, 281). It is precisely this experi- ment carried out within imagination that generates habits, because, as Peirce says in “A Survey of Pragmaticism”, “it is not the muscular action but the accompanying inward ef- forts, the acts of imagination, that produce the habit” (CP 5.479, 1907). Habits are regular ways of thinking, perceiving and interpreting that generate actions. As such, habits have a huge influence on human behavior, manifest themselves in the con- crete things we do and, at the same time, are formed within those same activities. Even more, according to Peirce, theactivitytakes the formofexperimentation in the inner world; and the conclusion (if it comes to a definite conclusion), is that under given conditions, the interpreter will have formed the habit of acting in a given way whenever he may desire a given kind of result. The real and living logical conclusionisthat habit (CP 5.491, 1907). Much more evidence could be given to support the view that habits are virtually decided (CP 2.435, c.1893) and also that intelligence comprises inward or potential actions that in- fluence the formation of habits (CP 6.286, 1893). Suffice it to say that, according to Peirce, deliberation is a function of the imagination, and that imagination is in itself an experiment which may have unexpected consequences that impose themselves upon the deliberative subject.

#### Additionally prefer

#### 1] Performativity- Responding to our framework concedes the validity of pragmatism since that in and of itself is a process of contestation that pragmatism would say is valuable and necessary for spaces like debate to function.

#### 2] Materiality- Our framework understands knowledge as changing in order to base social change and revision of ideas. Glaude 7’ Eddie S. (Eddie S. Glaude Jr. is the chair of the Center for African-American Studies and the William S. Tod Professor of Religion and African-American Studies at Princeton University.) In a Shade of Blue : Pragmatism and the Politics of Black America. University of Chicago Press, 2007. EBSCOhost. (5-7) Bracketed for grammer. Dulles AS

In a Shade of Blue is my contribution to the tradition I have just sketched. My aim is to think through some of the more pressing conceptual problems confronting African American political life, and I do so as a Deweyan prag-matist. I should say a bit about what I mean by this self-description. John Dewey thought of philosophy as a form of cultural and social criticism. He held the view that philosophy, properly understood as a mode of wis-dom, ought to aid us in our efforts to overcome problematic situations and worrisome circumstances. The principal charge of the philosopher, then, is to deal with the problems of human beings, not simply with the problems of philosophers. For Dewey, over the course of his long career, this involved bridging the divide between science, broadly understood, and morals—a divide he traced to a conception of experience that has led philosophers over the centuries to tilt after windmills. Dewey declared, “The problem of restoring integration and co-operation between man’s beliefs about the world in which he lives and his beliefs about values and purposes that should direct his conduct is the deepest problem of any philosophy that is not isolated from life.”9Dewey bases this conclusion on several features of his philosophy: (1) anti foundationalism, (2) experimentalism, (3) contextualism, and (4) soli-darity.10 Antifoundationalism, of course, is the rejection of foundations of knowledge that are beyond question. Dewey, by contrast, understands knowledge to be thefruitof our undertakingsas we seek “the enrichment of our immediate experience through **the** control over action it exercises.”11He insists that we turn our attention from supposed givens to actual consequences, pursuing a future fundamentally grounded in values shaped by experience and realized in our actions. This view makes clear the experimental function of knowledge. Dewey emphasized that knowledge entails efforts to control and select future experience and that we are always con-fronted with the possibility of error when we act. We experiment or tinker**,** withthe understanding that all facts are fallible and, as such, occasionally afford us the opportunity for revision.12Contextualism refers to an understanding of beliefs, choices, and actions as historically conditioned. Dewey held the view that inquiry, or the pursuit of knowledge, is value-laden, in the sense that we come to problems with interests and habits that orient us one way or another, and that such pursuits are also situational, in the sense that “knowledge is pursued and produced somewhere, some when, and by someone.”13Finally, solidaritycaptures the associational and cooperative dimensions of Dewey’s thinking. Dewey conceives of his pragmatism as “an instrument of social improvement” aimed principally at expanding democratic **life** andbroadeningtheground of individual self-development**.**14Democracy, for him, constitutes more than a body of formal procedures; it is a form of life that requires constant attention if we are to secure the ideals that purportedly animate it. Individuality is understood as developing one’s unique capacities within the context of one’s social relations and one’s community. The formation of the democratic character so important to our form of associated living involves, then, a caring disposition toward the plight of our fellows and a watchful concern for the well-being of our democratic life.

#### 3] TJFS- A] Inclusion – Pragmatism is a procedural for allowing argumentation in the debate space which controls the internal link to inclusion which is an impact multiplier B] Resource Disparities- Discursive frameworks ensure big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity and require a higher level of analytic thinking that small schools have.

#### 4] Root cause- Pragmatism solves the root cause of all violence – an affirmation of ethics which recognize others is key.

Burggraeve [http://www.staff.amu.edu.pl/~ewa/Burggraeve-Violence%20and%20the%20Vulnerable%20Face%20of%20the%20Other.pdf (Roger Burggraeve was born in Passendale, Flanders (Belgium), in 1942. Salesian of Don Bosco (priest). Licentiate in Philosophy (Rome, 1966). Doctorate in Moral Theology (Leuven, 1980). Associate Professor at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, KU Leuven (1980-1988). Professor (Ordinarius) from 1988 till 2007; now Emeritus Professor.]

Strictly speaking, racism takes the view that one group of people is morally or culturally superior to another group, based on a hereditary difference in race. Racism considers the racial origin of an individual or a community as the factor determining not only the appearance but also the way of thinking and acting. Moreover, racism accords value to one race above all others, and one who is racist usually reckons himself among the superior race. According to racist thinking, people are considered in the ﬁrst place or even exclusively in terms of their belongingness to a different race, most often visible in color of skin and other physical features (ﬁgure, nose, eyes, and so forth). On the basis of these features, they are then judged and above all condemned. And these condemnations are in turn nourished and strengthened by all sorts of "images of the enemy” cast against the "other" race. For Levinas, it is clear that racism was incarnated in an "exceptional" way in the persecution of the Jews by the National Socialism of Hitler and his followers (AS 60), which he therefore designates as "the diabolical criminality of absolute evil” (CCH 82). In his work Mein Kampf, Hitler argued for the superiority of the so-called Aryan race, the race of the (Iber-mensch ["Superman”]. Only those who belonged to the "pure" Aryan race, who all the more so embodied this race purely, had the right to live and reproduce. The Nazis therefore not only developed ingenious, scientiﬁcally designed programs to "solve" the Jewish question (the Endlb’sung, or Shoah) by means of concentration camps and gas chambers (of which Auschwitz in Poland was only one, but the most famous). They also developed and enacted complex, extensive sterilization programs aimed speciﬁcally at the physically and mentally handicapped so that the Aryan race would not be stained by begetting "impure" children. And there were also the infamous euthanasia programs established in order to remove "gently" the incurably ill and mentally handicapped, who were thus less valuable and unnecessary members of the Aryan race. Because homosexuals did not contribute to the furthering of the pure Aryan race they were severely persecuted, and the gypsies were eradicated because they did not belong to the Aryan race and therefore represented a threat to its purity. In a Wider sense, one also speaks of racism when one recognizes and relates to others on the basis of their belonging to another culture, language group, or religion. As contemporary examples of this, we can point to the manner in which people today reject immigrants from the Arab world and wish to expel them because of their origin in another religion, speciﬁcally Islam and its related traditions. Or think of the long-standing suppression and discrimination against African Americans in the United States, many of whose ancestors were brought over from Africa as slaves. According to Levinas, the core of racism consists not in the denial of, or failure to appreciate, similarities between people, but in the denial of, or better said, failure to appreciate and value, people’s differences, or better still, the fundamental and irreducible otherness by which they fall outside of every genre and are thus “unique”: "Alterity ﬂows in no sense out of difference, to the contrary difference goes back to alterity” (VA 92). A racist relation wants to recognize and value only the "same," or one’s “own” [het eigene], and therefore excludes the "foreign." Out of self-defense, we are easily inclined to accept and consider positively only that which agrees with, or is "similar" to, ourselves. One finds the other embarrassing, threatening, and frightening. One therefore tries to expel him from oneself, to place him outside so that he can be considered as the "enemy" from whom one "may" defend oneself, and whom one may even "destroy" as what brings life and well-being under pressure, unless one can reduce him to oneself or make him a part of oneself. One wants to accept ”others” (or "strangers," or ”foreigners”) only to the extent that they belong to one’s own “genre” or “kind,” which is to say to one’s own blood and soil, to the same family, tribe, sex, clan, nation, church, club, or community, do the same work, have the same birthplace and date. One’s ”own” is praised and even divinized at the price of the "other," which is vilified. The “stranger” becomes the scapegoat on whom we blame all of our problems and worries. One accepts differences only insofar as they are a matter of accidental particularities or specificities within a same genre or basic design, in which individuals differ from one another within a same “sort” only very relatively (for example, character, taste, intellectual level), and in which their deeper afﬁnity is not at all tested (VA 97). Against this background, it is clear that for Levinas anti-Semitism, as a specific and advanced form of racism, takes aim at the Jew as the intolerable other. For anti-Semitic thinking and sentiment, the Jew is simply the enemy, just as for every racism the other is the enemy as such, that is to say not on the basis of personality, one or another character trait, or a specific act considered morally troublesome or objectionable, but due only to his very otherness. In anti-Semitism, the Jew, as "other," is always the guilty one. It is never "oneself," the embodiment of the "same" that not only arranges everything around itself but also profiles itself as principle of meaning and value (CAJ 77—79).From this perspective on racism as rejection of the other, it appears, according to Levinas, that racism is not a rare and improbable phenomenon existing in the heart and thought of only some "perverse" people that has nothing to do with us. Insofar as one is, according to the spontaneous dynamic of existing, or conatus essendi, directed toward the "same," toward maintaining and fortifying one’s ”own”—all such as I have just sketched it—one must be considered "by nature” potentially racist, though of course without being "predestined" for it. In itself, this admits no question of psychological or pathological deviation. According to Levinas, this implies that one cannot simply dispense with the racism of Hitler and the Nazis, in contrast to something instead occurring only once, as a wholly distinct and incomparable phenomenon, at least if one views it not quantitatively but qualitatively, which is to say in terms of its roots and basic inspiration. In an attempt to hold open a pure—in fact, Manichean—distinction between "good" (us) and "bad" (the ”others”), thus keeping oneself out of range of the difficulties in question, it happens all too often that Hitlerism is described as something completely unique that has nothing in common with the aims and affairs of the common mortal. The perspective of Levinas shows that Hitlerism, with its genocide and other programs of eradication, is only a quantitative extension, that is to say a consistent, systematic, and inexorably reﬁned outgrowth of racism in its pure form, one that, in its turn, represents a concretization of the effort of existing, which, as the reduction of the other to the same, is the nature of our existence (without,on the other hand, our being abandoned to this nature as a fatality, since as ethical beings we can overcome it). No one is invulnerable; any of us is a potential racist, and at least sometimes a real racist. Racism, like Hitlerism, does not occur by chance, or by an accidental turn. Nor is it an exceptional perversion occurring in a group of psychologically disturbed people. It is a permanent possibility woven into the dynamic of our very being, so that Whoever accedes to and lives out the dynamic of his own being inevitably extends racism in one or another form (AS 60—61). We can no longer blame racism and anti-Semitism on "others," for both their possibility and the temptation to them are borne in the dynamic of our ohm being: as "non-reciprocal determination of the other” (T I 99), which is precisely the kernel of our freedom (TI 97). It is specifically to unmask this racist violence, and all forms of violence as modalities of denial of the other as other, that Levinas discerns the basic ethical norm in the commandment mentioned and explicated above, “Thou shall not kill,” which is to say in the commandment to ;respect the otherness of the other. In committing to the possible overcoming of evil, and of racism in particular, through the ethical choice for the good, Levinas certainly realizes how vulnerable this "overcoming" of evil is. By rejecting the idea that every objective system, through its ironclad, mechanistic laws and coerciveness, might be able to render evil impossible forever, and instead basing everything on the ethical call to the good, he makes clear that abuse, violence, and the racist exclusion and elimination of the other are constantly possible and can never be definitively overcome. In ethics, there is no eschatology, in the sense of a guaranteed "better world” or "world without evil.” There is only the ”good will” that must always prove itself in a choice against evil that is neither evident nor easy. Only in this way can there be a good future and justice for the other: only through ethical vigilance with respect to all forms of violence, tyranny, hate, and racism, and a society that nurtures in both our upbringing and education a “sensibility” for the other as “stranger.” Such a sensitivity takes in full seriousness the ethical essence of the human person, and serves always to put us back on the path to a culture "where the other counts more than I do,” and where the most foreign enjoys our complete hospitality.

#### 5] Social relations are dynamic and constantly being decentered from normative systems of knowledge; only pragmatism’s understanding of interactive knowledge production can mitigate entrenched violence.

Kadlec 8, Alison. "Critical pragmatism and deliberative democracy." Theoria 55.117 (2008): 54-80. (doctorate in political science from the University of Minnesota and bachelor's degrees from Michigan State University in political theory, constitutional democracy and English literature.)//Elmer and UT AI and Dulles AS

Social Intelligence: The Critical Potential Lived Experience Though human nature is intersubjectively generated on an ongoing basis, we are not merely the products of Platonic conceptions of ourselves. Individuals are cultivated in and by society through experiential processes in which we are acted upon, and act back upon a dynamic environment. For Dewey, 'experience' connotes a very specific process that stands in stark contrast to the traditional conception of experience as a matter of private consciousness. Because Dewey's notion of experience is **social, active, and educative,** what he calls the 'experiential continuum' is the process by which we are best able to develop social intelligence. The 'experiential continuum' is characterised by our enduring and undergoing the consequences of our actions, and intelligence is to be understood as the self-conscious and ongoing process of adjusting our attitudes in light of these consequences.25 In The Public and Its Problems , Dewey gives this view of intelligence a decidedly deliberative spin when he says, 'we lie, as Emerson said, in the lap of an immense intelligence. But that intelligence is dormant and its communications are broken, inarticulate and faint until it possesses the local community as its medium'.26 In 'Ethical Principles Underlying Education', Dewey is more explicit in explaining his view of the relationship between social intelligence and the normative commitment to democracy in his declaration that 'ultimate moral motives and forces are nothing more nor less than social intelligence the power of observing and comprehending social situations and social power trained capacities of control at work in the service of social interest and aims'.27 Dewey's unflagging faith in the transformative potential of social intelligence intrinsic to democracy as a way of life **is not Utopian**, nor is it based on a belief that all problems are finally solvable. Rather, it expresses a moral commitment that suggests that a working faith in social intelligence is our best shot at crafting habits and institutions that will further encourage us to identify **new opportunities for the expansion of our capacities** moving forward. The upshot here is that democracy as a way of life means, above all, that we stop thinking of democracy as a thing and start thinking about it as a way. Democracy is belief in the ability of human experience to generate the aims and methods by which further experience will grow in ordered richness. . . . Democracy is the faith that the process of experience is more important than any special result attained, so that the special results achieved are of ultimate value only as they are used to enrich and order the ongoing process. Since the process of experience is capable of being **educative**, faith in democracy is all one with faith in experience and education. All ends and values that are cut off from the ongoing process become arrests and fixations. They strive to fixate what has been gained instead of using it to open the road and point the way to new and better experiences.28 On this account, social intelligence is not a possession, it is a de-centred and educative process of ordering our **experiences** through manifold **communication**. The guiding principles, then, of social intelligence are 1) the protection and expansion of our capacity for free and communicative inquiry and 2) the protection and expansion of our capacity to perceive the shared consequences of our habits and policies. We judge the goodness or badness of these consequences by evaluating the way they act back on and impact our individual capacities for free inquiry that inform the ongoing development of social intelligence In turn, the 'proper conditions' for social intelligence then are those that increase our ability to perceive the complex shared consequences of our choices and practices. Intelligence is social in pragmatism because it requires the development of both firstand second-order attitudes that can only take place in an ongoing process of communication. Free inquiry is not just a matter of having the opportunity to seek information that will allow for the generation of thoughtful attitudes about issues, it is also a matter of appreciating and harnessing the democratic potential of second-order attitudes (attitudes about our attitudes). We are not passive receivers of information, **but dynamic interactors**, and therefore intelligence is intrinsically communicative. Free inquiry is the engine of social intelligence, which is in turn based on our willingness to have our firstorder attitudes adjusted in light of our second-order attitudes.29 The ongoing mutual adjustment of our first-order and second-order attitudes through a back and forth process between the two emerges only to the extent that we have the opportunities to communicate freely with others, and this is none other than the 'method' of social intelligence. The goal of communicative inquiry then is to build an ever richer context for the ongoing development of our ability to perceive the relationship between our beliefs, practices, and institutions. By taking a principal focus on increasing our ability for evermore sophisticated perception of the consequences of our habits of thought and action, we will be better equipped to distinguish between those habits that improve and those that impede our capacities for free inquiry. This is the material of problem-solving, as it is just this capacity for free inquiry that makes it possible to identify common problems in a way that they may be productively addressed. Turning back to the challenges leveled by radical democratic theorists, we can begin to see the opportunities made possible by critical pragmatism. Tapping into the critical potential of lived experience under conditions of unalterable changefulness begins with the therapeutic recognition that there is no such thing as a unified field of power directed entirely by stable and fixed interests. The first implication here is that there are always new opportunities to exploit cracks and fissures in various structurally **entrenched forms of power**. Second, the essentially complexity and flux of our world is always **producing new opportunities for transformative resistance** and for the development of more creative approaches to meaningful deliberation. Critical pragmatism pivots on the notion that under such conditions what we most need are not fixed and static foundations, we need the flexible habits of inquiry and **communication** that make it possible to both identify pernicious obstacles to deliberation and to challenge, circumvent, or neutralise their impact.

#### 6] Rule Following Paradox- There is nothing inherent to a rule that tells us how we ought to follow it, regardless of how correct the rule is. Only deliberation accounts for the diversity of interpretations of our norms.

#### 1] Death outweighs— A] Agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security—my framework constrains every NC and K and B] It’s the worst form of evil:

Paterson 3 – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics.

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### 3] Extinction outweighs

#### A] Life comes first – fluctuations in value to life are inevitable.

Bernstein 02 (Richard J., Vera List Prof. Phil. – New School for Social Research, “Radical Evil: A Philosophical Interrogation”, p. 188-192)

There is a basic value inherent inorganic being, a basic affirmation, "The Yes' of Life" (IR 81). 15 "The self-affirmation of being becomes emphatic in the opposition of life to death. Life is the explicit confrontation of being with not-being. . . . The 'yes' of all striving is here sharpened by the active `no' to not-being" (IR 81-2). Furthermore — and this is the crucial point for Jonas — this affirmation of life that is in all organic being has a binding obligatory force upon human beings. This blindly self-enacting "yes" gains obligating force in the seeing freedom of man, who as the supreme outcome of nature's purposive labor is no longer its automatic executor but, with the power obtained from knowledge, can become its destroyer as well. He must adopt the "yes" into his will and impose the "no" to not-being on his power. But precisely this transition from willing to obligation is the critical point of moral theory at which attempts at laying a foundation for it come so easily to grief. Why does now, in man, that become a duty which hitherto "being" itself took care of through all individual willings? (IR 82). We discover here the transition from is to "ought" — from the self-affirmation of life to the binding obligation of human beings to preserve life not only for the present but also for the future. But why do we need a new ethics? The subtitle of The Imperative of Responsibility — In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age — indicates why we need a new ethics. Modern technology has transformed the nature and consequences of human action so radically that the underlying premises of traditional ethics are no longer valid. For the first time in history human beings possess the knowledge and the power to destroy life on this planet, including human life. Not only is there the new possibility of total nuclear disaster; there are the even more invidious and threatening possibilities that result from the unconstrained use of technologies that can destroy the environment required for life. The major transformation brought about by modern technology is that the consequences of our actions frequently exceed by far anything we can envision. Jonas was one of the first philosophers to warn us about the unprecedented ethical and political problems that arise with the rapid development of biotechnology. He claimed that this was happening at a time when there was an "ethical vacuum," when there did not seem to be any effective ethical principles to limit ot guide our ethical decisions. In the name of scientific and technological "progress," there is a relentless pressure to adopt a stance where virtually anything is permissible, includ-ing transforming the genetic structure of human beings, as long as it is "freely chosen." We need, Jonas argued, a new categorical imperative that might be formulated as follows: "Act so that the effects of your action are compatible with the permanence of genuine human life"; or expressed negatively: "Act so that the effects of your action are not destructive of the future possibility of such a life"; or simply: "Do not compromise the conditions for an indefinite continuation of humanity on earth"; or again turned positive: "In your present choices, include the future wholeness of Man among the objects of your will."

#### B] Extinction outweighs

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

#### C] Process- the process of climate change AND nuclear war devastates marginilzed groups since they don’t have the same resources to overcome it.

#### D] Bias- high level threats are systematically underestimated in the status quo which straight turns their Olson evidence

**1AC - Advantage**

#### Resolved: The Republic of Korea ought to ban the appropriation of outer space by private entities.

#### 1] The appropriation of space by private entities isn’t value neutral but is sutured in a discourse of the cosmic elite and unequal IR.

Stockwell 20 [Samuel Stockwell (Research Project Manager, the Annenberg Institute at Brown University). “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies”. E-International Relations. Jul 20 2020. Accessed 12/7/21. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/> //Xu]

The US government’s support for private space companies is also likely to lead to the reinforcement of Earth-bound wealth inequalities in space. Many NewSpace actors frame their long-term ambitions in space with strong anthropogenic undertones, by offering the salvation of the human race from impending extinction through off-world colonial developments (Kearnes & Dooren: 2017: 182). Yet, this type of discourse disguises the highly exclusive nature of these missions. Whilst they seem to suggest that there is a stake for ordinary citizens in the vast space frontier, the reality is that these self-described space pioneers are a member of a narrow ‘cosmic elite’ – “founders of Amazon.com, Microsoft, Pay Pal… and a smattering of games designers and hotel magnates” (Parker, 2009: 91). Indeed, private space enterprises have themselves suggested that they have no obligation to share mineral resources extracted in space with the global community (Klinger, 2017: 208). This is reflected in the speeches of individuals such as Nathan Ingraham, a senior editor at the tech site EngadAsteroid mining, who claimed that asteroid mining was “how [America is] going to move into space and develop the next Vegas Strip” (Shaer, 2016: 50). Such comments highlight a form of what Beery (2016) defines as ‘scalar politics’. In similar ways to the ‘scaling’ of unequal international relations that has constituted our relationship with outer space under the guise of the ‘global commons’ (Beery, 2016: 99), private companies – through their anthropogenic discourse – are scaling existing Earth-bound wealth inequalities and social relations into space by siphoning off extra-terrestrial resources. By constructing their endeavours in ways that appeal to the common good, NewSpace actors are therefore concealing the reality of how commercial resource extraction serves the exclusive interests of their private shareholders at the expense of the vast majority of the global population.

#### 2] Appropriation intrinsically guts deliberative procedures since it denies the owner’s permission for property rights, blocking one possible experience/form of communication from other groups since it guts communal approaches

Oxford. Lexico. Appropriation. https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/appropriation

the action of taking something for one's own use, typically without the owner's permission.

**1AC---Tensions ADV**

#### South Korea’s space industry is fueled by the private sector – tech transfers and official statements.

**Si-Soo 21** [Park Si-Soo, 9-8-2021, Park Si-soo covers space industries in South Korea, Japan and other Asian countries. Park worked at The Korea Times — South Korea's leading English language newspaper — from 2007 to 2020. He earned a master’s degree in science journalism from Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology and a bachelor’s degree in business from Hanyang University. "South Korea to spend $593 million on public-to-private transfer of rocket technologies," SpaceNews, <https://spacenews.com/south-korea-to-spend-593-million-on-public-to-private-transfer-of-rocket-technologies/> accessed 1/12/2022] Adam

SEOUL, South Korea – Starting next year, South Korea’s government will transfer state-owned space launch vehicle technologies to domestic aerospace companies in a move to help them penetrate an expanding global space launch market. To that end, the government will spend 687 billion won ($593 million) from 2022 through 2027, [said the Ministry of Science and ICT, Sept. 7.](https://www.msit.go.kr/bbs/view.do?sCode=user&mId=113&mPid=112&pageIndex=&bbsSeqNo=94&nttSeqNo=3180691&searchOpt=ALL&searchTxt=)

Korea Aerospace Research Institute (KARI) — a state-run space technology developer that has played a central role in developing the nation’s first domestic space launch vehicle, KSLV-2 — will be responsible for the public-to-private transfer, according to the ministry. KSLV-2, nicknamed Nuri, is a three-stage liquid-propellant rocket capable of sending a 1.5-ton satellite into low Earth orbit. The rocket is set to make its first demonstration flight in October from Naro Space Center in Goheung, the only launch site in South Korea.

The transfer will be done in a way KARI and selected companies do joint development and launch tests.

“The time has come to make a departure from state-led development of space launch vehicles toward one in which the private sector plays an expanded and more active role,” said [Yong Hong-taek, the science ministry’s vice minister,](https://english.msit.go.kr/eng/contents/cont.do?sCode=eng&mPid=19&mId=22) in the statement.

The policy reconfirms the government’s commitment to accelerating public-to-private transfer of space technologies. It comes as SpaceX and other innovative private companies play increasingly important roles in the global space industry. In the first move of this kind, since May, KARI and Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (KAIST) have transferred their satellite-manufacturing technologies to a handful of major aerospace companies here.

While the science ministry didn’t  identify the companies that would benefit from the latest tech transfer, the most likely beneficiaries include [Hanwha Aerospace](https://spacenews.com/hanwha-aerospace-bets-big-on-space-business/), [Innospace](https://biz.chosun.com/industry/company/2021/08/26/B73DAPWKMBFAHCPFK2ME6NM6H4/?utm_source=naver&utm_medium=original&utm_campaign=biz), [Perigee Aerospace](https://spacenews.com/backed-by-samsung-south-korean-startup-perigee-aims-for-2020-maiden-launch/) and [Korean Air](https://spacenews.com/south-koreas-top-airline-to-develop-propellant-tank-for-smallsat-launcher/).

Hanwha is a major rocket engine developer here, which contributed to KSLV-2’s development with engine assembly and supply of key components. Innospace is a hybrid rocket startup, and Perigee is developing a methane-fueled smallsat launcher. Korea Air, South Korea’s biggest airline, is developing technologies to launch small satellites from its Boeing 747-400 cargo planes — the same way Virgin Orbit launches customers’ satellites into orbit.

**That ensures aggressive space racing with noko.**

**Ryall 21** Julian Ryall, 10-21-2021, "South Korea space rocket test prompts fear of arms race with North," DW, <https://www.dw.com/en/south-korea-space-rocket-test-prompts-fear-of-arms-race-with-north/a-59572929> //Jay

South Korea space rocket test prompts fear of arms race with North Tensions between Seoul and Pyongyang have grown in recent months. South Korea's failed test of its first-ever homegrown rocket has prompted worries of a new arms race. A rocket is launched in a cloud of smoke and flame from a launch pad with the ocean in the background South Korea has launched a Nuri rocket from the launch pad of its Naro Space Center in Goheung, South Korea Shortly after 5 p.m. local time (0800 UTC) on Thursday, South Korea launched its first domestically produced rocket from the Naro Space Center in the northeastern county of Goheung. All three stages of the liquid-fueled Nuri rocket, which cost around 2 trillion won ($1.7 billion, €1.46 billion), worked but the rocket reportedly failed to complete the mission of delivering a test satellite into orbit. South Korean President Moon Jae-in said the rocket reached an altitude of 700 kilometers (435 miles), and that the 1.5 ton payload separated successfully. However, Moon said that "putting a dummy satellite into orbit remains an unfinished mission." Despite the test being unable to fulfill its task of putting a satellite into orbit, the launch comes as South Korea is locked into a growing rivalry with North Korea over technological advances in weaponry. South Korean President Moon Jae-in called the test an "excellent accomplishment,'' taking South Korea a step further toward a space launch program. People wait to watch the launch of the Nuri rocket, the first domestically produced space rocket in Goheung, South Korea Many South Koreans gathered to watch the launch of the country's first homegrown space rocket North Korea submarine missile test was planned, experts think South Korea's launch of the Nuri rocket has long been planned. Analysts said it was no coincidence that North Korea on Tuesday carried out what it claims was the first launch of a ballistic missile from a submerged submarine (SLBM). The test launch was conducted off the naval base on the west coast of the peninsula. It was the eighth time that the North has carried out a missile launch this year. It also coincided with the five-day Seoul International Aerospace and Defense Exhibition, where South Korean President Moon Jae-in was pictured in a flight suit and in the cockpit of a domestically produced FA-50 fighter jet. Speaking to reporters, Moon said it is imperative for South Korea to build up its defenses: "A strong defense capability is always aimed at ensuring peace." "The Republic of Korea seeks to build a smart and strong armed forces based on state-of-the-art technology," he added. North justifies military buildup Exactly one week earlier, North Korean leader Kim Jong-un attended a defense development exhibition in the North's capital Pyongyang to mark the 76th anniversary of the founding of the Workers' Party, issuing a similar justification for his own military buildup. "We must be powerful for our coming generations as well," the state-run Korea Central News Agency (KCNA) quoted Kim as saying. "That is our first and foremost task." "The military danger facing our state daily to the military tension prevailing around the Korean peninsula is different from 10 or five, even three years ago," he said. Kim blamed "the unstable situation in the region" on the United States. a new type of a submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) being test-fired from waters North Korea confirmed it had tested a new type of submarine-launched ballistic missile In late September, the North tested what it claimed was an advanced new hypersonic missile. US defense analysis suggests that Pyongyang may resume underground nuclear tests or fire a long-range ballistic missile within the next year. Both would be violations of United Nations Security Council resolutions. But Pyongyang insists that its military developments are purely defensive and necessary as its enemies — primarily the US, South Korea and Japan — remain committed to overthrow of the Kim regime. Those countries deny that they are planning a regime change in North Korea. But they all point out that they cannot sit by as a nuclear-armed and deeply unpredictable neighbor continues to build out its military capabilities. South Korea tested its own submarine-launched ballistic missile recently, and is investing heavily in improved equipment on land, sea and air. Significantly, the Korean navy is pushing ahead with plans to build the nation's first aircraft carrier. Meanwhile, discussions are also underway about the possibility of developing a nuclear-powered submarine. North Korea 'careful not to cross red lines' "The North just tested its first hypersonic missile and has now launched an SLBM, so it seems that they are showing the South and the rest of the world just what they can do," said June Park, a political economist with Princeton University. "South Korea cannot just sit by and let that happen, so the Seoul defense show is a chance to demonstrate, 'we also have the ability to defend ourselves,'" she told DW. Robert Dujarric, co-director of the Institute of Contemporary Asian Studies at the Tokyo campus of Temple University, says there has been an uptick in saber-rattling after a period of relative restraint on the Korean Peninsula. But he said Pyongyang is very aware where the "red line" lies. "Ever since the armistice at the end of the Korean War in 1953, we have seen these periodic bouts of development of new weapons in the North — such as nuclear tests and then intercontinental ballistic missile launches — but the North has been very careful to not go too far, to not cross any red lines," he said. "They have caused small-scale border incidents and been provocative and made a nuisance of themselves — but they have never gone too far as they know that crossing that red line would bring down a massive US retaliation," he said. Are we seeing a new arms race on the Korean Peninsula? Just a phase? "I think we are in that cycle again, and it must be remembered that it is one thing to parade a new missile through Pyongyang or to carry out a test launch, but it's an entirely different thing to fire one of these things in an operational situation," Park explained. Unfortunately, says Park, the North's development of nuclear weapons gives the South little leeway in where to advance its own military capabilities in the years to come. South Korean people are split almost half-and-half on the question of whether or not to develop a domestic nuclear deterrent, she said. Should that happen, however, the reverberations would be felt far beyond North Korea and could arguably destabilize the entire northeast Asian region, where Russia, China and Japan are also major powers, Park explained.

**North Korea sees the South’s launches as a double standard – that emboldens the regime and increases aggression.**

**Parry 21** [Richard Lloyd Parry, Richard Lloyd Parry has lived since 1995 in Tokyo, where he is the Asia editor of The Times. He has reported from 29 countries, including Afghanistan, Iraq and North Korea, and has been named Foreign Correspondent of the Year Asia Editor, 10-21-2021, "South Korea heightens tensions with space launch," The Times, [https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/south-korea-heightens-tensions-with-space-launch-jb8mnwwdp accessed 1/12/2022](https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/south-korea-heightens-tensions-with-space-launch-jb8mnwwdp%20accessed%201/12/2022)] Adam

South Korea launched a domestically built rocket into space today in a breakthrough that will embolden North Korean accusations of hypocrisy. The three-stage KSLV-II Nuri entered orbit after being launched from the Naro Space Centre on a small island off the country’s southwest coast, although it failed in its final task — putting into orbit a dummy satellite. Even so, it was a welcome half-success after years of setbacks and failures. The mission is likely to be seized upon by [North Korea](https://archive.is/o/a0crs/https:/www.thetimes.co.uk/article/north-korea-demands-end-to-joint-military-exercises-amid-further-missile-tests-hgwhg3jwf) as an example of double standards. Beginning in 1998 the North fired off a series of what it called civilian rockets, which were denounced by the US and South Korea as a front for developing long-range missiles. These predictions turned out to be correct and North Korea now has an arsenal of ballistic missiles, including weapons with the range to potentially strike the mainland United States. South Korea says its programme is intended for nothing more than launching civilian satellites. It was a nervous day for South Korea. In 2010 an earlier version of the Nuri exploded two minutes after take off, and until this afternoon the failure rate for the country’s rockets was 70 per cent. The launch was postponed by an hour as engineers checked valves in the rocket — among its three million separate parts. But just after 5pm local time the Nuri lifted off smoothly into clear skies and jettisoned its first and second stages on schedule. The launch confirms South Korea as only the seventh country in the world to have developed a domestic space vehicle that can carry a payload heavier than a tonne, after China, France, India, Japan, Russia and the United States. However, Nuri failed to launch its 1.5-tonne dummy satellite of steel and aluminium, which was supposed to have been placed into a low earth orbit of 600km to 800km. “It’s very difficult for newcomers to achieve this,” President Moon said at the Space Centre after the launch. “But we achieved it, with no help from other countries.” A version of the Nuri was successfully launched in 2013, though its first stage was manufactured in Russia. There is no immediate prospect that South Korea will convert its rocket technology to military use. It already has short and medium-range ballistic missiles although it is bound by an agreement with its US ally to limit these in range to 800km. Last month South Korea joined the small group of countries able to fire ballistic missiles from a submarine. With a range of 500km, the Hyunmoo 4-4 missile fired from a 3,000-tonne Dosan Ahn Chang-ho class submarine has all of North Korea within its range. But when North Korea carried out its [own submarine missile launch](https://archive.is/o/a0crs/https:/www.thetimes.co.uk/article/north-korea-tests-unidentifed-ballistic-missile-lw5fh0t8k) this week, the South expressed its “regret” and the US condemned the action. “To criticise [North Korea] for developing and test-firing the same weapon system as the one the US possesses or is developing is a clear expression of double standards and it only excites our suspicion about the ‘authenticity’ of its statement that it does not antagonise [North Korea],” a spokesman in Pyongyang said.

**Causes East Asian war---escalation, miscalc, and cyberattacks.**

**Sukin and Dalton 21** Lauren Sukin, 10-26-2021, (Lauren Sukin is a Ph.D. candidate at Stanford University’s department of political science and a pre-doctoral fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation. Toby Dalton is a senior fellow at, and co-director of, the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.)"Why South Korea Shouldn’t Build Its Own Nuclear Bombs," War on the Rocks, <https://warontherocks.com/2021/10/why-south-korea-shouldnt-build-its-own-nuclear-bombs/> //Jay

Lind and Press also point to alliance credibility challenges as a reason why South Korea should build its own nuclear weapons. They are certainly not alone in warning that U.S. nuclear credibility may be crumbling, yet there is plenty of evidence indicating the political and military foundations of the U.S.-South Korean defense relationship remain strong. Recent public opinion surveys by the Chicago Council for Global Affairs showed that 62 percent of Americans support the use of U.S. military forces to defend South Korea against a North Korean attack. This is matched by attitudes in South Korea, where the public also continues to express high levels of support for, and confidence in, the alliance. A September 2021 Asan Institute poll, for example, showed 78 percent support for maintaining or strengthening the U.S.-South Korean alliance. Proponents of a South Korean nuclear weapons program argue, however, that South Koreans are no longer confident in the United States — they point to high levels of public support for nuclear proliferation (70 percent in the recent Asan poll) and concerns that South Korea’s military alone is not sufficient to deter North Korea (72 percent, according to Asan). But deeper research paints a more nuanced picture of the credibility challenge. For example, research by Lauren Sukin found that, in 2019, 58 percent of South Korean survey respondents believed the United States would use nuclear weapons to defend South Korea from a North Korean nuclear attack. Other work shows robust U.S. public support for the nuclear security guarantee to South Korea. Scholars have similarly found that the U.S. public is willing to use nuclear weapons, including against North Korea, and even when there is a high risk of nuclear retaliation. So the claim by Lind and Press that “South Korea can’t be sure it can depend on its U.S. ally for protection” seems overblown. This is not to argue that concerns about alliance credibility have no basis. Building confidence in the alliance among the South Korean public is an ongoing challenge, made much harder in the wake of the Trump administration’s extortionate approach to alliance burden-sharing negotiations. South Koreans were also alarmed in 2017 that President Donald Trump’s “fire and fury” might result in a war they did not want. Yet, neither of these are problems are fundamentally about the reliability of U.S. promises to aid South Korea in a security crisis. Rather, they point to a need for better alliance political and military cohesion, especially coordination about contingencies involving North Korea that could escalate to use of nuclear weapons. In sum, alliance credibility problems are real but not as severe as many have suggested, and nuclear weapons are far from a clear remedy for the problems that persist. **Would Nuclear Weapons Improve South Korean Security?** Even if the alliance problems were as profound as some analysts contend — and if South Korean nuclear proliferation did not somehow make them worse — a South Korean decision to acquire nuclear weapons would not necessarily improve Seoul’s security against North Korea or China, as advocates have claimed. Indeed, a lot would depend on how North Korea and China would react to South Korean proliferation. South Korean nuclear weapons may not be especially useful politico-military tools against China. U.S. nuclear threats against China during the Korean War did not dissuade Beijing from continuing to fight. Nor has China hesitated to leverage its conventional military strength in territorial contests with nuclear-armed India. China’s ongoing modernization of its nuclear forces — whether by constructing missile silos or testing hypersonics — suggests Beijing may view the survivability and effectiveness of its arsenal as vital for deterring the United States, especially in the Taiwan Strait. Would South Korean nuclear weapons dissuade Beijing from undertaking coercive operations against Seoul? It seems unlikely. If anything, South Korean proliferation could plausibly invite more **coercive Chinese economic and military pressures** if Beijing interpreted Seoul’s nuclear arsenal as a direct challenge to its regional aspirations. Vis-à-vis China, then, South Korea could wind up counterintuitively less secure with nuclear weapons than without them. South Korean nuclear weapons could similarly make the situation with North Korea much more dangerous. Already, joint U.S.-South Korean military exercises, which Pyongyang calls “exercises for a nuclear war,” have repeatedly prompted North Korea to issue aggressive rhetoric, engage in cross-border provocations, and conduct missile tests. In the face of a South Korean nuclear weapons program, it would be unreasonable to expect North Korea to take no countervailing actions. For example, it seems likely that South Korean proliferation could cause N**orth Korea to further augment** its nuclear arsenal, posture its nuclear weapons for first use, or take greater risks to gain the upper hand in an escalating military crisis. After all, even the United States, with its far superior nuclear arsenal, has had limited success deterring or compelling North Korea. Moreover, even if South Korean nuclear weapons likely would deter large-scale violence by China or North Korea, they could make the threat of low-level conflict escalation greater than it already is today. This is especially important in the Indo-Pacific context, where the most prevalent threats and sources of crisis escalation — such as China’s overflights of contested territory or North Korea’s offensive use of **cyber** capabilities — exist far below the nuclear threshold. The “stability-instability paradox” of nuclear weapons suggests that, although mutual possession of nuclear weapons may reduce the chances of nuclear war, it may, at the same time, make conventional wars and militarized crises more likely, as well as incentivize greater risk taking at lower levels. A more moderated version of this argument suggests that nuclear weapons may not necessarily make low-level conflict more likely, but neither do they prevent it. For instance, a nuclear-armed South Korea could be emboldened to respond more aggressively to North Korean provocations with proactive deterrence or “quid pro quo plus” military operations, the inherent escalation risks of which are intended to dissuade North Korea in the first place. Facing perceived “use or lose” pressures, North Korea may be quicker to cross certain **escalation** thresholds, such as the use of long-range rocket systems, as it seeks escalation dominance. The potential for these action-reaction dynamics to spiral into a race up the escalation ladder is clear. To be certain, this potential is already present, but it seems likely to worsen if South Korea possessed nuclear weapons. Reaction times during moments of crisis would be shorter, tensions higher; **miscommunication** and misperception easier, and nuclear use more accessible. South Korean proliferation could, then, make conflict more likely at worst and fail to deter it at best.

#### Nuclear war causes extinction

PND 16. internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock’s 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans’ International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf> //Re-cut by Elmer

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest of the world) uninhabitable, potentially inducing global famine lasting up to decades. Toon and Robock note in ‘Self Assured Destruction’, in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, that: 13. “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, even after the arsenal reductions planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be suicidal, resulting in self assured destruction. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation to reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about **20 percent** for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.” 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/all humans (and severely impact/extinguish other species) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. Gareth Evans’ ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.

### 1AC – Underview

#### 1AR theory is legit – anything else means infinite abuse – drop the debater, competing interps, no rvis– 1AR is too short to make up for the time trade-off – no RVIs and no 2NR theory and paradigm issues– 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time. Aff theory first – it’s a much larger strategic loss because 1min is ¼ of the 1AR vs 1/7 of the 1NC which means there’s more abuse if I’m devoting a larger fraction of time.