## OFF

### T – Long

#### Interp: the aff may only claim offense from the hypothetical implementation of Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### “Resolved” means enactment of a law.

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word **“resolve,”** given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

#### Appropriation” is “large-scale extraction of space resources.” Comprehensive analysis proves

Leon 18 [Amanda, JD from UVA] “Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources” Vol. 104:497, Virginia Law Review, <https://www.capdale.com/files/24323_leon_final_note.pdf>, 2018 RE

Employing the treaty interpretation tools of ordinary meaning, preparatory materials, historical context, state practice, and state interpretation offers many possible understandings of the obligations imparted by Articles I and II of the OST. For example, while the ordinary meaning of “use” could reasonably include the exploitation of materials, the meeting summaries of the Fifth Session of the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space Legal Sub-Committee make clear that no consensus was ever reached regarding whether “use” includes large-scale exploitation of space resources, let alone fee-simple ownership and the ability to sell commercially. State practice dealing with extraterrestrial samples also sheds little light on the confusion, as the examples cited all deal instead with scientific samples of limited quantity. The international community’s rejection of the Moon Agreement also fails to bring clarity. While on the one hand the rejection could be read as a rejection of the idea that the OST prohibits private property rights, it could also be read as a rejection of the common heritage of mankind doctrine. Finally, the prospect of private venture space mining and extraterrestrial resource extraction remained far off and futuristic at the time of the Treaty’s negotiation, making drawing legal conclusions about the legality of these revolutionary activities extremely difficult.

Overall, however, the Treaty’s structure and its purposes (preserving peace and avoiding international conflict in outer space) ultimately indicate that private property rights in space resources are prohibited by Article II’s non-appropriation principle, at least until future international delegation determines otherwise (like in the Antarctic). The Treaty’s structure confirms this interpretation. Article I lays down a general rule for activity in space. Subsequent articles of the Treaty then lay out more specific requirements of and qualifications to this general rule. Much like Article IV restricts the use of nuclear weapons in space, Article II restricts the use of space in ways that might result in potentially controversial property claims. Historically, claims to mineral rights have resulted in just as contentious conflict as those over sovereign lands. Treaty efforts to avoid conflicts in Antarctica and the high seas reflect similar sentiments. The Soviet Union’s representative even hinted at this structural relationship between Articles I and II during Treaty negotiations.232 In light of the imminent need to ease Cold War tensions, the potential for conflict over property, and the final structure of the Treaty, this Note concludes that the large-scale extraction of space resources is incompatible with the non-appropriation principle of Article II of the OST.233 As a result, the United States’ provision of property rights to its citizens to possess, own, transport, use, and sell space and asteroid resources extracted through the SREU Act contravenes its international obligations established by the OST.

#### “Is unjust” can require positive action to rectify the injustice

Pomerleau [Wayne, PhD, Professor of Philosophy at Gonzaga] “Western Theories of Justice”, IEP, <https://iep.utm.edu/justwest/>, last date cited is 2010, RE

Nozick (a departmental colleague of Rawls at Harvard) was one of the first and remains one of the most famous critics of Rawls’s liberal theory of justice. Both are fundamentally committed to individual liberty. But as a libertarian, Nozick is opposed to compromising individual liberty in order to promote socio-economic equality and advocates a “minimal state” as the only sort that can be socially just. In Anarchy, State, and Utopia (1974), especially in its famous chapter on “Distributive Justice,” while praising Rawls’s first book as the most important “work in political and moral philosophy” since that of Mill, Nozick argues for what he calls an “entitlement conception of justice” in terms of three principles of just holdings. First, anyone who justly acquires any holding is rightly entitled to keep and use it. Second, anyone who acquires any holding by means of a just transfer of property is rightly entitled to keep and use it. It is only through some combination of these two approaches that anyone is rightly entitled to any holding. But some people acquire holdings unjustly—e.g., by theft or fraud or force—so that there are illegitimate holdings. So, third, justice can require the rectification of unjust past acquisitions. These three principles of just holdings—“the principle of acquisition of holdings, the principle of transfer of holdings, and the principle of rectification of the violations of the first two principles”—constitute the core of Nozick’s libertarian entitlement theory of justice. People should be entitled to use their own property as they see fit, so long as they are entitled to it. On this view, any pattern of distribution, such as Rawls’s difference principle, that would force people to give up any holdings to which they are entitled in order to give it to someone else (i.e., a redistribution of wealth) is unjust. Thus, for Nozick, any state, such as ours or one Rawls would favor, that is “more extensive” than a minimal state and redistributes wealth by taxing those who are relatively well off to benefit the disadvantaged necessarily “violates people’s rights” (State, pp. 149, 183, 230, 150-153, 230-231, 149).

#### US Code defines private entities

US Code 6 U.S. Code § 1501 – Definitions, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/6/1501#15_A>, 2015 RE

(15)Private entity

(A)In general

Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

(B)Inclusion

The term “private entity” includes a State, tribal, or local government performing utility services, such as electric, natural gas, or water services.

(C)Exclusion

The term “private entity” does not include a foreign power as defined in section 1801 of title 50.

#### Definition of “outer space”

Vereshchetin 06 [Vladlen, former Member of the ICJ, Chairman of the International Law Commission, and Professor of International Law] “Outer Space,” Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law, <https://spacelaw.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/p_spacelaw/EPIL_Outer_Space.pdf>, 2006 RE

A. Definition of the Term ‘Outer Space’

1 The term ‘outer space’, like several other basic notions of space law (‘outer space activity’, ‘space flight’, ‘space object’), although frequently used in space agreements and other space law instruments, has never been defined by them. There are a number of reasons for this, not least the objective difficulty for the States concerned to agree on legal definitions in the context of rapidly developing technology and their apprehension that legally binding definitions might restrict their sphere of operation.

2 The absence of a formal definition of outer space does not mean that no general perception exists as to what is meant by outer space, even if the use of the term in natural sciences and in law may not always be exactly the same. It should be remembered that there is no definitive physical boundary between atmospheric space and extra-atmospheric space, the transition from one to the other being gradual. Although at 100 km the density of the air is but one millionth of what it is at sea level, for natural scientists these two regions of space, in some respects, may be perceived as one single whole. However, with the launching of the first satellite in 1957 the notion of outer space became inextricably linked with the exploration and uses of space by means of man-made spacecraft (→ Spacecraft, Satellites, and Space Objects). The physical and technical factors are directly relevant to the legal regulation of the region of space concerned. The atmospheric space of the earth and most of the activities in this space fall within the ambit of → Air Law. The space beyond the atmosphere is governed by space law. The ‘spatial’ element of each of the two above-mentioned branches of law is reflected in their denominations: the first being known as air (ie atmospheric) law, the second as space law, often referred to as outer space (ie extra-atmospheric) law.

3 The legal regimes governing → airspace and outer space are fundamentally different. Thus, logically and jurisprudentially it is necessary to know where air space ends and outer space begins. In theory, there must be no ‘outer’ boundary of application of space law, since outer space itself is limitless, but in practice space law, keeping pace with the development of space technology, does not purport to regulate space activity beyond the solar system (see Art. 1 Agreement Governing the Activities of State on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies [(adopted 18 December 1979, entered into force 11 July 1984) 1363 UNTS 3]). At the same time, ‘celestial bodies’ of the solar system, other than the earth, but comprising the Moon, are included in the legal notion of outer space (→ Moon and Celestial Bodies). This follows from the title and text of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies ([signed 27 January 1967, entered into force 10 October 1967] 610 UNTS 205) (‘Outer Space Treaty’).

#### At best, it’s extra topical, which still skews neg prep and links to our offense.

#### Vote negative for predictable limits and ground—-allowing the affirmative to pick any grounds for the debate makes negative engagement impossible, by skirting a predictable starting point and making our preparation and research useless. Because debate is a competitive game, there is an incentive to revert to truisms that give the negative no chance at engagement. The lack of a plan also means the affirmative can shift their advocacy in later speeches instead of being tied to a particular text, which obviates negative arguments.

#### This has two impacts –

#### Fairness – A predictable limit is the only way to give the neg a chance to win—-radical aff choice shifts the grounds for the debate and puts the aff far ahead. Pre-tournament negative preparation is structured around topical plans as points of offense, which means anything other than a topical plan structurally favors the affirmative. Fairness is an intrinsic good—-debate is fundamentally a game and requires effective competition between the aff and the neg—-the only way for any benefit to be produced from debate and the reason why people are incentivized to do prep and research is to help them do better in their next round is if the judge can make a decision between two sides who have had a relatively equal chance to prepare for a common point of debate. Fairness also comes before substance—-deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from our inability to prepare for it—-any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them, because it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### Second is Argument Engagement---advocacy tied to the resolution incentivizes nuanced research and CLASH with a well prepared opponent---They turn debate into one with no negative counterargumentation which causes confirmation bias and less good affirmatives. It also doesn’t subject the aff to rigorous arugmentation which eliminates the skills necessary to make real material change in the world and doesn’t generate real productive discussions – turns their offense.

#### Topical version of the aff – end the commercialization of space. Use sufficiency when evaluating the TVA because all deficits are neg ground. This and SSD solve their offense by re-centering debate on the 1AC.

#### Topicality must be a voting issue—the role of the ballot is to vote for whoever does the better debating over the resolutional question. Any aff role for debate must explain why we switch sides and why there has to be a winner and a loser—switching sides within the competitive yet limited bounds of the topic performs the labor of the negative which avoids group polarization and untested advocacy

#### Theory is an issue of competing interpretations because reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters will exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation.

## OFF

### CP

#### We advocate for the entirety of the affirmative without the use of “invasion.” We would like to change that word to “occupy.”

#### Invasion rhetoric is weaponized in polarized politics---the aff increases political violence and fearmongering on the left and right

Byman 21 (Daniel L., Daniel Byman is a senior fellow in the Center for Middle East Policy at Brookings, where his research focuses on counterterrorism and Middle East security. He previously served as the research director of the center. He is also a professor in the Georgetown University Walsh School of Foreign Service's Security Studies Program, “How hateful rhetoric connects to real-world violence”, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2021/04/09/how-hateful-rhetoric-connects-to-real-world-violence/>) DGA

In January 6, 2021, President Trump gave an incendiary speech to supporters, lamenting election fraud, urging them to march on the Capitol where Congress was certifying the victory of President Biden, and telling them to “fight like hell.” Critics of the president, including his own acting Secretary of Defense Chris Miller, blamed the remarks for the Capitol riot. Congress would then go on to impeach Trump a second time for inciting the violence. Daniel L. Byman Daniel L. Byman Senior Fellow - Foreign Policy, Center for Middle East Policy dbyman Trump’s speech, however, is not a unique or even rare event, especially at a time of heavy polarization in the United States and other countries. Conservative websites and political leaders, especially at the state and local level, now regularly use violent rhetoric and demonize their political opponents. In addition, the high levels of polarization make it more likely that violent rhetoric will spread to both sides of the political debate. Already, violent rhetoric is growing on the political left. It is often difficult to trace one leader’s statement to subsequent events, and even in the case of the Capitol insurrection the president’s defenders insist on his innocence. However, a range of research suggests the incendiary rhetoric of political leaders can make political violence more likely, gives violence direction, complicates the law enforcement response, and increases fear in vulnerable communities. AS EXTREMISM MAGNIFIES, THE LIKELIHOOD OF VIOLENCE INCREASES There is no direct line between violent rhetoric and political violence if the speakers are careful not to name specific targets and means, and otherwise incriminate themselves. The risk of violence is nevertheless considerable. Although any individual — even one who cites President Trump or another leader when committing violence — may have multiple motives for acting, some sense of the problem can be traced by studies that show correlations between increases in hostile political rhetoric and violence. Part of the problem is that leaders’ remarks do not fade away after they are given. Incendiary rhetoric from political leaders against their political opponents, minority groups, and other targets is often quickly magnified. Leaders with large social media followings will see their remarks retweeted and otherwise shared with millions of followers. Leaders’ rhetoric then drives the coverage of more traditional news outlets, which broadcast it to their viewers and listeners. Rhetoric from national leaders also serves as a cue for local figures, particularly if the national leaders have loyal personal followings. The local leaders’ rhetoric in turn is amplified by social media and traditional outlets. Ordinary people play an important role too in spreading the message, sharing it with their own commentary with their friends and family. Related Books Brookings Big Ideas for America Edited by Michael E. O’Hanlon 2017 Open Networks, Closed Regimes By Shanthi Kalathil and Taylor C. Boas 2002 Redefining Urban and Suburban America Edited by Bruce Katz and Robert E. Lang 2003 Widely shared extreme rhetoric shifts the so-called “Overton Window,” signaling that an issue is now the subject of acceptable discourse when, in the past, discussing it might have been taboo. Prejudiced elite speech, one study found, is particularly powerful if other elites endorse it, emboldening audiences to declare their own prejudices and act on them accordingly. As one expert noted, referring to President Trump’s anti-Muslim and anti-Hispanic rhetoric: “The president’s rhetoric has helped to shift discourse norms in our country such that it is more acceptable among more people to denigrate and attack other groups of human beings.” An academic study found that rhetoric did not change attitudes but rather emboldened individuals to express, and act on, pre-existing views they had once hidden. Anti-Muslim discourse prompted by remarks by candidate Trump grew on Facebook and other social media sites in 2016. This, in turn, led followers to increase their anti-Muslim tweets and to get more attention from cable news channels. In subsequent days, hate crimes against Muslims increased 32%, with a significant, but lesser, increase against the Hispanic community, another target of Trump’s rhetoric. Specific tweets would lead to increases in hate crimes, with the level rising and falling depending on the prevalence of the social media activity. Hateful rhetoric can also stir dangerous emotions. A study of violence in Sweden found that hateful speech spurs negative emotions toward the target community among listeners, and another study of European audiences found that exposure to politicians’ violent rhetoric increases support for political violence among those surveyed. Such rhetoric also makes political violence against the target community seem more legitimate. In Germany, another study found that increases in anti-refugee sentiments on Facebook led to increases in violence against refugees: When Facebook had an outage, or when different events dominated the news, violence fell. Incendiary rhetoric also creates a more dangerous political climate in general. An analysis of the manifesto issued by El Paso Walmart shooter Patrick Crusius, who killed 23 people, mostly of Hispanic heritage, found that he used words like “invasion” and “replacement,” drawing on conspiracy theories promoted by conservative media hosts. Another study found the politicians’ hate speech increases political polarization and that this, in turn, makes domestic terrorism more likely. A spiral of reciprocal radicalization is a particular danger. Fringe groups in the targeted population can exploit hateful rhetoric directed against them, justifying their own violence and mobilizing additional support. The risk of reciprocal radicalization can be overstated, but even a low probability of it occurring is of concern, as it can worsen violence from both sides and empower even more demagogues. GIVING VIOLENCE DIRECTION Leaders lead. That truism highlights an obvious point when considering violent rhetoric: violence against whom? Political rhetoric not only highlights the problem but also the obstacles to solving it, often in the form of supposedly dangerous individuals and communities. Thus, if a leader targets them rhetorically, violence may increase sharply against communities that, in the past, had experienced relatively little violence. Some individuals charged with terrorism-related crimes claim that the rhetoric of President Trump and right-wing news media convinced them of the danger of Muslims and other groups and led them to act. A 2020 news report found that 54 cases involving assaults and threats were linked to individuals who invoked Trump and his rhetoric during their actions. Of these, 41 cases involved pro-Trump violence, and 13 cases involved supposed defiance of Trump. A number of participants in the Capitol riots saw themselves as loyal soldiers for President Trump and claimed they were “awaiting direction” regarding how to act. When President Trump tweeted out the phrase “Chinese virus” as COVID-19 began to spread in 2020, the use of the term exploded, according to a study in the American Journal of Public Health. Many of the tweets had virulent anti-Asian sentiments. Reporting from StopAAPIhate.org indicates that numerous hate incidents occurred after this tweet, with many falsely linking Asian-Americans to the virus. Individuals as well as communities may be vulnerable. In 2019, President Trump blasted Representative Ilhan Omar (D-MN) in a tweet, claiming “she is out of control” and that she is anti-Semitic and anti-American. He also tweeted out a short video showing images from the 9/11 terrorist attacks alongside selected remarks of Rep. Omar. She claimed: “Since the president’s tweet Friday evening, I have experienced an increase in direct threat on my life—many directly referring or replying to the president’s video.” Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer, who was targeted by President Trump in several tweets, wrote that each time she is attacked, “my family and I see a surge in vicious attacks sent our way.” COMPLICATING THE LAW ENFORCEMENT RESPONSE In addition to increasing the threat, intelligence and police services face several problems when leaders use incendiary rhetoric. First, they must worry about offending their bosses or, at the very least, being out of step with their agendas. The Washington Post reports that law enforcement officials did not fully register the danger posed by demonstrators at the Capitol on January 6 because “the overwhelming majority of the participants at the rally were White conservatives fiercely loyal to Trump” and because law enforcement officials took great pains to ensure they were not being perceived as violating the protesters’ free speech rights. Second, especially at the state and local level, political rhetoric can shape who is considered dangerous. Federal and state authorities often focused on Antifa, which represented at most a limited danger, diverting resources to it despite the presence of much more violent and active far-right groups. It is vital for social media companies to be vigilant in stopping violent rhetoric and for law enforcement to anticipate, and quickly suppress, violence before it spreads. INCREASING FEAR Given the increased likelihood of violence, the targeting of particular communities, and a possibly fitful law enforcement response, it is logical that communities may experience more fear. This fear can hold, however, even when actual levels of violence are low: The perception fueled by hateful rhetoric overcomes the reality. Polls of Americans show that over 75% believe that heated language makes political violence more likely. Concerns were particularly pronounced among Black, Hispanic, and Asian American and Pacific Islander communities. There is a deceptively simple answer to the problem of incendiary rhetoric: Politicians should exercise restraint themselves and condemn their fellow leaders when they cross the line that separates inspiring their followers from encouraging violence. Unfortunately, this advice is unlikely to be heeded. President Trump succeeded politically in part because he broke political taboos and a host of would-be successors are eager to capitalize on the energy of his base. For now, it is vital for social media companies to be vigilant in stopping violent rhetoric and for law enforcement to anticipate, and quickly suppress, violence before it spreads. Such measures are short-term ones, however, and do not solve the deeper problem.

#### “Invasion” rhetoric gets exported to foreign policy and reinscribes state power – it justifies a militarized response to defeat the evil Other.

Richard Jackson 5 [Government and International Politics @ University of Manchester] “Security, Democracy, and the Rhetoric of Counter-Terrorism.” Democracy and Security 1, no. 2 (2005): 147–71. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48602563.

The realm of foreign policy, and particularly foreign adversaries, is enormously significant for “writing” identities.27 Foreign policy is critical for maintaining internal/external boundaries, and war (as a special form of foreign policy) plays a central role in maintaining the domains of inside/outside, foreign/ domestic, self/other. This is no less true for the “war on terrorism,” which as we have suggested, is constructed largely in an epideictic rhetorical mode, rather than a deliberative mode.28 Bush makes appeals that attempt to unify the community and amplify its virtues; national character rather than national deliberation determine its actions. In fact, it has been argued that the very concept of the political self is based on the identification of the “enemy”; in other words, the enemy terrorist in the “war on terrorism” acts as the “enabling other” of the state—its negative justification.29 More than just identity maintenance then, the discourse of self and other in the rhetoric of counter-terrorism co-constitutes the political; it permits the state as practice.

Perhaps the most important feature of the construction of identity in this discourse is the ubiquitous use of a rhetorical trope of “good and evil.” Deeply embedded in American rhetorical traditions and religious life (as well as being a sub-plot of the “civilization-barbarism” meta-narrative), this language essentializes the terrorists as both satanic and morally corrupt. On September 11, Bush stated that “Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature”;30 in subsequent texts, he frequently refers to terrorists as “the evil ones,” and “evildoers.” These are theological terms, deployed largely for a Southern conservative audience, but also appealing to popular entertainment understandings of “good guys” and “bad guys.” As such, it is a demonological move in which the terrorists are individually and collectively marked as “cruel,” “mad”, and driven by “hate”; perhaps inadvertently, it also supernaturalizes them. In this agent/act ratio, the character of the terrorists precedes their actions: the terrorists did what they did because it is in their nature to do so—they murdered because that is what evil, demonic terrorists do.31 It is a powerful discourse, and an act of demagoguery, which de-contextualizes and de-historicizes the actions of the terrorists, emptying them of any political content, while simultaneously de-humanizing them. After all, there can be no deeper explanation for such acts, and there can be no reasoning or compromising with evil; the only right response is exorcism and purification. At the same time, the radical evil argument32 is a long used strategy of silencing liberal dissent: from Leo Strauss and Reinhold Neibuhr to Ronald Reagan, liberals have been charged with lacking both a realistic sense of human evil and the moral courage to confront it.

In an extension of re-making the attackers as demons, they are also scripted as inhuman or non-human. Bush speaks of the “curse of terrorism that is upon the face of the earth,”33 while Colin Powell refers to “the scourge of terrorism.”34 This medical metaphor is restated more explicitly by Rumsfeld: “We share the belief that terrorism is a cancer on the human condition.”35 Bush in turn, speaks of the danger to the body politic posed by “terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own.”36 In this construction, the terrorist is remade as a dangerous organism that makes its host ill; they hide interiorly, drawing on the lifeblood of their unsuspecting hosts and spreading poison. This particular language is actually a precursor to the disciplinary idea of “the enemy within”; they are the new “reds under the bed.” Of course, such “an evil and inhuman group of men”37—these “faceless enemies of human dignity”38— are undeserving of our sympathy or protection. While it would be wrong to treat an enemy soldier inhumanely, or torture a criminal suspect, the same cannot be said for a parasite, a cancer, a curse. If the enemy is removed from the moral realm of human community, then by extension, actions towards them cannot be judged on moral terms. This is extremely liberating for a government fighting a hidden enemy, as it means that those government agencies that practice the “black arts” can be unleashed with impunity.

However, as if it were not enough to strip the enemy of all human features, the discourse also goes on to write them as fundamentally “alien” and “foreign.” As John Ashcroft states:

Today I’m announcing several steps that we’re taking to enhance our ability to protect the United States from the threat of terrorist aliens. [ . . . ] The Foreign Terrorist Tracking Task Force that Mr. McCraw will lead will ensure that federal agencies coordinate their efforts to bar from the United States all aliens who meet any of the following criteria: aliens who are representatives, members or supporters of terrorist organizations; aliens who are suspected of engaging in terrorist activity; or aliens who provide material support to terrorist activity.39

This designation of “alien terrorists” in particular, is the ultimate expression of “otherness” and is designed to clearly demarcate the boundaries between the inside and the outside, between those who belong to the community and those outside of it. In other words, not only are the terrorists disqualified from the domain of our community, they are disqualified from humanity itself. In a society immersed in the movie mythology of Invasion of the Body Snatchers, Alien, Independence Day, and The X-Files, the meanings of the term “alien terrorist” oscillate between “extra-terrestrial parasite” and “foreign enemy” without a hint of irony. After all, alien invasion movies are cultural metaphors for the fear of foreign invasion. Anthropologically, the trope of the evil/cancerous/ alien terrorist “monster”—the mode of composing social relations among terms—is actually the cultural projection of the tabooed “wild man” figure of the Western imagination.40 That is, rooted in the fundamental need to control dangerous behavior, taboos function to locate, identify, and segregate transgressions and dangers. In the absence of the (old) barbarians and the “red menace,” terrorism now fulfills these functions to a tee.

## OFF

### K

**Their cessation of revolutionary institution building abdicates the potential for true communal power, reducing revolution to reactive bursts of energy.**

Escalante 19. Alyson. Marxist-Leninist. Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. "Communism and Climate Change: A Dual Power Approach." Failing That. Invent. https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/02/15/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach.

I have previously argued that a crucial advantage to **dual power** **strategy** is that it gives the masses an infrastructure of socialist **institutions** which can directly provide for **material needs** in times of **capitalist crisis.** **Socialist agricultural** and **food distribution programs** can take ground that the **capitalist state** cedes by simultaneously meeting the needs of the masses while proving that socialist **self-management** and **political** **institutions** can function **independently** of capitalism. This approach is not only capable of **literally saving lives** in the case of crisis, but of demonstrating the **possibility of a revolutionary project** which seeks to **destroy rather than reform** capitalism. One of the most pressing of the various crises which humanity faces today is climate change. Capitalist production has devastated the planet, and everyday we discover that the small window of time for avoiding its most disastrous effects is shorter than previously understood. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that we have 12 years to limit (not even prevent) the more catastrophic effects of climate change. The simple, and horrific, fact that we all must face is that climate change has reached a point where many of its effects are **inevitable**, and we are now in a **post-brink world**, where damage control is the primary concern. **The question is not whether we can escape** a future of **climate change, but whether we can survive it**. Socialist strategy must adapt accordingly. In the face of this crisis, the democratic socialists and social democrats in the United States have largely settled on market based reforms. The Green New Deal, championed by Alexandria Ocasio Cortez and the left wing of the Democratic Party, remains a thoroughly capitalist solution to a capitalist problem. The proposal does nothing to challenge capitalism itself, but rather seeks to subsidize market solutions to reorient the US energy infrastructure towards renewable energy production, to develop less energy consuming transportation, and the development of public investment towards these ends. **The plan does nothing to call into question the profit incentives and endless resource consumption of capitalism which led us to this point**. Rather, it seeks to reorient the relentless market forces of capitalism towards slightly less destructive technological developments. While the plan would lead to a massive investment in the manufacturing and deployment of solar energy infrastructure, National Geographic reports that, “Fabricating [solar] panels **requires caustic chemicals** such as sodium hydroxide and hydrofluoric acid, and **the process uses water as well as electricity**, the production of which **emits greenhouse gases**.” Technology alone cannot sufficiently combat this crisis, as the production of such technology through capitalist manufacturing infrastructure **only perpetuates environmental harm**. Furthermore, subsidizing and incentivizing renewable energy stops far short of actually combating the fossil fuel industry driving the current climate crisis. The technocratic market solutions offered in the Green New Deal fail to adequately combat the driving factors of climate change. What is worse, they rely on a violent imperialist global system in order to produce their technological solutions. The development of high-tech energy infrastructure and the development of low or zero emission transportation requires the import of raw material and rare earth minerals which the United States can only access because of the imperial division of the Global South. This imperial division of the world requires constant **militarism** from the imperial core nations, and as Lenin demonstrates in Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, facilitates **constant warfare** as imperial states compete for **spheres of influence** in order to facilitate cheap resource extraction. The US military, one of many imperialist forces, is the single largest user of petroleum, and one of its main functions is to ensure oil access for the United States. Without challenging this imperialist division of the world and the role of the United States military in upholding it, the Green New Deal fails even further to challenge the underlying causes of climate change. Even with the failed promises of the Green New Deal itself, it is unlikely that this tepid market proposal will pass at all. Nancy Pelosi and other lead Democrats have largely condemned it and consider it “impractical” and “unfeasible.” This dismissal is crucial because it reveals the total inability of capitalism to resolve this crisis. If the center-left party in the heart of the imperial core sees even capitalist reforms as a step too far, we ought to have very little hope that a reformist solution will present itself within the ever shrinking 12 year time frame. There are times for delicacy and there are times for bluntness, and we are in the latter. To put things bluntly: the capitalists are not going to save us, and **if we don’t find a way to save ourselves, the collapse of human civilization is a real possibility.** The pressing question we now face is: **how are we going to save ourselves?** Revolution and Dual Power If capitalism will not be able to resolve the current encroaching climate crisis, we must find a way to organize outside the confines of capitalist institutions, towards the end of overthrowing capitalism. If the Democratic Socialists of America backed candidates cannot offer real anti-capitalist solutions through the capitalist state, we should be skeptical of the possibility for any socialist organization doing so. The DSA is far larger and far more well funded than any of the other socialist organizations in the United States, and they have failed to produce anything more revolutionary than the Green New Deal. We have to abandon the idea that electoral strategy will be sufficient to resolve the underlying causes of this crisis within 12 years. While many radicals call for revolution instead of reform, the reformists often raise the same response: revolution is well and good, but what are you going to do in the mean time? In many ways this question is fair. The socialist left in the United States today is not ready for revolutionary action, and a mass base does not exist to back the various organizations which might undertake such a struggle. Revolutionaries must concede that we have much work to be done before a revolutionary strategy can be enacted. This is a hard truth, but it is true. Much of the left has sought to ignore this truth by embracing adventurism and violent protest theatrics, in the vain hope of sparking revolutionary momentum which does not currently exist. If this is the core strategy of the socialist left, **we will accomplish nothing in the next 12 years**. Such approaches are as useless as the opportunist reforms pushed by the social democrats. Our task in these 12 years is not simply to arm ourselves and hope that magically the masses will wake up prepared for revolution and willing to put their trust in our small ideological cadres. We must instead, build a movement, and with it we must build infrastructure which can survive revolution and provide a framework for socialist development. Dual power is tooled towards this project best. **The Marxist Center** network has done an impressive amount of work developing socialist institutions across the US, largely through **tenants organizing** and **serve the people programs**. The left wing factions within the DSA itself have also begun to develop **mutual aid programs** that could be useful for dual power strategy. At the same time, **mutual aid is not enough**. We cannot simply build these institutions as a reform to make capitalism more survivable. Rather, we must make these institutions part of a **broader revolutionary movement** and they ought to function as a material prefiguration to a socialist society and economy. The institutions we build as dual power outside the capitalist state today ought to be structured towards revolutionary ends, such that they will someday function as the early institutions of a revolutionary socialist society. To accomplish this goal, we cannot simply declare these institutions to be revolutionary. Rather **they have to be linked together through an actual revolutionary movement working towards revolutionary ends**. This means that dual power institutions cannot exist as ends in and of themselves, nor can **abstract notions of mutual aid** cannot be conceptualized as an end in itself. The explicit purpose of these institutions has to be to **radicalize** the masses through meeting their needs, and providing an infrastructure for a socialist movement to meet **the needs of** its members and the **communities** in which it operates. **Revolutionary institutions** that **can provide food, housing**, and other needs for a revolutionary movement will be crucial for **build**ing **a base** among the masses and for constructing the beginnings of a socialist infrastructure for when we eventually engage in revolutionary struggle.

#### They conflate “materialism” with “materiality” – violence is not some amalgamation of signs but is instead about flesh and bone – their project fuels capitalist pedagogy

McLaren 10 [Peter, UC-Los Angeles and Nathalia E. Jaramillo, Purdue University, “Not Neo-Marxist, Not Post-Marxist, Not Marxian, Not Autonomist Marxism: Reflections on a Revolutionary (Marxist) Critical Pedagogy” Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies 2010 10: 251]

Ebert (2009; Ebert & Zavarzadeh, 2008) makes an important distinction between corporeality/materiality and matter/materialism. Materiality is related to objective idealism and refers to the acceptance of an idea in the mind as something real, something that escapes class interests. In this way, avant-garde scholars will deconstruct materialism as merely the effects of tropes and representations. It attempts to create a prefigurative origin for what is essentially an ontology. However, Ebert (2009) argues that this constitutes transforming materialism into materiality, into a contemplative corporeality of difference, purging materialism of its conceptuality and determinate meanings. Matter is turned into signs or the effect of signs or sign power. This has led to the recent interest in the politics of performativity—performing identities, performing pedagogy, performing class, and so on. However, Ebert argues that matter is not synonymous with physical objects; matter exists outside the consciousness of the subject, and it cannot be separated from its production and contradictions in history. Matter is objective reality in history. Ebert and Zavarzadeh (2008) characterize materialism as the objective (transformative) productive activities of humans involving them in social relations; these social relations occur under definite historical conditions that are independent of their will and are shaped by class struggle over the surplus produced by social labor. A materialism that excludes historical processes and operates as a medium of cultural practices is not materialism; it is materiality or what Ebert (2009) refers to as “matterism.” Avant-garde critics who would replace materialism with materiality (through the tropes of supplementarity, spectrality, undecidability, and difference) severely undercut the claim for the objectivity of class interests and ultimately replace class struggle with the struggle over the sign. Like Ebert, David McNally (2001) in his classic Marxist text, Bodies of Meaning, describes the deconstructive efforts of post-structuralists such as Jacques Derrida as a form of linguistic idealism. In his critique of anti-fetishistic thought (like that of Marx), that palpates the farthest reach of linguistic meaning, Derrida devalues dialectical critique as useless by disavowing embodied human activity, by ignoring laboring human bodies and rejecting them as metaphysical illusions. When Derrida deals with issues of the economy, he is interested only in capital that begets capital—that is, in credit or fictitious capital. Likewise, in his critique of Saussure, he critiques the notion of a transcendental signified, a universal equivalent or what McNally refers to as meaning’s gold standard (something positive that can exist outside of an endless reference of commodities to other commodities). There is nothing extralinguistic for Derrida, since language suspends all reference to something outside of it. Similarly, for Derrida, money lacks a referent. It is driven by credit and speculation and lacks any material foundations. Derrida deals with fictitious or dematerialized money, money that can be produced without labor, that is, money as an expression of hyperreality. Capital in this view is nothing more than a self-engendering dance on a solipsistic path of self-fecundation. The real is folded into the representation. Derrida (and Baudrillard and others) assimilate the economy (the same one that is throwing people out of their homes and into the streets at present) into their poststructuralist model of language. Contrary to Derrida, Ebert and McNally maintain that value is not a sign freed from its referent; rather, value expresses itself in material form. It must pass through laboring bodies and their history of struggle, through toiling subjects and practical human activity that takes place in an organic social universe of skin, hair, blood, and bone. And capitalism abstracts from these bodies, and commodifies them. The work of McNally and Ebert implodes the limitations of post-structuralist thought in dealing with capitalist exploitation. According to Ebert (2009), revolutionary agents of social transformation act ethically when they attempt to resolve the contradictions of their objective location in relations of exploitation. Capitalist violence often doubles as cultural discourses, and Ebert views popular culture, especially, as a narcosis of violence, predicated on distracting subjects from the central antagonism of capitalist society—the struggles over the surplus labor of the other––thereby producing subjects who cannot grasp the totality of the system. In Ebert’s view, the pedagogical practices developed by the poststructuralist avant-garde theorize experience in relation to trauma, desire, and affective relations in general as if these relations were antiseptically cleaved from relations of class, thereby replacing a conceptual analysis of the social totality with liberating pedagogical narratives grounded in local affective strategies—strategies that serve unwittingly as epistemological covers for economic conditions that help the subject cope with the objective material conditions of capitalist exploitation. This leads ultimately to a de-historicization of social life and draws attention away from the way in which all human beings who populate capitalist societies are implicated in some manner in international class struggles and the social division of labor (see also Zavarzadeh, 2003). Ebert and Zavarzadeh describe this process as a “pedagogy of affect.” They write that The pedagogy of affect piles up details and warns students against attempting to relate them structurally because any structural analysis will be a causal explanation, and all causal explanations, students are told, are reductive. Teaching thus becomes a pursuit of floating details—a version of games in popular culture. Students seem to know but have no knowledge. This is exactly the kind of education capital requires for its new workforce: workers who are educated but nonthinking; skilled at detailed jobs but unable to grasp the totality of the system—energetic localists, ignorant globalists. This pedagogy provides instruction not in knowledge but in savviness—a knowing that knows what it knows is an illusion but is undeluded about that illusion; it integrates the illusion, thereby making itself immune to critique. Savviness is enlightened false consciousness: a consciousness that knows it is false, but its “falseness is already reflexively buffered.” (2008, pp. 107-108)

#### The onslaught of capitalism has manifested in violence, climate change, lashout and weapons dispersed throughout the globe – the alternative provides the tools to fight back.

Escalante 19. Alyson, “Truth and Practice: The Marxist Theory of Knowledge.” 9/8/2019. [https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/09/08/truth-and-practic-the-marxist-theory-of-knowledge](https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/09/08/truth-and-practic-the-marxist-theory-of-knowledge/), DKP

Part 4: For Science, For Victory So, why does all this matter? What is at stake in an attempt to outline the Marxist Epistemology? The world we live in today is in a dire state. Climate destruction continues at a fast pace, and every with every passing day, capitalism proves itself to be incapable of addressing this. Capitalist production and its endless drive for resources to match artificial market demands has created a climate crisis that leaves us on the brink of potential extinction. Governments around the world are turning to far right and fascist leaders to assuage their fears of an uncertain future, and the most marginalized and oppressed suffer because of it. Fascism is on the rise, and history tells us very clearly what that can result in without opposition. The decaying US empire continues to lash out in violence across the globe in a desperate attempt to re-assert its power and hegemony. Whole countries are destroyed in its desperate bids for more fossil fuels. The world burns from America’s white phosphorus weaponry. The need for a revolutionary movement capable of replacing capitalism with something better has never been so clear. The choice between socialism or barbarism has never been so stark. More and more people are starting to realize that reform cannot save us, that capitalism and imperialism themselves are the problem, and that we must unite and band together to fight for a better world. The question then is: how will we know what strategies, what tactics, and what ideas to unite around? If the skeptics and postmodernists are correct that knowledge is always relative and localized, then we cannot built a global and universal strategy to unite around. If they are correct then we are doomed to small acts of localized or individual resistance in the face of apocalypse. To embrace such a vision of the world (with its accompanying epistemological skepticism) is to embrace defeat. The masses do not want to embrace defeat, they want to know how to fight back. Marxism can provide the tools necessary to engage in that fight. Marxism, with its self criticism and its insistence on incorporating the valuable ideas of its critics has created a means for unifying workers across the globe with anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles. The Marxist belief in the possibility of true ideas, tested and verified in practice, creates the possibility for unity on a global scale. The scientific status of Marxism means that as our climate changes, as our world looks more and more grim, Marxism will adapt through struggle and practice; it will provide us with the ideas and tools we need to fight and win. There will be no victory for the workers of the world without the ability to wield a revolutionary science. What is at stake in questions of Marxist epistemology is the very possibility of creating a philosophical and scientific basis for revolution. We must defend this possibility. We must defend the scientific status of Marxism, and must insist on the possibility of victory.

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only the Party can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct violent tendencies within organizing, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation.

Escalante 18. Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist. Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “Party Organizing in the 21st Century. September 2018. <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century.>

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation.

A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

#### This is a reformulation of classic white Marxism -- socialist organizing must center anti-racist struggle, mandating that allies put their lives on the line for revolutionary anti-capitalism and adopting Black demands as the demands of the entire working class.

Ervin 16. Lorenzo Kom'boa Ervin is an American writer, activist, and black anarchist. “The Progressive Plantation: racism inside white radical social change groups.” 2016. URL: [http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lsereviewofbooks/2017/01/04/book-review-vulnerability-in-resistance-edited-by-judith-butler-zeynep-gambetti-and-leticia-sabsay. cut by vikas](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lsereviewofbooks/2017/01/04/book-review-vulnerability-in-resistance-edited-by-judith-butler-zeynep-gambetti-and-leticia-sabsay.%20cut%20by%20vikas) bbyyy

**Building an Anti-Racist Liberation Support Movement**

**For years it has been known there are some very simple components to an anti-racist tendency on the Left.** The type of **organization needed must be** a "mass" organization working to unite all workers and poor people in common class struggle, but that it must also be **able to** recognize the duty to support and adopt **the** special demands of the Black and other non-white peoples **as those of the entire working class. It must challenge white supremacy on a daily basis** in both white working class communities and radical social change organizations; **it must** refute racist philosophy and propaganda **and must counter racist mobilizations and attacks**, with armed self-defense and street fighting, when necessary. The objective of such a mass movement was to win elements of the white working class over to an anti-white supremacy, class-conscious position; to unite the -entire- working class; and to directly confront the right wing. **This program**, **must function** in conjunction with pre-existing struggles in communities of color, **not as a white Left vanguard dominating the** entire **movement.** So I have never called for a white-led or "white rights" organization like those I have criticized. **The cooperation of and solidarity of all workers and poor people is essential for full social revolution, not just its privileged white sector.** They must be willing to follow the lead of poor and oppressed workers and activists of color, as was done during the civil rights movement of the 1960s. **That is something that the white Left has not been able to do** and is why they set up their own all-white groups, which in no time at all lapse into liberalism and racial exclusion. As revolutionaries, **we must always understand our objective is to overthrow the capitalist state and its rulers**, and that we must live the politics we preach. Racism is intolerable. This movement must have the potential to deconstruct the racist capitalist state and construct an entirely new society on anti-authoritarian principles. It has to go beyond white Left campaigns of the past, or it's just empty rhetoric. So I am proposing something different: an anti-racist tendency as a political movement to change society itself. This would be a race and class based revolutionary movement, not content to sit around and read books, elect a few Black politicians or "friends of Labor" to Congress or the State Legislature, write protest letters, circulate petitions, or other such tame liberal reform tactics. It also would not be concerned with white middle class leftist issues like "Nazi youth music", the so-called "vanguard role" of white workers, animal rights, world trade reform and other white rights campaigns. For years, I have asked these white radicals: What about racial profiling, mass imprisonment of Blacks/Latinos and the poor, police murder and brutality, etc. and other hallmarks of a racist society? Why are you not uniting with Black and other non-white peoples? I have never got a satisfactory response to these questions. This proposed campaign I am speaking of is around issues that could also act as a pole of attraction for peoples of color to this movement, because they directly affect them. Further, raising issues of the crushing of the human rights of poor and working people of color, especially the millions of homeless and unemployed in the inner cities could push it further than the agenda of the old civil rights movement, which only tepidly raised issues of racial discrimination and exploitation of the poor to demand reforms of capitalism, but shied away from anything that sounded vaguely like "Socialism". **We must be willing to fight in the streets with** the **poor, racially oppressed and economically down-pressed peoples**, because that is who we are. It would take the examples of the early radical labor movements like the IWW, as well as the later Civil Rights/ Black Power movements of the 1960s and the Welfare Rights movement, to show that only direct action tactics of confrontation and militant protest will yield any results at all. We also have to study the examples of the 1992 Los Angeles and 2001 Cincinnati rebellions, which show once again that, while poor people will revolt, there need to be powerful allies extending material aid and resistance information. These allies can also start resistance and support campaigns in the white communities. We need to also show there is an existing mass movement to take it to the next step and spread the insurrection on a long-term basis. **For the most part**, **the** Anarchist and **Socialist movement still does not** even **deal with police murder or brutality, poverty, or** certain kinds of "uncomfortable" **racist issues like criminalization of youth of color, except in a peripheral way as political rhetoric. I have not seen** the various Anarchist Black Cross or Anti-Racist Action groups, or the white led Socialist parties deal with the disproportionate imprisonment **of Black people in the U.S.**, (10 times that of white people), **the** frequent police murders **of Black civilians, or** the racial profiling of the millions of Black people each year. So, **we must also challenge our allies** in the Anarchist, anti-globalization movements, and "Occupy Wall Street" movement **to** both **act as** true political allies **and** serve as a source of material support, while still respecting our autonomy. **This is why I am continually saying** that **it is necessary for white workers to defend** the **democratic rights and gains of non-white workers** in the general society, instead of just fighting for white rights on the job and/ or white issues of social advancement. Finally, **to be clear this anti-racist movement is a coalition of peoples of color with white allies**. **But it has to be recognized** as a cardinal principle by all, **that oppressed peoples have a right to self-determination**, **including the right to run** their own **organizations and liberation struggle**. Most importantly, inside the anti-racism movement itself the peoples of colour have to take the lead, even if they share it with others. The victims of racism know best how to fight back against it. The Anarchists, **Socialists** and other white radicals **must recognize this and help build a** millitant **anti-racist group**, **which would** be both a **support** group for **the** Black revolution **and a** mass-organizing center **to unite the class of poor peoples and oppressed.** It is very important to wrest the mass influence of the racial equality movement out of the hands of the left-liberal Democratic wing of the ruling class. The left liberals like Jessie Jackson or Al Sharpton may talk a good fight, but as long as they are not overthrowing Capitalism and smashing the state, they will betray and sabotage the entire struggle against racism. **The strategy of the left-liberals is to deflect class consciousness into strictly race consciousness and then call for mere enforcement of the civil rights laws by the federal government**. For the most part, **they refuse to appeal to class material interests of the U.S. white working and middle classes to support Black rights and as a result allow the right-wing to capitalize unopposed** on the latent racist feeling among whites, as well as on their economic insecurity. Jackson did this during his political campaigns, but only to win votes for the Democrats. They do not even try to organize the Black working class poor. **The kind of movement I am proposing will step in the breach and attack white supremacy and dismantle the very threads of what hold capitalism together.** **Without the mass white consensus** to the rule of the American state and the system of white skin privilege, capitalism could not continue to function without interruption. Anarchists and Socialists have to stop giving lip service to all this. The way they apply it, "race treason" is a farce, it is just the latest political fad since whites don't have to really be inconvenienced or challenged. However, true anti-racist politics challenge the notion of whites doing anything less than putting their own lives and future on the line **for a new society and** dismantling a capitalist system which while it brutally oppresses peoples of color, and exploits all of us as working people.
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Counterplan: We endorse the entirety of the affirmative with the exception of African asteroid mining.

#### Commercial mining solves extinction from scarcity, climate, terror, war, and disease.

Pelton 17—(Director Emeritus of the Space and Advanced Communications Research Institute at George Washington University, PHD in IR from Georgetown).. Pelton, Joseph N. 2017. The New Gold Rush: The Riches of Space Beckon! Springer. Accessed 8/30/19.

Are We Humans Doomed to Extinction? What will we do when Earth’s resources are used up by humanity? The world is now hugely over populated, with billions and billions crammed into our overcrowded cities. By 2050, we may be 9 billion strong, and by 2100 well over 11 billion people on Planet Earth. Some at the United Nations say we might even be an amazing 12 billion crawling around this small globe. And over 80 % of us will be living in congested cities. These cities will be ever more vulnerable to terrorist attack, natural disaster, and other plights that come with overcrowding and a dearth of jobs that will be fueled by rapid automation and the rise of artifi cial intelligence across the global economy. We are already rapidly running out of water and minerals. Climate change is threatening our very existence. Political leaders and even the Pope have cautioned us against inaction. Perhaps the naysayers are right. All humanity is at tremendous risk. Is there no hope for the future? This book is about hope. We think that there is literally heavenly hope for humanity. But we are not talking here about divine intervention. We are envisioning a new space economy that recognizes that there is more water in the skies that all our oceans. Th ere is a new wealth of natural resources and clean energy in the reaches of outer space—more than most of us could ever dream possible. There are those that say why waste money on outer space when we have severe problems here at home? Going into space is not a waste of money. It is our future. It is our hope for new jobs and resources. The great challenge of our times is to reverse public thinking to see space not as a resource drain but as the doorway to opportunity. The new space frontier can literally open up a “gold rush in the skies.” In brief, we think there is new hope for humanity. We see a new a pathway to the future via new ventures in space. For too long, space programs have been seen as a money pit. In the process, we have overlooked the great abundance available to us in the skies above. It is important to recognize there is already the beginning of a new gold rush in space—a pathway to astral abundance. “New Space” is a term increasingly used to describe radical new commercial space initiatives—many of which have come from Silicon Valley and often with backing from the group of entrepreneurs known popularly as the “space billionaires.” New space is revolutionizing the space industry with lower cost space transportation and space systems that represent significant cost savings and new technological breakthroughs. “New Commercial Space” and the “New Space Economy” represent more than a new way of looking at outer space. These new pathways to the stars could prove vital to human survival. If one does not believe in spending money to probe the mysteries of the universe then perhaps we can try what might be called “calibrated greed” on for size. One only needs to go to a cubesat workshop, or to Silicon Valley or one of many conferences like the “Disrupt Space” event in Bremen, Germany, held in April 2016 to recognize that entrepreneurial New Space initiatives are changing everything [ 1 ]. In fact, the very nature and dimensions of what outer space activities are today have changed forever. It is no longer your grandfather’s concept of outer space that was once dominated by the big national space agencies. The entrepreneurs are taking over. The hopeful statements in this book and the hard economic and technical data that backs them up are more than a minority opinion. It is a topic of growing interest at the World Economic Forum, where business and political heavyweights meet in Davos, Switzerland, to discuss how to stimulate new patterns of global economic growth. It is even the growing view of a group that call themselves “space ethicists.” Here is how Christopher J. Newman, at the University of Sunderland in the United Kingdom has put it: Space ethicists have offered the view that space exploration is not only desirable; it is a duty that we, as a species, must undertake in order to secure the survival of humanity over the longer term. Expanding both the resource base and, eventually, the habitats available for humanity means that any expenditure on space exploration, far from being viewed as frivolous, can legitimately be rationalized as an ethical investment choice. (Newman) On the other hand there are space ethicists and space exobiologists who argue that humans have created ecological ruin on the planet—and now space debris is starting to pollute space. Th ese countervailing thoughts by the “no growth” camp of space ethicists say we have no right to colonize other planets or to mine the Moon and asteroids—or at least no right to do so until we can prove we can sustain life here on Earth for the longer term. However, for most who are planning for the new space economy the opinion of space philosophers doesn’t really fl oat their boat. Legislators, bankers, and aspiring space entrepreneurs are far more interested in the views of the super-rich capitalists called the space billionaires. A number of these billionaires and space executives have already put some very serious money into enterprises intent on creating a new pathway to the stars. No less than five billionaires with established space ventures—Elon Musk, Paul Allen, Jeff Bezos, Sir Richard Branson, and Robert Bigelow—have invested millions if not billions of dollars into commercializing space. They are developing new technologies and establishing space enterprises that can bring the wealth of outer space down to Earth. This is not a pipe dream, but will increasingly be the economic reality of the 2020s. These wealthy space entrepreneurs see major new economic opportunities. To them space represents the last great frontier for enterprising pioneers. Th us they see an ever-expanding space frontier that offers opportunities in low-cost space transportation, satellite solar power satellites to produce clean energy 24h a day, space mining, space manufacturing and production, and eventually space habitats and colonies as a trajectory to a better human future. Some even more visionary thinkers envision the possibility of terraforming Mars, or creating new structures in space to protect our planet from cosmic hazards and even raising Earth’s orbit to escape the rising heat levels of the Sun in millennia to come. Some, of course, will say this is sci-fi hogwash. It can’t be done. We say that this is what people would have said in 1900 about airplanes, rocket ships, cell phones and nuclear devices. The skeptics laughed at Columbus and his plan to sail across the oceans to discover new worlds. When Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana Purchase from France or Seward bought Alaska, there were plenty of naysayers that said such investment in the unknown was an extravagant waste of money. A healthy skepticism is useful and can play a role in economic and business success. Before one dismisses the idea of an impending major new space economy and a new gold rush, it might useful to see what has already transpired in space development in just the past five decades. The world’s first geosynchronous communications satellite had a throughput capability of about 500 kb / s. In contrast, today’s state of the art Viasat 2 —a half century later— has an impressive throughput of some 140 Gb/s. Th is means that the relative throughput is nearly 300,000 greater, while its lifetime is some ten times longer (Figs. 1.1 and 1.2 ). Each new generation of communications satellite has had more power, better antenna systems, improved pointing and stabilization, and an extended lifetime. And the capabilities represented by remote sensing satellites , meteorological satellites , and navigation and timing satellites have also expanded their capabilities and performance in an impressive manner. When satellite applications first started, the market was measured in millions of dollars. Today commercial satellite services exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. Vital services such as the Internet, aircraft traffi c control and management, international banking, search and rescue and much, much more depend on application satellites. Th ose that would doubt the importance of satellites to the global economy might wish to view on You Tube the video “If Th ere Were a Day Without Satellites?” [ 2 ]. Let’s check in on what some of those very rich and smart guys think about the new space economy and its potential. (We are sorry to say that so far there are no female space billionaires, but surely this, too, will come someday soon.) Of course this twenty-fi rst century breakthrough that we call the New Space economy will not come just from new space commerce. It will also come from the amazing new technologies here on Earth. Vital new terrestrial technologies will accompany this cosmic journey into tomorrow. Information technology, robotics, artificial intelligence and commercial space travel systems have now set us on a course to allow us humans to harvest the amazing riches in the skies—new natural resources, new energy, and even totally new ways of looking at the purpose of human existence. If we pursue this course steadfastly, it can be the beginning of a New Space renaissance. But if we don’t seek to realize our ultimate destiny in space, Homo sapiens can end up in the dustbin of history—just like literally millions of already failed species. In each and every one of the five mass extinction events that have occurred over the last 1.5 billion years on Earth, some 50–80 % of all species have gone the way of the T. Rex, the woolly mammoth, and the Dodo bird along with extinct ferns, grasses and cacti. On the other hand, the best days of the human race could be just beginning. If we are smart about how we go about discovering and using these riches in the skies and applying the best of our new technologies, it could be the start of a new beginning for humanity. Konstantin Tsiokovsky, the Russian astronautics pioneer, who fi rst conceived of practical designs for spaceships, famously said: “A planet is the cradle of mankind, but one cannot live in a cradle forever.” Well before Tsiokovsky another genius, Leonardo da Vinci, said, quite poetically: “Once you have tasted flight, you will forever walk the earth with your eyes turned skyward, for there you have been, and there you will always long to return.” The founder of the X-Prize and of Planetary Resources, Inc., Dr. Peter Diamandis, has much more brashly said much the same thing in quite diff erent words when he said: “The meek shall inherit the Earth. The rest of us will go to Mars.” The New Space Billionaires Peter Diamandis is not alone in his thinking. From the list of “visionaries” quoted earlier, Elon Musk, the founder of SpaceX; Sir Richard Branson, the founder of Virgin Galactic; and Paul Allen, the co-founder of Microsoft and the man who financed SpaceShipOne, the world’s first successful spaceplane have all said the future will include a vibrant new space economy. Th ey, and others, have said that we can, we should and we soon shall go into space and realize the bounty that it can offer to us. Th e New Space enterprise is today indeed being led by those so-called space billionaires , who have an exciting vision of the future. They and others in the commercial space economy believe that the exploitation of outer space may open up a new golden age of astral abundance. They see outer space as a new frontier that can be a great source of new materials, energy and various forms of new wealth that might even save us from excesses of the past. Th is gold rush in the skies represents a new beginning. We are not talking about expensive new space ventures funded by NASA or other space agencies in Europe, Japan, China or India. No, these eff orts which we and others call New Space are today being forged by imaginative and resourceful commercial entrepreneurs. Th ese twenty-fi rst century visionaries have the fortitude and zeal to look to the abundance above. New breakthroughs in technology and New Space enterprises may be able to create an “astral life raft” for humanity. Just as Columbus and the Vikings had the imaginative drive that led them to discover the riches of a new world, we now have a cadre of space billionaires that are now leading us into this New Space era of tomorrow. These bold leaders, such as Paul Allen and Sir Richard Branson, plus other space entrepreneurs including Jeff Bezos of Amazon and Blue Origin, and Robert Bigelow, Chairman of Budget Suites and Bigelow Aerospace, not only dream of their future in the space industry but also have billions of dollars in assets. These are the bright stars of an entirely new industry that are leading us into the age of New Space commerce. These space billionaires, each in their own way, are proponents of a new age of astral abundance. Each of them is launching new commercial space industries. They are literally transforming our vision of tomorrow. These new types of entrepreneurial aerospace companies—the New Space enterprises—give new hope and new promise of transforming our world as we know it today. The New Space Frontier What happens in space in the next few decades, plus corresponding new information technologies and advanced robotics, will change our world forever. These changes will redefi ne wealth, change our views of work and employment and upend almost everything we think we know about economics, wealth, jobs, and politics. Th ese changes are about truly disruptive technologies of the most fundamental kinds. If you thought the Internet, smart phones, and spandex were disruptive technologies, just hang on. You have not seen anything yet. In short, if you want to understand a transition more fundamental than the changes brought to the twentieth century world by computers, communications and the Internet, then read this book. There are truly riches in the skies. Near-Earth asteroids largely composed of platinum and rare earth metals have an incredible value. Helium-3 isotopes accessible in outer space could provide clean and abundant energy. There is far more water in outer space than is in our oceans. In the pages that follow we will explain the potential for a cosmic shift in our global economy, our ecology, and our commercial and legal systems. These can take place by the end of this century. And if these changes do not take place we will be in trouble. Our conventional petro-chemical energy systems will fail us economically and eventually blanket us with a hydrocarbon haze of smog that will threaten our health and our very survival. Our rare precious metals that we need for modern electronic appliances will skyrocket in price, and the struggle between “haves” and “have nots” will grow increasingly ugly. A lack of affordable and readily available water, natural resources, food, health care and medical supplies, plus systematic threats to urban security and systemic warfare are the alternatives to astral abundance. The choices between astral abundance and a downward spiral in global standards of living are stark. Within the next few decades these problems will be increasingly real. By then the world may almost be begging for new, out of- the-box thinking. International peace and security will be an indispensable prerequisite for exploitation of astral abundance, as will good government for all. No one nation can be rich and secure when everyone else is poor and insecure. In short, global space security and strategic space defense, mediated by global space agreements, are part of this new pathway to the future.

#### African asteroid mining solves their economy without massive biodloss drawback

Oni 19 David is a space industry and technology analyst at Space in Africa. He’s a graduate of Mining Engineering from the Federal University of Technology Akure. "Why Africa Should Consider Asteroid Mining - Space in Africa." Space in Africa, 1 Sept. 2019, africanews.space/why-africa-should-consider-asteroid-mining.

It is no news that mining activities have caused severe environmental consequences, and Africa has had its fair share too. While policies and regulations are being put in place by governments and various international bodies to prevent further environmental degradation and protect what is left of the earth’s habitat, the majority of the African continent has struggled to enforce these regulations, largely due to weak governmental structures. Sadly, the African political clime has been plagued with a complicated history of inconsistent legislation and weak law enforcement mechanisms. For most African countries, it is a conundrum. Many mining firms thrive, not only because of the promising prospects but also because of the loopholes in the regulations and policies of most African countries. To them, working under unpleasant conditions is a small price to pay, compared to upholding safety and environmental standards. Mining, by nature, is an exploitative, dangerous and environmentally damaging activity. Even with strict policies and regulations in place, mining activities will still release dangerous substances into the atmosphere and surroundings. It really is a catch-22 with combating environmental degradation, because eventually, it is only a matter of time before the consequent environmental hazards catch up with us. The good news is that significant progress is being made in the space industry. Our world has gone from baby steps on the moon to giant leaps in space technology. These milestones are now beyond bragging rights, but rather an exigent obligation to keep up with the global paradigm shift. What’s more, these advancements are extending to the African continent. A number of African states have several satellites already launched into space, and more African states already have space programmes running. Space science and technology is the new black! The industrialisation of space would be brought about primarily by increasing commercial activities in space, worth several billion dollars per year, largely involving the following activities: telecommunications, direct broadcast television, navigation (e.g. the Global Positioning System), remote sensing, and meteorological services. With SpaceX, Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic —the top three frontline space tourism companies— are engaged in a fierce rivalry as to who would be the supreme space tourism company, and a host of government as well as private companies showing sufficient interest and involvement in space tourism, it is safe to say that asteroid mining is imminent. Asteroid Mining in Africa Artist’s concept of asteroid mining station (Credit: Deep Space Industries) There are millions of asteroids in the solar system – remnants of bodies colliding in space. Most of the asteroids are distributed between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter —the main asteroid belt— but not all of them. According to Advantage Environment, approximately 13,000 asteroids are categorized as near-Earth objects, well within reasonable reach, and at least 900 more are discovered every year. Asteroid mining is a concept that involves the extraction of useful materials from asteroids and near-earth objects, which are useful for propulsion, construction, life support, agriculture, metallurgy, and precious and strategic metals. Volatiles such as hydrogen and methane could be used to produce rocket fuel for transporting spacecraft between the Earth and near-earth objects. Rare-earth metals, such as thulium, scandium, and holmium could be used to manufacture materials as well as solar panels which could be used to power habitats in space. These solar-powered cells could also be used to provide electricity for its inhabitants with satellites specifically designed for this purpose. Iron, nickel and cobalt would serve as fundamental raw materials for building space factories. Precious metals such as platinum, platinum-group metals (PGMs), and gold are also useful. A handful of companies, emerging and existing, will require materials with a high level of purity in large quantities, all of which are readily available in asteroids. There are conjectures that the asteroid mining industry is a whooping trillion-dollar industry. Asteroid Mining in Africa Photo Credit: Planetary Resources With all of the vast possibilities that space technology brings our way, we might want to ask ourselves, is asteroid mining still rocket science? To establish a mine, a portion of vegetation is cleared. This causes deforestation (and eventually, erosion and flooding) as well as the loss of biodiversity, which adversely affect native inhabitants. Leakages and tailing dumpings have raised serious environmental concerns. Yet most African governments struggle to keep these occurrences in check. There have been several reported cases of cyanide leaks and lead poisoning. Rivers and dams are re-routed to create exposed riverbeds for mining, which has a detrimental effect on fish and wildlife that depend on rivers for survival. OK Tedi copper and gold mine in Papua, New Guinea has caused environmental harm that is far-reaching to the 50,000 residents spread across the 120 villages close to the mine, due to the discharges produced daily. Mining also has a remarkable adverse effect on the atmosphere. During mining, particles that are not visible to the ordinary eye are released into the air and transported by wind. Lead, arsenic, cadmium, and other toxic elements are often present in such particles. Respiratory diseases and allergies can be triggered by the inhalation of such airborne particles. Underground mining causes huge amounts of waste earth to be brought to the surface, waste that often becomes toxic when it comes into contact with air and water. It causes cave-ins and sinkholes which can cause severe damage to buildings and equipment, as well as the loss of life. Coal mining also leads to greenhouse gas emissions. Acid mine drainage occurs when water comes in contact with coal and other rocks during the mining process. This water, made toxic because of the influence of toxic minerals and other heavy metals, eventually leaks out of abandoned mines and contaminates groundwater, streams, rivers, soil, plants, animals and humans. As a result, an orange colour blankets the river, estuary or sea bed, killing plants and making surface water unfit for drinking. Asteroid Mining in Africa Acid mine drainage in South Africa Common health threats posed by coal mining include pneumoconiosis (aka black lung disease), cardiopulmonary disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, hypertension, lung disease, and kidney disease. In a report given by Infogalactic, a series of lead poisonings in Zamfara State, Nigeria, led to the deaths of at least 163 people between March and June 2010, including 111 children. Health ministry figures state the discovery of 355 cases, with 46 per cent proving fatal. According to NASA-compiled data, Kriel, a town in South Africa’s coal mining province in east Johannesburg, has the second-highest volume of sulphur dioxide (SO2) emissions in the world. Mining activities have taken a toll on our environment, which is why beyond maximizing of mineral resources for space infrastructure and fuelling of propellants, asteroid mining also provides a ready recourse to terrestrial mining activities, with a view to saving the planet. Thousands of people are forced to work in mines and are also forced to live under sub-human conditions. If attention is shifted from terrestrial mining, of course with robots working the mines in space, these people could not only live elongated lives but also find healthier employment alternatives. The advantages of asteroid mining are numerous: trip exchanges for cargo to reduce wasteful journeys of transport trucks, development of cheaper batteries to reduce energy and storage costs, beneficiation of plastic waste to sustainable and clean bio-fuel as well as the development and use of solar-powered airships Some studies indicate that an asteroid that runs 1,000 m (3,280 ft) across could yield about 100,000 tons of platinum, which already has miners in South Africa worried because they only mine a measly 130 tons of the metal on Earth each year. “Space miners will first target water-rich asteroids for their hydrogen potential, then mineral-rich asteroids for their nickel and iron-ore. Platinum is a small by-product of their yield and has no use in space. But that means it poses a risk to the platinum resources below the earth’s surface”, says Kieck. This is not the time for African countries to take the back seat, instead, they should take advantage of the momentum that is driving the space industry. Nations like South Africa, Zimbabwe and Nigeria have shown interests in asteroid mining, having recognised its vast potential. It will be noteworthy to see African countries on the frontiers with technology giants like Russia, China and the USA. In May 2017, Mechanical engineer and PhD graduate, Jonathan Lun’s idea for the innovation challenge was chosen as the winner at the GIC awards ceremony, in Johannesburg. His idea is to use an innovative rocket technology, known as a vacuum arc thruster, which consumes asteroid metal as fuel to achieve industrial-scale transport of mined asteroid material. Asteroid mining will serve as a stepping stone, bridging the gap between developed countries and developing countries in space technology to a significant level, Africa will be setting the foundation to be key players in the space industry, while at the same time contributing significantly to the battle against environmental degradation.

#### Yes private companies key and coming now – over 283, launching soon, but keeping barriers low key

Bailey 21 Stephanie Bailey, Business. "Why Africa is sending more satellites into space." CNN, October 6, 2021, www.cnn.com/2021/09/21/business/african-satellites-spc-intl/index.html.

London (CNN Business)Africa's space industry has been slow to take off, but it's predicted to skyrocket in the next few years. Since the continent's first satellite launched more than 20 years ago, 44 have been sent into orbit by 13 African countries, according to consultancy Space in Africa. It says a further 125 are being developed by 23 countries, all expected to launch before 2025. The payoff could be substantial. A 2021 report by the World Economic Forum estimates that data collected from space could unlock $2 billion a year in benefits for Africa. The report says satellites could address agricultural challenges by measuring crop health, improve water management by monitoring drought, and track tree cover for more sustainable forest management. In a continent where less than a third of the population has access to broadband, more communication satellites could help people connect to the internet. Addressing Africa's challenges South African startup Astrofica was founded four years ago, providing space consultancy services. It supported the CubeSat program at Cape Peninsula University of Technology, which launched a constellation of maritime satellites for tracking ships along the southern African coast. Astrofica's co-founder and CTO, Khalid Manjoo, says the goal of the startup is to use the space industry to address Africa's challenges — from food security to national security. It hopes to launch its first constellation of satellites by the end of 2022, "that will provide decision makers with critical data sets [in] near real time," according to Manjoo. He hopes the data will be used to monitor crop yield or track the use of fertilizers, as well as help governments with water management. The launch of South Africa&#39;s SumbandilaSat on a Russian Soyuz rocket in Baikonur, Kazakhstan, in September 2009. The launch of South Africa's SumbandilaSat on a Russian Soyuz rocket in Baikonur, Kazakhstan, in September 2009. "The satellites that we put up in space, it's cool stuff, but it's not necessarily the end goal; the end goal for Astrofica is to deal with the challenges and problems that we would like to solve," he says. "They cannot be solved using purely terrestrial systems, they need these critical space-based insights." Manjoo says African countries are spending too much money acquiring agricultural data from international providers, which is not timely enough — although the company welcomes collaboration with foreign partners. According to Manjoo, ride shares — where satellite manufacturers can buy a spot on someone else's rocket — have made getting to space cheaper and more accessible. Astrofica is looking to launch its first satellite on board an American SpaceX rocket, a Russian Soyuz rocket, or a Polar Satellite Launch Vehicle in India. Launching constellations Space in Africa estimates over 283 companies now operate in the continent's space and satellite industry, which it says generated more than $7.3 billion in revenue in 2019 and predicts will generate over $10 billion by 2024. Africa must remove barriers to flying to secure post-pandemic boom, says IATA regional exec Africa must remove barriers to flying to secure post-pandemic boom, says IATA regional exec Another South African company, Dragonfly Aerospace, provides imaging systems for satellites and is now working on launching its own constellation. "The new space industry has a lot of opportunity because there's a lot of growth," says Bryan Dean, Dragonfly Aerospace's CEO. "You are now able to launch more satellites for the same amount of money than you were in the past, and a system of satellites in orbit is far more powerful than a single satellite because they work together and combine the data." Space entrepreneur Max Polyakov bought the company in April and as part of expansion plans, Dean says Dragonfly Aerospace is near completing a 3,000 square meter satellite manufacturing facility in Stellenbosch, South Africa, with capacity to build up to 48 satellites per year. Dragonfly Aerospace&#39;s new facility. Dragonfly Aerospace's new facility. Dean says one bottleneck for the production of satellites is being able to test how they will behave in the extreme temperatures of space. "In the past this was dominated by government facilities which you could rent," he says. "But with the advent of more commercial operations, many companies are investing in having those facilities in house." The company hopes to launch its first satellite in June next year from the US. Overcoming roadblocks Minoo Rathnasabapathy, a space research engineer at MIT, says the continent's space industry still has challenges to overcome, most notably a lack of resources. "When you consider the US or Europe, it's really apples and oranges." she says. "In the US we see a lot of private industry and a lot of private funding and we're seeing NASA and ESA [the European Space Agency] be able to tap into that funding. Whereas in Africa, we're just not there yet and that's completely understandable given other priorities of the countries." Astrofica's Manjoo says another hurdle is changing mindsets. Astrofica&#39;s Jessie Ndaba and Khalid Manjoo testing SumbandilaSat, a South African micro earth observation satellite, in 2009. Astrofica's Jessie Ndaba and Khalid Manjoo testing SumbandilaSat, a South African micro earth observation satellite, in 2009. "There is still a view across the continent, quite a myopic view, that the investments that you need to justify in space are too high risk and also that money may be better positioned in terms of alleviating tangible issues such as education, poverty, infrastructure upliftment, which decision makers can see," he says. Manjoo adds that government bureaucracy is holding back the African space industry and investment is needed to support local businesses. "Those are huge amounts of investments," he says. "But countries are slowly starting to understand that the investment in space today is actually for the sustainability and prosperity of your country and your region in the years to come."

**Key to prevent extinction**

**Owusu-Afriyie, 2 ---** Aburi Botanic Gardens staff

(George, "The Potential Role of African Botanic Gardens in Environmental Awareness Programmes and the Need to be Involved," 10-1-2, www.bgci.org/education/1703/, accessed 1-15-12)

Today some of the 60 botanic gardens and arboreta in Africa are among those botanic gardens that are leading the worldwide fight to save plant diversity, as well as creating an understanding and awareness for the promotion of methods of conservation and development of plant resources. Despite financial constraints, a number of African botanic gardens are implementing major reforms under the auspices of Botanic Gardens Conservation International, to enable them play a more purposeful role in conservation. The Creation of Environmental Awareness Among the Populace **African's biological diversity is** not only of continental economic importance but is also **of global significance**. Unfortunately, existing arrangements for the utilization of the continent's biodiversity cannot be considered sustainable and this is having serious repercussions on development programmes in Africa. The rich plant diversity in Africa is indiscriminately harvested for a number of purposes including: cultivation and production of food and cash crops for domestic and external interests herbal medicine construction. Luckily, in spite of their continued exploitation, botanic gardens and other habitats still contain some of the **richest assemblages of plant life known on this planet.** Thus African gardens are appropriate institutions with the necessary capacities and plant diversities for use in environmental awareness programmes. The success of environmental awareness programmes will largely depend upon the communities' understanding of the functioning of the environment, the problems it presents, and their expected contribution to its protection and improvement. The pursuit of conservation-oriented practices to halt the degradation and extinction of plant resources will depend not only on their acceptability, but also on the active support and involvement of the populace at large. In addition, people need to be well informed, sensitized and motivated towards adopting specific plant conservation practices and the sustainable use of plant resources. It is well known that plants are the **key to life on Earth** and the **prime element in biodiversity**. They dominate our landscape, providing the framework of natural ecosystems that provide the habitats for animal species and **make life on earth possible for humans** as well as other living beings. Yet in spite of this common knowledge of the importance of plants in human survival, plant life is being lost at an increasing rate not only in Africa, but also throughout the whole world. This is the result of economic pressure on the developing countries and careless human activities. Until unfair transactions, particularly in trading systems, are addressed and humans made the centre of attention, only a limited impact will be made in our effort to control the excessive utilization of resources and the regenerability of the various life-sustaining systems on the Earth.

**Prefer the specificity our evidence to African biodiversity- its key to prevent extinction- key region and species to global life-support systems**

**Richard, 10** -- science and technology editor

(Michael Graham, "The True Size and Importance of Africa," 10-13-10, www.treehugger.com/clean-technology/the-true-size-and-importance-of-africa-map.html, accessed 1-16-12)

Don't Overlook Africa! Because of the way flat maps distort the size of countries (the closer they are to the poles, the more distorted they are), most people don't really know just how big the African continent is. This leads many people - and the smart and powerful aren't immune to this - to underestimate Africa's importance. The map above shows just how wrong our perception can be (unless we've already seen a map like this before). It shows that you could fit the whole USA, China, India, Spain, France, Germany, the UK, Italy, Switzerland, Japan, and Eastern Europe, inside of Africa and still have some room left. We're All Inter-Connected Africa matters a lot because of the number of people who live there (about 1 billion as of 2005, with projections of 2 billion by 2050), but also because of the **number of indigenous animal and plant species**, because of the vast expanses of land that aren't being protected, because of the huge ecosystems that are uniquely found there, because of the impact that it can have on the global climate (especially deforestation and desertification), because of all the solar power potential and other natural resources, etc. It is one of the **key regions** that needs to improve on many levels for the welfare of its people and **to safeguard the integrity of our planet's life-support systems.** Africa is too often the forgotten continent, but it shouldn't be, and humanitarian problems should make us forget environmental issues because both go hand in hand. The degradation of the environment will affect the most vulnerable people there.

## Case

**1NC – Framing**

#### 1] C/ROB : vote for the better debater, anything else self/serving, arbitrary, and impact justified

#### 2] Death outweighs---it’s the upmost moral evil and disavowal of the risk makes it more likely.

Burns 2017 (Elizabeth Finneron-Burns is a Teaching Fellow at the University of Warwick and an Affiliated Researcher at the Institute for Futures Studies in Stockholm, What’s wrong with human extinction?, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00455091.2016.1278150?needAccess=true>, Canadian Journal of Philosophy, 2017)

Many, though certainly not all, people might believe that it would be wrong to bring about the end of the human species, and the reasons given for this belief are various. I begin by considering four reasons that could be given against the moral permissibility of human extinction. I will argue that only those reasons that impact the people who exist at the time that the extinction or the knowledge of the upcoming extinction occurs, can explain its wrongness. I use this conclusion to then consider in which cases human extinction would be morally permissible or impermissible, arguing that there is only a small class of cases in which it would not be wrong to cause the extinction of the human race or allow it to happen. 2.1. It would prevent the existence of very many happy people One reason of human extinction might be considered to be wrong lies in the value of human life itself. The thought here might be that it is a good thing for people to exist and enjoy happy lives and extinction would deprive more people of enjoying this good. The ‘good’ in this case could be understood in at least two ways. According to the first, one might believe that you benefit a person by bringing them into existence, or at least, that it is good for that person that they come to exist. The second view might hold that if humans were to go extinct, the utility foregone by the billions (or more) of people who could have lived but will now never get that opportunity, renders allowing human extinction to take place an incidence of wrongdoing. An example of this view can be found in two quotes from an Effective Altruism blog post by Peter Singer, Nick Beckstead and Matt Wage: One very bad thing about human extinction would be that billions of people would likely die painful deaths. But in our view, this is by far not the worst thing about human extinction. The worst thing about human extinction is that there would be no future generations. Since there could be so many generations in our future, the value of all those generations together greatly exceeds the value of the current generation. (Beckstead, Singer, and Wage 2013) The authors are making two claims. The first is that there is value in human life and also something valuable about creating future people which gives us a reason to do so; furthermore, it would be a very bad thing if we did not do so. The second is that, not only would it be a bad thing for there to be no future people, but it would actually be the worst thing about extinction. Since happy human lives have value, and the number of potential people who could ever exist is far greater than the number of people who exist at any one time, even if the extinction were brought about through the painful deaths of currently existing people, the former’s loss would be greater than the latter’s. Both claims are assuming that there is an intrinsic value in the existence of potential human life. The second claim makes the further assumption that the forgone value of the potential lives that could be lived is greater than the disvalue that would be accrued by people existing at the time of the extinction through suffering from painful and/or premature deaths. The best-known author of the post, Peter Singer is a prominent utilitarian, so it is not surprising that he would lament the potential lack of future human lives per se. However, it is not just utilitarians who share this view, even if implicitly. Indeed, other philosophers also seem to imply that they share the intuition that there is just something wrong with causing or failing to prevent the extinction of the human species such that we prevent more ‘people’ from having the ‘opportunity to exist’. Stephen Gardiner (2009) and Martin O’Neill (personal correspondence), both sympathetic to contract theory, for example, also find it intuitive that we should want more generations to have the opportunity to exist, assuming that they have worth-living lives, and I find it plausible to think that many other people (philosophers and non-philosophers alike) probably share this intuition. When we talk about future lives being ‘prevented’, we are saying that a possible person or a set of possible people who could potentially have existed will now never actually come to exist. To say that it is wrong to prevent people from existing could either mean that a possible person could reasonably reject a principle that permitted us not to create them, or that the foregone value of their lives provides a reason for rejecting any principle that permits extinction. To make the first claim we would have to argue that a possible person could reasonably reject any principle that prevented their existence on the grounds that it prevented them in particular from existing. However, this is implausible for two reasons. First, we can only wrong someone who did, does or will actually exist because wronging involves failing to take a person’s interests into account. When considering the permissibility of a principle allowing us not to create Person X, we cannot take X’s interest in being created into account because X will not exist if we follow the principle. By considering the standpoint of a person in our deliberations we consider the burdens they will have to bear as a result of the principle. In this case, there is no one who will bear any burdens since if the principle is followed (that is, if we do not create X), X will not exist to bear any burdens. So, only people who do/will actually exist can bear the brunt of a principle, and therefore occupy a standpoint that is owed justification. Second, existence is not an interest at all and a possible person is not disadvantaged by not being caused to exist. Rather than being an interest, it is a necessary requirement in order to have interests. Rivka Weinberg describes it as ‘neutral’ because causing a person to exist is to create a subject who can have interests; existence is not an interest itself.3 In order to be disadvantaged, there must be some detrimental effect on your interests. However, without existence, a person does not have any interests so they cannot be disadvantaged by being kept out of existence. But, as Weinberg points out, ‘never having interests itself could not be contrary to people’s interests since without interest bearers, there can be no ‘they’ for it to be bad for’ (Weinberg 2008, 13). So, a principle that results in some possible people never becoming actual does not impose any costs on those ‘people’ because nobody is disadvantaged by not coming into existence.4 It therefore seems that it cannot be wrong to fail to bring particular people into existence. This would mean that no one acts wrongly when they fail to create another person. Writ large, it would also not be wrong if everybody decided to exercise their prerogative not to create new people and potentially, by consequence, allow human extinction. One might respond here by saying that although it may be permissible for one person to fail to create a new person, it is not permissible if everyone chooses to do so because human lives have value and allowing human extinction would be to forgo a huge amount of value in the world. This takes us to the second way of understanding the potential wrongness of preventing people from existing — the foregone value of a life provides a reason for rejecting any principle that prevents it. One possible reply to this claim turns on the fact that many philosophers acknowledge that the only, or at least the best, way to think about the value of (individual or groups of) possible people’s lives is in impersonal terms (Parfit 1984; Reiman 2007; McMahan 2009). Jeff McMahan, for example, writes ‘at the time of one’s choice there is no one who exists or will exist independently of that choice for whose sake one could be acting in causing him or her to exist … it seems therefore that any reason to cause or not to cause an individual to exist … is best considered an impersonal rather than individual-affecting reason’ (McMahan 2009, 52). Another reply along similar lines would be to appeal to the value that is lost or at least foregone when we fail to bring into existence a next (or several next) generations of people with worth-living lives. Since ex hypothesi worth-living lives have positive value, it is better to create more such lives and worse to create fewer. Human extinction by definition is the creation of no future lives and would ‘deprive’ billions of ‘people’ of the opportunity to live worth-living lives. This might reduce the amount of value in the world at the time of the extinction (by killing already existing people), but it would also prevent a much vaster amount of value in the future (by failing to create more people). Both replies depend on the impersonal value of human life. However, recall that in contractualism impersonal values are not on their own grounds for reasonably rejecting principles. Scanlon himself says that although we have a strong reason not to destroy existing human lives, this reason ‘does not flow from the thought that it is a good thing for there to be more human life rather than less’ (104). In contractualism, something cannot be wrong unless there is an impact on a person. Thus, neither the impersonal value of creating a particular person nor the impersonal value of human life writ large could on its own provide a reason for rejecting a principle permitting human extinction. It seems therefore that the fact that extinction would deprive future people of the opportunity to live worth-living lives (either by failing to create either particular future people or future people in general) cannot provide us with a reason to consider human extinction to be wrong. Although the lost value of these ‘lives’ itself cannot be the reason explaining the wrongness of extinction, it is possible the knowledge of this loss might create a personal reason for some existing people. I will consider this possibility later on in section (d). But first I move to the second reason human extinction might be wrong per se. 2.2. It would mean the loss of the only known form of intelligent life and all civilization and intellectual progress would be lost A second reason we might think it would be wrong to cause human extinction is the loss that would occur of the only (known) form of rational life and the knowledge and civilization that that form of life has created. One thought here could be that just as some might consider it wrong to destroy an individual human heritage monument like the Sphinx, it would also be wrong if the advances made by humans over the past few millennia were lost or prevented from progressing. A related argument is made by those who feel that there is something special about humans’ capacity for rationality which is valuable in itself. Since humans are the only intelligent life that we know of, it would be a loss, in itself, to the world for that to end. I admit that I struggle to fully appreciate this thought. It seems to me that Henry Sidgwick was correct in thinking that these things are only important insofar as they are important to humans (Sidgwick 1874, I.IX.4).5 If there is no form of intelligent life in the future, who would there be to lament its loss since intelligent life is the only form of life capable of appreciating intelligence? Similarly, if there is no one with the rational capacity to appreciate historic monuments and civil progress, who would there be to be negatively affected or even notice the loss?6 However, even if there is nothing special about human rationality, just as some people try to prevent the extinction of nonhuman animal species, we might think that we ought also to prevent human extinction for the sake of biodiversity. The thought in this, as well as the earlier examples, must be that it would somehow be bad for the world if there were no more humans even though there would be no one for whom it is bad. This may be so but the only way to understand this reason is impersonally. Since we are concerned with wrongness rather than badness, we must ask whether something that impacts no one’s well-being, status or claims can be wrong. As we saw earlier, in the contractualist framework reasons must be personal rather than impersonal in order to provide grounds for reasonable rejection (Scanlon 1998, 218–223). Since the loss of civilization, intelligent life or biodiversity are per se impersonal reasons, there is no standpoint from which these reasons could be used to reasonably reject a principle that permitted extinction. Therefore, causing human extinction on the grounds of the loss of civilization, rational life or biodiversity would not be wrong. 2.3. Existing people would endure physical pain and/or painful and/or premature deaths Thinking about the ways in which human extinction might come about brings to the fore two more reasons it might be wrong. It could, for example, occur if all humans (or at least the critical number needed to be unable to replenish the population, leading to eventual extinction) underwent a sterilization procedure. Or perhaps it could come about due to anthropogenic climate change or a massive asteroid hitting the Earth and wiping out the species in the same way it did the dinosaurs millions of years ago. Each of these scenarios would involve significant physical and/or non-physical harms to existing people and their interests. Physically, people might suffer premature and possibly also painful deaths, for example. It is not hard to imagine examples in which the process of extinction could cause premature death. A nuclear winter that killed everyone or even just every woman under the age of 50 is a clear example of such a case. Obviously, some types of premature death themselves cannot be reasons to reject a principle. Every person dies eventually, sometimes earlier than the standard expected lifespan due to accidents or causes like spontaneously occurring incurable cancers. A cause such as disease is not a moral agent and therefore it cannot be wrong if it unavoidably kills a person prematurely. Scanlon says that the fact that a principle would reduce a person’s well-being gives that person a reason to reject the principle: ‘components of well-being figure prominently as grounds for reasonable rejection’ (Scanlon 1998, 214). However, it is not settled yet whether premature death is a setback to well-being. Some philosophers hold that death is a harm to the person who dies, whilst others argue that it is not.7 I will argue, however, that regardless of who is correct in that debate, being caused to die prematurely can be reason to reject a principle when it fails to show respect to the person as a rational agent. Scanlon says that recognizing others as rational beings with interests involves seeing reason to preserve life and prevent death: ‘appreciating the value of human life is primarily a matter of seeing human lives as something to be respected, where this involves seeing reasons not to destroy them, reasons to protect them, and reasons to want them to go well’ (Scanlon 1998, 104). The ‘respect for life’ in this case is a respect for the person living, not respect for human life in the abstract. This means that we can sometimes fail to protect human life without acting wrongfully if we still respect the person living. Scanlon gives the example of a person who faces a life of unending and extreme pain such that she wishes to end it by committing suicide. Scanlon does not think that the suicidal person shows a lack of respect for her own life by seeking to end it because the person whose life it is has no reason to want it to go on. This is important to note because it emphasizes the fact that the respect for human life is person-affecting. It is not wrong to murder because of the impersonal disvalue of death in general, but because taking someone’s life without their permission shows disrespect to that person. This supports its inclusion as a reason in the contractualist formula, regardless of what side ends up winning the ‘is death a harm?’ debate because even if death turns out not to harm the person who died, ending their life without their consent shows disrespect to that person. A person who could reject a principle permitting another to cause his or her premature death presumably does not wish to die at that time, or in that manner. Thus, if they are killed without their consent, their interests have not been taken into account, and they have a reason to reject the principle that allowed their premature death.8 This is as true in the case of death due to extinction as it is for death due to murder. However, physical pain may also be caused to existing people without killing them, but still resulting in human extinction. Imagine, for example, surgically removing everyone’s reproductive organs in order to prevent the creation of any future people. Another example could be a nuclear bomb that did not kill anyone, but did painfully render them infertile through illness or injury. These would be cases in which physical pain (through surgery or bombs) was inflicted on existing people and the extinction came about as a result of the painful incident rather than through death. Furthermore, one could imagine a situation in which a bomb (for example) killed enough people to cause extinction, but some people remained alive, but in terrible pain from injuries. It seems uncontroversial that the infliction of physical pain could be a reason to reject a principle. Although Scanlon says that an impact on well-being is not the only reason to reject principles, it plays a significant role, and indeed, most principles are likely to be rejected due to a negative impact on a person’s well-being, physical or otherwise. It may be queried here whether it is actually the involuntariness of the pain that is grounds for reasonable rejection rather than the physical pain itself because not all pain that a person suffers is involuntary. One can imagine acts that can cause physical pain that are not rejectable — base jumping or life-saving or improving surgery, for example. On the other hand, pushing someone off a cliff or cutting him with a scalpel against his will are clearly rejectable acts. The difference between the two cases is that in the former, the person having the pain inflicted has consented to that pain or risk of pain. My view is that they cannot be separated in these cases and it is involuntary physical pain that is the grounds for reasonable rejection. Thus, the fact that a principle would allow unwanted physical harm gives a person who would be subjected to that harm a reason to reject the principle. Of course the mere fact that a principle causes involuntary physical harm or premature death is not sufficient to declare that the principle is rejectable — there might be countervailing reasons. In the case of extinction, what countervailing reasons might be offered in favour of the involuntary physical pain/ death-inducing harm? One such reason that might be offered is that humans are a harm to the natural environment and that the world might be a better place if there were no humans in it. It could be that humans might rightfully be considered an all-things-considered hindrance to the world rather than a benefit to it given the fact that we have been largely responsible for the extinction of many species, pollution and, most recently, climate change which have all negatively affected the natural environment in ways we are only just beginning to understand. Thus, the fact that human extinction would improve the natural environment (or at least prevent it from degrading further), is a countervailing reason in favour of extinction to be weighed against the reasons held by humans who would experience physical pain or premature death. However, the good of the environment as described above is by definition not a personal reason. Just like the loss of rational life and civilization, therefore, it cannot be a reason on its own when determining what is wrong and countervail the strong personal reasons to avoid pain/death that is held by the people who would suffer from it.9 Every person existing at the time of the extinction would have a reason to reject that principle on the grounds of the physical pain they are being forced to endure against their will that could not be countervailed by impersonal considerations such as the negative impact humans may have on the earth. Therefore, a principle that permitted extinction to be accomplished in a way that caused involuntary physical pain or premature death could quite clearly be rejectable by existing people with no relevant countervailing reasons. This means that human extinction that came about in this way would be wrong. There are of course also additional reasons they could reject a similar principle which I now turn to address in the next section. 2.4. Existing people could endure non-physical harms I said earlier than the fact in itself that there would not be any future people is an impersonal reason and can therefore not be a reason to reject a principle permitting extinction. However, this impersonal reason could give rise to a personal reason that is admissible. So, the final important reason people might think that human extinction would be wrong is that there could be various deleterious psychological effects that would be endured by existing people having the knowledge that there would be no future generations. There are two main sources of this trauma, both arising from the knowledge that there will be no more people. The first relates to individual people and the undesired negative effect on well-being that would be experienced by those who would have wanted to have children. Whilst this is by no means universal, it is fair to say that a good proportion of people feel a strong pull towards reproduction and having their lineage continue in some way. Samuel Scheffler describes the pull towards reproduction as a ‘desire for a personalized relationship with the future’ (Scheffler 2012, 31). Reproducing is a widely held desire and the joys of parenthood are ones that many people wish to experience. For these people knowing that they would not have descendants (or that their descendants will endure painful and/or premature deaths) could create a sense of despair and pointlessness of life. Furthermore, the inability to reproduce and have your own children because of a principle/policy that prevents you (either through bans or physical interventions) would be a significant infringement of what we consider to be a basic right to control what happens to your body. For these reasons, knowing that you will have no descendants could cause significant psychological traumas or harms even if there were no associated physical harm. The second is a more general, higher level sense of hopelessness or despair that there will be no more humans and that your projects will end with you. Even those who did not feel a strong desire to procreate themselves might feel a sense of hopelessness that any projects or goals they have for the future would not be fulfilled. Many of the projects and goals we work towards during our lifetime are also at least partly future-oriented. Why bother continuing the search for a cure for cancer if either it will not be found within humans’ lifetime, and/or there will be no future people to benefit from it once it is found? Similar projects and goals that might lose their meaning when confronted with extinction include politics, artistic pursuits and even the type of philosophical work with which this paper is concerned. Even more extreme, through the words of the character Theo Faron, P.D. James says in his novel The Children of Men that ‘without the hope of posterity for our race if not for ourselves, without the assurance that we being dead yet live, all pleasures of the mind and senses sometimes seem to me no more than pathetic and crumbling defences shored up against our ruins’ (James 2006, 9). Even if James’ claim is a bit hyperbolic and all pleasures would not actually be lost, I agree with Scheffler in finding it not implausible that the knowledge that extinction was coming and that there would be no more people would have at least a general depressive effect on people’s motivation and confidence in the value of and joy in their activities (Scheffler 2012, 43). Both sources of psychological harm are personal reasons to reject a principle that permitted human extinction. Existing people could therefore reasonably reject the principle for either of these reasons. Psychological pain and the inability to pursue your personal projects, goals, and aims, are all acceptable reasons for rejecting principles in the contractualist framework. So too are infringements of rights and entitlements that we accept as important for people’s lives. These psychological reasons, then, are also valid reasons to reject principles that permitted or required human extinction.

#### 3] Non consequential ethics are impossible

Greene 07 – Joshua, Associate Professor of Social science in the Department of Psychology at Harvard University (The Secret Joke of Kant’s Soul published in Moral Psychology: Historical and Contemporary Readings, accessed: <https://www.gwern.net/docs/philosophy/ethics/2007-greene.pdf>, pages 47-50)

**What turn-of-the-millennium science** **is telling us is that human moral judgment is not a pristine rational enterprise**, that our **moral judgments are driven by a hodgepodge of emotional dispositions, which themselves were shaped by a hodgepodge of evolutionary forces, both biological and cultural**. **Because of this, it is exceedingly unlikely that there is any rationally coherent normative moral theory that can accommodate our moral intuitions**. Moreover, **anyone who claims to have such a theory**, or even part of one, **almost certainly doesn't**. Instead, what that person probably has is a moral rationalization. It seems then, that we have somehow crossed the infamous "is"-"ought" divide. How did this happen? Didn't Hume (Hume, 1978) and Moore (Moore, 1966) warn us against trying to derive an "ought" from and "is?" How did we go from descriptive scientific theories concerning moral psychology to skepticism about a whole class of normative moral theories? The answer is that we did not, as Hume and Moore anticipated, attempt to derive an "ought" from and "is." That is, our method has been inductive rather than deductive. We have inferred on the basis of the available evidence that the phenomenon of rationalist deontological philosophy is best explained as a rationalization of evolved emotional intuition (Harman, 1977). Missing the Deontological Point I suspect that **rationalist deontologists will remain unmoved by the arguments presented here**. Instead, I suspect, **they** **will insist that I have simply misunderstood what** Kant and like-minded **deontologists are all about**. **Deontology, they will say, isn't about this intuition or that intuition**. It's not defined by its normative differences with consequentialism. **Rather, deontology is about taking humanity seriously**. Above all else, it's about respect for persons. It's about treating others as fellow rational creatures rather than as mere objects, about acting for reasons rational beings can share. And so on (Korsgaard, 1996a; Korsgaard, 1996b). **This is, no doubt, how many deontologists see deontology. But this insider's view**, as I've suggested, **may be misleading**. **The problem**, more specifically, **is that it defines deontology in terms of values that are not distinctively deontological**, though they may appear to be from the inside. **Consider the following analogy with religion. When one asks a religious person to explain the essence of his religion, one often gets an answer like this: "It's about love**, really. It's about looking out for other people, looking beyond oneself. It's about community, being part of something larger than oneself." **This sort of answer accurately captures the phenomenology of many people's religion, but it's nevertheless inadequate for distinguishing religion from other things**. This is because many, if not most, non-religious people aspire to love deeply, look out for other people, avoid self-absorption, have a sense of a community, and be connected to things larger than themselves. In other words, secular humanists and atheists can assent to most of what many religious people think religion is all about. From a secular humanist's point of view, in contrast, what's distinctive about religion is its commitment to the existence of supernatural entities as well as formal religious institutions and doctrines. And they're right. These things really do distinguish religious from non-religious practices, though they may appear to be secondary to many people operating from within a religious point of view. In the same way, I believe that most of **the standard deontological/Kantian self-characterizatons fail to distinguish deontology from other approaches to ethics**. (See also Kagan (Kagan, 1997, pp. 70-78.) on the difficulty of defining deontology.) It seems to me that **consequentialists**, as much as anyone else, **have respect for persons**, **are against treating people as mere objects,** **wish to act for reasons that rational creatures can share, etc**. **A consequentialist respects other persons, and refrains from treating them as mere objects, by counting every person's well-being in the decision-making process**. **Likewise, a consequentialist attempts to act according to reasons that rational creatures can share by acting according to principles that give equal weight to everyone's interests, i.e. that are impartial**. This is not to say that consequentialists and deontologists don't differ. They do. It's just that the real differences may not be what deontologists often take them to be. What, then, distinguishes deontology from other kinds of moral thought? A good strategy for answering this question is to start with concrete disagreements between deontologists and others (such as consequentialists) and then work backward in search of deeper principles. This is what I've attempted to do with the trolley and footbridge cases, and other instances in which deontologists and consequentialists disagree. **If you ask a deontologically-minded person why it's wrong to push someone in front of speeding trolley in order to save five others, you will get** characteristically deontological **answers**. Some **will be tautological**: **"Because it's murder!"** **Others will be more sophisticated: "The ends don't justify the means**." "You have to respect people's rights." **But**, as we know, **these answers don't really explain anything**, because **if you give the same people** (on different occasions) **the trolley case** or the loop case (See above), **they'll make the opposite judgment**, even though their initial explanation concerning the footbridge case applies equally well to one or both of these cases. **Talk about rights, respect for persons, and reasons we can share are natural attempts to explain, in "cognitive" terms, what we feel when we find ourselves having emotionally driven intuitions that are odds with the cold calculus of consequentialism**. Although these explanations are inevitably incomplete, **there seems to be "something deeply right" about them because they give voice to powerful moral emotions**. **But, as with many religious people's accounts of what's essential to religion, they don't really explain what's distinctive about the philosophy in question**.