### 1NC Shell

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all positions they have read full text on the 2018-2019 NDCA wiki at least 30 minutes before the round.

#### Violation: you didn’t, I have screenshots

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

#### Net benefits:

#### Education

#### Incentivizes Research – Disclosure allows debaters to craft specific responses to their opponent’s positions which promotes deep discussion.

Nails 13 [(Jacob, NDT Policy Debater at Georgia State University), “A Defense of Disclosure (Including Third Party Disclosure)”, NSD Update, 10/10/2013] DD  
In theory, the increased quality of information could trade off with quantity. If debaters could just look to the wiki for evidence, it might remove the competitive incentive to do one’s own research. Empirically, however, the opposite has been true. In fact, a second advantage of disclosure is that it motivates research. Debaters cannot expect to make it a whole topic with the same stock AC – that is, unless they are continually updating and frontlining it. Likewise, debaters with access to their opponents’ cases can do more targeted and specific research. Students can go to a new level of depth, researching not just the pros and cons of the topic but the specific authors, arguments, and adovcacies employed by other debaters. The incentive to cut author-specific indicts is low if there’s little guarantee that the author will ever be cited in a round but high if one knows that specific schools are using that author in rounds. In this way, disclosure increases incentive to research by altering a student’s cost-benefit analysis so that the time spent researching is more valuable, i.e. more likely to produce useful evidence because it is more directed. In any case, if publicly accessible evidence jeopardized research, backfiles and briefs would have done LD in a long time ago.

#### **Evidence Ethics** – Full text disclosure allows debaters to ensure that evidence has been accurately tagged and cut.

#### **Tambe and Ghandra 14** [(Arjun, ToC Quarterfinalist) and (Akhil, Three time ToC qualifier), “Evidence Ethics in LD Debate: A Proposal by Akhil Ghandra and Arjun Tambe”, VBriefly, 10/24/2014] DDFirst, we think **debaters should disclose** the **full text** of their positions on the NDCA wiki. Many articles have already been written on the importance of disclosure, so we won’t repeat those arguments here. However, we think **disclosure can help address the issue of miscutting or fabricating evidence since debaters can verify whether a piece of evidence read by their opponent has been cut ethically by reading the article the evidence is cut from.** Full text disclosure would also elevate the quality of disclosure. **Providing the first and last three words of an article can make it difficult to reconstruct a debater’s case since not everyone has access to all the databases articles may have been accessed from.** Full text disclosure expands access to debaters’ evidence.

#### Accessibility

#### Resource Inequality – Full text disclosure puts everyone on an equal playing field by ensuring that debaters with fewer resources can still access evidence cut from expensive online libraries and databases.

#### Prep Burden – Larger schools have the ability to scout more rounds at tournaments by virtue of the fact that they have larger teams and more connections on the circuit. Disclosure solves because it gives everyone access to the same intelligence.

#### Voter: Fairness, Education

### 1NC – Paradigm Issues

#### Use competing interpretations:

#### Reasonability is arbitrary which invites judge intervention or random unjustified thresholds.

#### Competing interpretations deters future abuse by creating consistent norms that debaters can be held to in the future.

#### Reasonability causes a race to the bottom where debaters try to be as abusive as possible while still remaining reasonable, which increases abuse.

#### Reasonability collapses into competing interpretations because you still need to read a counter-interp to prove that you are being reasonable.

**Drop the debater:**

1. **Dropping the arg is the equivalent of severance because it allows them to shift to a different position in the 1ar which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense.**
2. **Drop the arg collapses to drop the debater on T because if they have no advocacy there is nothing to vote for.**
3. **Deters future abuse the greatest incentive in debate is competitive success so debaters won’t read positions if they can’t win on them.**

#### Drop all undisclosed arguments:

#### Substance crowd out – Drop the debater crowds out substantive discussion, if the ballot is at stake debaters will go all in on theory.

#### Drop the debater incentivizes frivolous theory because even cheap shot interpretation can win rounds, that kills substantive engagement.

#### Proportional – Dropping the debater overcompensates for the abuse. Dropping the argument is a more proportional punishment since it still gives them an opportunity to win the round on turns to negative position.

## 1NC – Off

#### Biotech industry strong now

Cancherini et al. 4/30 [(Laura, Engagement Manager @ McKinsey & Company, Joseph Lydon, Associate Partner @ McKinsey & Company, Jorge Santos Da Silva, Senior Partner at McKinsey & Company, and Alexandra Zemp, Partner at McKinsey & Company), “What’s ahead for biotech: Another wave or low tide?“, McKinsey & Company, 4-30-2021, https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/pharmaceuticals-and-medical-products/our-insights/whats-ahead-for-biotech-another-wave-or-low-tide] TDI

Belying this downbeat mood, biotech has in fact had one of its best years so far. By January 2021, venture capitalists had invested some 60 percent more than they had in January 2020, with more than $3 billion invested worldwide in January 2021 alone.5 IPO activity grew strongly: there were 19 more closures than in the same period in 2020, with an average of $150 million per raise, 17 percent more than in 2020. Other deals have also had a bumper start to 2021, with the average deal size reaching more than $500 million, up by more than 66 percent on the 2020 average (Exhibit 3).6

What about SPACs?

The analysis above does not include special-purpose acquisition companies (SPACs), which have recently become significant in IPOs in several industries. Some biotech investors we interviewed believe that SPACs represent a route to an IPO. How SPACs will evolve remains to be seen, but biotechs may be part of their story.

Fundamentals continue strong

When we asked executives and investors why the biotech sector had stayed so resilient during the worst economic crisis in decades, they cited innovation as the main reason. The number of assets transitioning to clinical phases is still rising, and further waves of innovation are on the horizon, driven by the convergence of biological and technological advances.

In the present day, many biotechs, along with the wider pharmaceutical industry, are taking steps to address the COVID-19 pandemic. Together, biotechs and pharma companies have more than 250 vaccine candidates in their pipelines, along with a similar number of therapeutics. What’s more, the crisis has shone a spotlight on pharma as the public seeks to understand the roadblocks involved in delivering a vaccine at speed and the measures needed to maintain safety and efficacy standards. To that extent, the world has been living through a time of mass education in science research and development.

Biotech has also benefited from its innate financial resilience. Healthcare as a whole is less dependent on economic cycles than most other industries. Biotech is an innovator, actively identifying and addressing patients’ unmet needs. In addition, biotechs’ top-line revenues have been less affected by lockdowns than is the case in most other industries.

Another factor acting in the sector’s favor is that larger pharmaceutical companies still rely on biotechs as a source of innovation. With the top dozen pharma companies having more than $170 billion in excess reserves that could be available for spending on M&A, the prospects for further financing and deal making look promising.

For these and other reasons, many investors regard biotech as a safe haven. One interviewee felt it had benefited from a halo effect during the pandemic.

More innovation on the horizon

The investors and executives we interviewed agreed that biotech innovation continues to increase in quality and quantity despite the macroeconomic environment. Evidence can be seen in the accelerating pace of assets transitioning across the development lifecycle. When we tracked the number of assets transitioning to Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III clinical trials, we found that Phase I and Phase II assets have transitioned 50 percent faster since 2018 than between 2013 and 2018, whereas Phase III assets have maintained much the same pace. There could be many reasons for this, but it is worth noting that biotechs with Phase I and Phase II assets as their lead assets have accounted for more than half of biotech IPOs. Having an early IPO gives a biotech earlier access to capital and leaves it with more scope to concentrate on science.

#### Lack of IP protection makes medical innovation prohibitively risky and expensive

Grabowski et al 15 [(Henry, Professor of Economics, member of the faculty for the Health Sector Management Program, and Director of the Program in Pharmaceuticals and Health Economics at Duke University) “The Roles of Patents and Research And Development Incentives In Biopharmaceutical Innovation,” Health Affairs, 2/2015] JL

The essential rationale for patent protection for biopharmaceuticals is that long-term benefits in the form of continued future innovation by pioneer or brand-name drug manufacturers outweigh the relatively short-term restrictions on imitative cost competition associated with market exclusivity. Regardless, the entry of other branded agents remains an important source of therapeutic competition during the patent term.

Several economic characteristics make patents and intellectual property protection particularly important to innovation incentives for the biopharmaceutical industry. **5** The R&D process often takes more than a decade to complete, and according to a recent analysis by Joseph DiMasi and colleagues, per new drug approval (including failed attempts), it involves more than a billion dollars in out-of-pocket costs. **6** Only approximately one in eight drug candidates survive clinical testing. **6**

As a result of the high risks of failure and the high costs, research and development must be funded by the few successful, on-market products (the top quintile of marketed products provide the dominant share of R&D returns). **7**,**8** Once a new drug’s patent term and any regulatory exclusivity provisions have expired, competing manufacturers are allowed to sell generic equivalents that require the investment of only several million dollars and that have a high likelihood of commercial success. Absent intellectual property protections that allow marketing exclusivity, innovative firms would be unlikely to make the costly and risky investments needed to bring a new drug to market.

Patents confer the right to exclude competitors for a limited time within a given scope, as defined by patent claims. However, they do not guarantee demand, nor do they prevent competition from nonidentical drugs that treat the same diseases and fall outside the protection of the patents.

New products may enter the same therapeutic class with common mechanisms of action but different molecular structures (for example, different statins) or with differing mechanisms of action (such as calcium channel blockers and angiotensin receptor blockers). 9 Joseph DiMasi and Laura Faden have found that the time between a first-in-class new drug and subsequent new drugs in the same therapeutic class has been dramatically reduced, from a median of 10.2 years in the 1970s to 2.5 years in the early 2000s. 10 Drugs in the same class compete through quality and price for preferred placement on drug formularies and physicians’ choices for patient treatment.

Patents play an essential role in the economic “ecosystem” of discovery and investment that has developed since the 1980s. Hundreds of start-up firms, often backed by venture capital, have been launched, and a robust innovation market has emerged. **11** The value of these development-stage firms is largely determined by their proprietary technologies and the candidate drugs they have in development. As a result, the strength of intellectual property protection plays a key role in funding and partnership opportunities for such firms.

#### MRNA solves a litany of diseases, but continued innovation is key

Gupta 5/7 [(Swati, vice president and head of emerging infectious diseases and scientific strategy at IAVI, a nonprofit scientific research organization that develops vaccines and antibodies for HIV, tuberculosis, emerging infectious diseases (including COVID-19) and neglected diseases, PhD and MPH from Yale University) “The Application and Future Potential of mRNA Vaccines,” Yale School of Public Health, 5/7/2021] JL

The implications of mRNA technology are staggering. Several vaccine developers are studying this technology for deployment against rabies, influenza, Zika, HIV and cancer, as well as for veterinary purposes. Its potential utility is based upon its being a “platform technology” that can be developed and scaled rapidly. Given that only the genetic code for a protein of interest is needed, synthetically produced mRNA vaccines can be made rapidly, in days. Other vaccine approaches involve growing and/or producing proteins in cells, a process that can take months. Messenger RNA vaccines are generally regarded as safe, since they do not integrate into our cells’ DNA and naturally degrade in the body after injection. They also can be safely administered repeatedly, as we are seeing with the two-dose regimen for both the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines.

Despite the current success of mRNA vaccines for COVID-19, scientists continue to work on making the technology better. A number of laboratories are testing more thermostable formulations of mRNA vaccines, which currently must be kept at freezing or ultra-cold temperatures. Others are investigating second-generation vaccines that will only require a single shot, and “universal” coronavirus vaccines that could protect against future emerging coronaviruses. Messenger RNA vaccines that target a broad range of different diseases, all in one shot, are also in development; this approach has the potential to greatly simplify current vaccination schedules.

Taken together, these advantages and potential future developments position mRNA vaccines as an increasingly important technology in our arsenal of tools against infectious disease outbreaks, and are likely to be critical to fighting future epidemics and pandemics. Global partnerships like the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness and Innovation (CEPI), tasked with facilitating the development of vaccines to stop future epidemics, have called for vaccines to be able to be tested in the clinic within months after a new pathogen is identified. With the latest discoveries in mRNA technology, we are well on our way to this goal; the ability of this platform technology to be transformative is no longer a hope, but more likely to be a reality in the very near future.

#### Disease causes extinction – defense is wrong

Piers Millett 17, Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization.

A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6

While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).

In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2

## 1NC – Off

#### CP: Member nations of the World Trade Organization should adopt the European Union’s proposal to:

#### Ensure that COVID-19 vaccines, treatments and their components can cross borders freely

#### Encourage producers to expand their production, while ensuring that those countries most in need of vaccines receive them at an affordable price

#### Facilitate the use of compulsory licensing within the WTO's existing Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights

#### Solves vaccine access but avoids innovation

Brachmann 6/8 [(Steve, contributor to IPWatchdog.com, Research on Point, and Main Street Host writing about technology and innovation) “EU Offers Alternative to COVID-19 IP Waiver That Supports Innovation and Addresses Supply Chain Problems,” IP Watchdog, 6/8/2021] JL

The EU’s proposal to the WTO regarding COVID-19 vaccine access focuses on three key elements. The first element focuses on international supply chain issues, advocating for countries producing vaccines to increase international exports and to avoid any trade restrictions on vaccines or their raw materials that could hinder the supply chain either for countries in need or the global COVAX Facility initiative. Supply chain issues have a real and devastating effect on unvaccinated communities, as evidenced by the recent news that Thailand government officials acknowledged delays and reductions for a promised shipment of 17 million doses of Thai-produced AstraZeneca vaccines to the Philippines. One of the biggest supply chain issues facing the unvaccinated world right now is the decision of India’s government, which along with South Africa proposed the patent waiver at the WTO, to stop exporting vaccines manufactured by the Serum Institute of India, the world’s largest vaccine manufacturer, in order to address India’s own exploding COVID-19 infection rates. For its part, the United States under President Joe Biden recently announced an increase of 20 million doses to the country’s planned COVID-19 vaccine exports.

The second key element in the EU’s proposal requests that governments support vaccine manufacturers and developers to ensure affordable vaccine supplies. This portion of the EU’s proposal acknowledges the beneficial impacts of licensing, which ensures that developers and manufacturers enter into agreements that those companies are incentivized to uphold because they promote business interests. The EU’s proposal notes that the vaccine developers Pfizer, BioNTech, Johnson & Johnson and Moderna have all committed to agreements to deliver a combined 1.3 billion doses through 2021 at no profit to low-income countries and at low cost to middle-income countries.

The final key element in the EU’s alternative focuses on intellectual property and recognizes that “voluntary licenses are the most effective instrument to facilitate the expansion of production and sharing of expertise.” While compulsory licensing could be available without voluntary licensing due to the extraordinary nature of the COVID-19 pandemic, the EU advocates for using existing mechanisms for compulsory licensing under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). While the EU is currently drafting a communication dedicated to intellectual property rights which it plans to submit to all WTO members, the governmental body was clear on its thoughts regarding the India-South Africa proposal backed by many governments, including the Biden Administration:

As regards the broad waiver proposed by a number of WTO members, the European Commission, while ready to discuss any option that helps end the pandemic as soon as possible, is not convinced that this would provide the best immediate response to reach the objective of the widest and timely distribution of COVID-19 vaccines that the world urgently needs.

The forces urging the world towards waiving international patent rights under TRIPS for COVID-19 vaccines are about as legion as they are misguided. On June 7, the WTO announced that it had received a petition signed by 2.7 million people around the world calling for the suspension of patent rights on COVID-19 vaccines. Currently more than 60 nations have publicly supported the India-South Africa proposal to waive patent rights under TRIPS for COVID-19 vaccines. However, as the EU’s proposal indicates, developing effective responses to international supply chain issues regarding vaccines do not have to stoop to dismantling the system for encouraging the investment in pharmaceutical R&D that produced the vaccine in the first place. In fact, the EU’s proposal recognizes that properly respecting IP rights and encouraging voluntary licensing, while making some allowances for Article 31 of TRIPS, will be a much more effective answer than a political stance that creates more problems than it solves by reducing medical innovation at exactly the time that the world needs it the most.

In supporting the waiver, the Biden Administration has arguably abdicated one of its first promises: that it would be an administration guided by science and truth. There is no science that exists to show that patents are barriers to vaccine access. That is a fact that has been acknowledged by the World Intellectual Property Organization, the UN’s agency for intellectual property rights, since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. The sentimentality driving those supporting the TRIPS waiver for COVID-19 vaccines won’t solve supply chain issues in manufacturing capacity, which the EU’s alternative does address, but it will do a great job at decreasing investment into medical R&D because weak patent rights decrease economic productivity. Decreased investment in medical R&D will slow down the research needed to cure new COVID-19 variants that continue to appear across the world, and needless human death will continue.

### Framing

**The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing**

**First, pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. People consistently regard pleasure and pain as good reasons for action, despite the fact that pleasure doesn’t seem to be instrumentally valuable for anything.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues**.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values**.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable**.** You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes**:** “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.

**Moreover, *only* pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. All other values can be explained with reference to pleasure; Occam’s razor requires us to treat these as instrumentally valuable.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

I think several things should be said in response to Moore’s challenge to hedonists. First, **I do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain why we should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable.** Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, **there is something peculiar about the list of additional intrinsic values** that counts in hedonism’s favor**: the listed values have a strong tendency to be well explained as things that help promote pleasure and avert pain.** To go through Frankena’s list, life and consciousness are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; activity, health, and strength bring about pleasure; and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as “pleasures and satisfactions.” The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and “proportion in objects contemplated,” and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena’s list, such as understanding, **wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly.** **Morally good dispositions and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, contribute a happy society, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after.** To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values. Indeed, pluralists’ suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism’s: “Hedonists,” he writes “do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend.”24 Ross writes that “[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors.”25 Roger Crisp observes that “those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy.”26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that if **the suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values are potentially explainable by appeal to just pleasure and pain** (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), **then—by appeal to Occam’s razor—we have at least a pro tanto reason to resist the introduction of any further intrinsic values and disvalues. It is ontologically more costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case all values admit of explanation by reference to a single intrinsic value and a single intrinsic disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts.** **The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists.** The challenge can be phrased as the following question: **If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they tend to point toward pleasure and away from pain?**27

**Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority.  
Bostrom 12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]  
These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

**Reducing the risk of extinction is always priority number one.   
Bostrom 12** [Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford.], Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.  Forthcoming book (Global Policy). MP. http://www.existenti...org/concept.pdfEven if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the   possibility of space colonization and software minds, **we find that the expected loss of an existential   catastrophe is greater than the value of 10^16 human lives**.  **This implies that the expected value of   reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least a hundred times the   value of a million human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 10  54 humanbrain-emulation subjective life-years (or 10  52  lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even   more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a   technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected   value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth   a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives. **One might consequently argue that even the tiniest reduction of existential risk has an   expected value greater than that of the definite provision of any ordinary good, such as the direct   benefit of saving 1 billion lives.**  And, further, that the absolute value of the indirect effect of saving 1  billion lives on the total cumulative amount of existential riskâ€”positive or negativeâ€”is almost   certainly larger than the positive value of the direct benefit of such an action.

#### Prefer further:

#### Moral uncertainty-