## Util

#### 1] Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – all other frameworks collapse.

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] TDI

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.**

#### 2] Extinction first --- moral uncertainty.

**Bostrom 12** [(Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford) “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy, 2012] TDI

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 now know — 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** indeed profoundly **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**.

#### 3] Actor specificity: A] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefit some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action. B] States lack wills or intentions since policies are collective actions. C] Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings.

#### 4] Ground – Util distributes equitable ground on every topic which allows for the best in depth debates to happen

#### 5] RW- most people intuitively act under util, even if your fw is better in an ideal world, learning about util is better for our world

## DA

#### Private sector development is happening now and is necessary to scale up and lock in India’s status as a powerhouse in space.

EdexLive, 06-25-2020, "Opening space sector will enable India to play important role in global space economy: ISRO chief," New Indian Express, https://www.edexlive.com/news/2020/jun/25/opening-space-sector-will-enable-india-to-play-important-role-in-global-space-economy-isro-chief-12874.html TDI

SRO chief K Sivan on Thursday stated that opening the space sector for private enterprises will help scale up benefits from space technology and enable Indian industry to be an important player in the global space economy. "If the space sector is opened (for private enterprises), the potential of the entire country can be utilised to scale up benefits from space technology. It will not only result in the accelerated growth of the sector but also enable Indian industry to be an important player in the global space economy," the Indian Space Research Organisation chief said. Sivan said that far-reaching reforms in space technology in India will put the country in the league of the select countries. "As part of longer socio-economic reform, space reforms will improve access to space-based services for India's development. Far-reaching reforms will put India in the league of few countries with efficient promotional and authorisation mechanism for private-sector space activities," he said. Talking about reforms that the government is planning to implement in the country's space sector, he said, "Space sector, where India is among a handful of countries with advanced space technology, can play a significant role in boosting the industrial base of India." "The government's decision is to implement reform measures to leverage ISRO's achievement by opening the space sector for private enterprises," he added. He further said that "Department of Space will promote sector space activities to enable it to provide end to end space services, including building and launching of rockets and satellites as well as providing space-based services on a commercial basis." "With this, there is an opportunity for large scale employment in the technology sector and India becoming a global technology powerhouse," ISRO chief added. Sivan also talked about the government's decision to establish an autonomous nodal agency for taking independent decisions for regulating the activities of private companies. "Government has approved the establishment of an autonomous nodal agency - Indian National Space, Promotion and Authorisation Centre - for taking independent decisions with respect to permitting and regulating the activities of private companies in the space sector," said ISRO chief. "It will act as a national nodal agency for handholding and promoting the private sector in space endeavours and for this ISRO will share its technical expertise as well as facilities," he added.

#### India private sector is key to space success – low cost operations, transparency, and accountability.

Rajagopalan ’20 [Dr Rajeswari (Raji) Pillai Rajagopalan is the Director of the Centre for Security, Strategy and Technology (CSST) at the Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi., 5-24-2020, "India’s Space Programme: A role for the private sector, finally?," ORF, <https://www.orfonline.org/research/indias-space-programme-a-role-for-the-private-sector-finally-66661/>] TDI

India’s finance minister Nirmala Sitharaman announced last week that India’s private sector will play a key role in augmenting India’s space programme, and that the government intends to share the facilities of the Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO) with the private sector. This announcement was part of the Narendra Modi government’s call for new and bold reforms in an effort to promote its ‘self-reliant India’ mission. It is the fourth segment of the Rs 20 lakh crore Aatma Nirbhar Bharat Abhiyan special economic stimulus. Sitharaman’s announcement entails a role for the private sector, possibly with the goal of greater investments in technology development and acquisition, capacity-building and space exploration, including planetary exploration. The minister, while announcing these reforms, appeared to understand that the private sector can help augment India’s space capability. While praising the work done by ISRO, she also pointed out that the private sector is also doing a lot of work in developing space technology. She also acknowledged that the existing regulations prevent private entities from using or even testing their products. Therefore, to level the playing field, the government “will make a provision for the private sector to benefit from the assets which are available to ISRO and for India (in general) to benefit from.” The minister also said the new reforms would allow the private sector to play an active role in “satellites, launches and space-based services”. But as always, implementation is key. Properly executing these reforms will require enabling policies and appropriate regulatory frameworks. That the new reforms will allow private sector players to use ISRO facilities is a big deal. This indeed must be music to the ears of commercial players who have been seeking to get a fair share of the pie in terms of manufacturing of satellites and propellant technologies, among other areas. It should not be too difficult for India’s private space sector because there is a sizeable talent pool available outside ISRO. More importantly, the entry of the private sector, as in the telecom sector, can bring several advantages in terms of cost and access. Following the announcement, ISRO tweeted that it will follow the government’s guidelines to allow the private sector to undertake space activities in the country. Though this did not seem particularly welcoming of the government’s initiative, ISRO’s support is critical to making it a success. ISRO has in the last few years been opening up to the Indian private space sector in a gradual manner – mostly as a matter of compulsion because ISRO simply does not have the in-house capacity to address India’s growing requirements. Today, the Indian space programme is not just about civilian applications for remote-sensing, meteorology and communication, as in the early decades. India’s space sector and its requirements have grown enormously in the last decade to include television and broadband services, space science and exploration, space-based navigation and, of course, defence and security applications. Among others, Ambassador Rakesh Sood has articulated the need for legislation to facilitate ISRO’s partnership with industries and entrepreneurs. Narayan Prasad and Prateep Basu, two prominent faces in the Indian space start-up segment, have argued that despite ISRO’s successes, “India’s space competitiveness has suffered from the absence of a globally reputed, private space industry.” The private sector, especially the NewSpace industry and start-ups, have an advantage in terms of low-cost operations, which itself should be a big incentive for the government to make it an active stakeholder. A certain amount of democratisation of space technology with the participation of the private sector can ensure costs are kept low. And expanding the number of stakeholders will also ensure more transparency and better accountability and regulatory practices. This has been missing in India’s space sector. The same agency has undertaken promotion, commercialisation and regulatory functions – which is not healthy.

#### India space key to soft power.

Hickert 17 Cameron Hickert, Harvard’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Schwarzman Scholars, "Space Rivals: Power and Strategy in the China-India Space Race - Schwarzman Scholars", August 14, 2017, <https://www.schwarzmanscholars.org/events-and-news/space-rivals-power-strategy-china-india-space-race/> TDI

The regional rivalry between India and China has long simmered, and the next frontier increasingly appears to be space. Beyond the hard power dimension, this regional space race has taken on many of the soft power characteristics of the competition between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. during the Cold War. It should not be forgotten, “a major factor in the Asian space race is prestige, as rapidly developing countries there use technology to jockey for status. Space technology in particular, being flashy and complex, often captures the most cache.” Because soft power is about perception and attraction, demonstrating prowess in space capabilities is a crucial step in building this power regionally. Many of the feats that China and India are pursuing have already been achieved by the U.S., so mistakes are costlier in terms of international credibility – failures are perceived as worse when another nation has already been successful. Yet the attraction power of spaceflight achievements is more lucrative than in the past, as private entities around the world face tighter competition and shorter timelines in launching satellites, and are therefore willing to bring their business to any nation that can demonstrate the ability to launch cargo safely and cheaply. A prime example is India’s recent launch of 20 satellites on a single rocket; this mission included satellites from around the world, including the United States. The increased soft power borne out of a successful space program therefore is not only useful in the struggle for regional prestige, but also paves the way for increased economic success in a fast-growing industry.

#### India k2 taking up the climate change and alternative energy cause

GPC 17 [(Greater Pacific Capital, investing institution designed to identify and develop investing opportunities in and between India and other international economies), “Path to Power: India’s Great Opportunity in the Changing World Order,” 7/17/17, Greater Pacific Capital, <https://greaterpacificcapital.com/path-to-power-indias-great-opportunity-in-the-changing-world-order/>]TDI

Taking up the Climate Change and Alternative Energy Cause**.** The US withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord has left a serious gap in climate change leadership that has yet to be filled.  While the rest of the world has vowed to continue without the US and China has signalled its willingness to play a greater role in the process, the size of the challenge facing the world exceeds any one country’s ability to lead alone on the matter. India, as the world’s fifth largest producer of energy has a strong position to be one of a small number of countries to lead the way in fighting climate change. India is targeting to grow renewable energy production fourfold within five years, and with its low-cost base can become a core source of mass-produced cost effective renewable solutions for the rest of the world.

#### Climate change causes extinction.

Specktor 19 [Brandon; writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years; "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, 6/4/19; <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html>]

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

# Case

### Ableist

#### Kant’s use of rationality as the basis for ethics excludes people with cognitive disabilities as nonhuman animals. This ableist politics subordinates those deemed “invaluable”.

Ryan 11, Intro to ethics @ Birmingham University Phil 140; “Cognitive Disability, Misfortune, and Justice”; Jan 17; <http://parenethical.com/phil140win11/2011/01/17/group-3-cognitive-disability-misfortune-and-justice-deontology-ryan/>

In Kant's deontological ethics, one has a duty to treat humanity not as a means, but as an ends. However, Kant's criterion for being part of humanity and moral agency is not biological. In order to be considered fully human, and a moral agent, one must be autonomous and rational. If one lacks rationality and autonomy they cannot escape the chain of causality to act freely from moral principles, and hence are not moral agents. Kant's moral program fails to account for those who are cognitively impaired because they lack autonomy and rationality. Since Kant's requirement for moral agency is so cut-and-dry and leaves no room for ambiguity, there is no clear moral distinction made between the cognitively impaired and other non-human animals. In the case of Kant, there could be no universal moral law from the categorical imperative that would apply to the cognitively impaired and not non-human animals as well. Kant and McMahan are similar, in that their standards for moral agency exclude the cognitively impaired (rationality/autonomy and psychological capacities respectively). In Kant's morality, those who are rational and autonomous are to be treated as ends in themselves. In the case of the cognitively impaired, there is no such requirement. Similarly, in McMahan's moral theory, those who are human and unfortunate are entitled to compensation by society under the dictates of justice. However, according to McMahan the cognitively impaired are not human in the relevant sense (possessing certain psychological capacities and features) so they are not entitled to compensation. In excluding the cognitively impaired from moral agency, both Kant and McMahan reach a conclusion that many of us find unsettling, in which we might give the cognitively impaired a moral preference over a similarly endowed non-human animal, is because of a responsibility to respect the family members of the cognitively endowed, not because [that] they have [no] any value as moral agents in themselves.

### Overview

#### Apriori is just definitional knowledge humans have invented to understand the world e.g. we know all bachelors are unmarried males but we can conceive of a world in which all bachelors are married women.

#### 1] Hijack—only util can account for degrees of wrongness, telling someone their shirt looks nice when it doesn’t is better than telling a slave owner where a runaway slave is which means aggregation controls the internal link to your fw

#### 2] AC collapses to the NC—if each person has infinite value, having more of that value is a good thing so you have to aggregate

#### 3] Epistemology hijack—epistemology outweighs in terms of fw justifications—it determines how we create knowledge and determine a fw in the first place; only util accounts for all forms of epistemology such as aposteriori knowledge

#### 4] Actor spec—even if ur phil were true, our aspec argument indicates that moral actions committed by the state are evaluated via consequences based on how the public perceives it—perception outweighs and controls int link to your fw since agency is the basis of your fw

#### 5] No Intent Foresight Distinction

Korsgaard 02 (Christine M. Korsgaard Internalism and the Sources of Normativity. Constructions of Practical Reason: Interviews on Moral and Political Philosophy, edited by Herlinde Pauer-Studer (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002). [http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~korsgaar/CPR.CMK.Interview.pdf) //](http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~korsgaar/CPR.CMK.Interview.pdf)%20//) Lex CH

Some philosophers argue that a moral theory has to have at least a consequentialist structure (without being necessarily utilitarian), including a means-end conception of rationality in order to be able to take the consequences of actions into account. It has been a well-known objection (if we think, for example, of Max Weber’s distinction between Gesinnungsethik and Verantwortungsethik) that Kant’s ethic does not take consequences into account. **What do you think of this objection and how does your modified Kantian moral theory answer it?** Certainly I do not think that a moral theory has to have a consequentialist structure. Earlier I mentioned, as a common point between Kant and Aristotle, the view that the unit of moral assessment is the action, the act undertaken for the sake of a certain end, rather than merely the act by itself. Acts may be assessed primarily in terms of their consequential value, but actions, the units of moral value, should not be. **Of course I do not think that it is correct to say that Kantian agents do not care about or are not interested either in the consequences of their acts. It would be impossible even to formulate a maxim without attention to the intended consequences of an act. So, I think, there is in a way a very deep disagreement here about what the unit of assessment is.**

#### [6] Hijack – util contextualizes why we care about violating the categorical imperative. It’s because it causes pain to individuals – otherwise your framework is impact justified.

#### 7. Intention unverifiable – Kant says it is not enough that your rational will ends with the correct action, it must be motivated by a sense of duty alone – Kant admits that when our inclination aligns with duty it becomes impossible to know whether the act contained moral value.

#### 8. If freedom is not an additive quality it becomes near impossible to weigh between violations of certain freedom - it is not a question of hindering a hinderance since not all actions that violate some freedom are bad, for instance kant thinks the government is good and it restricts freedom which makes competing freedom violations irresolvable.

#### 9. Kant draws extremely unintuitive and nonbinding conclusions that justify rejecting it on face – for instance kant would not agree that we ought to go back in time and kill Hitler to prevent the holocaust since killing is a violation of freedom.

#### 10. Shmagency objection – if reason is universalizable we can use our reason to escape it’s constitutive nature.

#### 11. Martyr objection- if people like jesus are willing to die for a cause and sacrifice themselves as means to an end than people can treat others the same

## Offense

#### 1] Libertarianism mandates a market-oriented approach to space—that negates

Broker 20 [(Tyler, work has been published in the Gonzaga Law Review, the Albany Law Review and the University of Memphis Law Review.) “Space Law Can Only Be Libertarian Minded,” Above the Law, 1-14-20, <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/>] TDI

The impact on human daily life from a transition to the virtually unlimited resource reality of space cannot be overstated. However, when it comes to the law, a minimalist, dare I say libertarian, approach appears as the only applicable system. In the words of NASA, “2020 promises to be a big year for space exploration.” Yet, as Rand Simberg points out in Reason magazine, it is actually private American investment that is currently moving space exploration to “a pace unseen since the 1960s.” According to Simberg, due to this increase in private investment “We are now on the verge of getting affordable private access to orbit for large masses of payload and people.” The impact of that type of affordable travel into space might sound sensational to some, but in reality the benefits that space can offer are far greater than any benefit currently attributed to any major policy proposal being discussed at the national level. The sheer amount of resources available within our current reach/capabilities simply speaks for itself. However, although those new realities will, as Simberg says, “bring to the fore a lot of ideological issues that up to now were just theoretical,” I believe it will also eliminate many economic and legal distinctions we currently utilize today. For example, the sheer number of resources we can already obtain in space means that in the rapidly near future, the distinction between a nonpublic good or a public good will be rendered meaningless. In other words, because the resources available within our solar system exist in such quantities, all goods will become nonrivalrous in their consumption and nonexcludable in their distribution. This would mean government engagement in the public provision of a nonpublic good, even at the trivial level, or what Kevin Williamson defines as socialism, is rendered meaningless or impossible. In fact, in space, I fail to see how any government could even try to legally compel collectivism in the way Simberg fears. Similar to many economic distinctions, however, it appears that many laws, both the good and the bad, will also be rendered meaningless as soon as we begin to utilize the resources within our solar system. For example, if every human being is given access to the resources that allows them to replicate anything anyone else has, or replace anything “taken” from them instantly, what would be the point of theft laws? If you had virtually infinite space in which you can build what we would now call luxurious livable quarters, all without exploiting human labor or fragile Earth ecosystems when you do it, what sense would most property, employment, or commercial law make? Again, this is not a pipe dream, no matter how much our population grows for the next several millennia, the amount of resources within our solar system can sustain such an existence for every human being. Rather than panicking about the future, we should try embracing it, or at least meaningfully preparing for it. Currently, the Outer Space Treaty, or as some call it “the Magna Carta of Space,” is silent on the issue of whether private individuals or corporate entities can own territory in space. Regardless of whether governments allow it, however, private citizens are currently obtaining the ability to travel there, and if human history is any indicator, private homesteading will follow, flag or no flag. We Americans know this is how a Wild West starts, where most regulation becomes the impractical pipe dream. But again, this would be a Wild West where the exploitation of human labor and fragile Earth ecosystem makes no economic sense, where every single human can be granted access to resources that even the wealthiest among us now would envy, and where innovation and imagination become the only things we would recognize as currency. Only a libertarian-type system, that guarantees basic individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness could be valued and therefore human fidelity to a set of laws made possible, in such an existence.

#### 2] Property rights in space can be consistent with international law

Simberg 12 [(Rand, MSE in technical management from West Coast University, recognized as an expert in space transportation by the Office of Technology Assessment) “Homesteading the Final Frontier A Practical Proposal for Securing Property Rights in Space,” Competitive Enterprise Institute, April 2012, <https://cei.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Rand-Simberg-Homesteading-the-Final-Frontier.pdf>] TDI

But is it true that any recognition of off-planet property claims is de facto a violation of the Outer Space Treaty? Not necessarily. For instance, one could argue that the existence of the Moon Treaty is in and of itself a refutation of the notion that the Outer Space Treaty outlaws private property in space, or else there would be no need for another treaty that essentially explicitly does so. And there is at least one potential loophole that could be exploited by appropriately worded legislation. There are two key assumptions in the legal argument used by opponents of off-planet property claims: 1) that the recognition by a government would only recognize claims by its own citizens; and 2) that it would defend them by force. That need not necessarily be so. Under the treaty, it would in fact be possible for a government, or group of governments, to recognize the property claims of anyone who met specified conditions, regardless of their citizenship or nationality. Such cooperation would obviate the need for physical force to defend claims. The argument that the treaty permits individual property rights was actually made from the very beginning. In 1969, two years after the treaty went into force, the late distinguished space-law professor, Stephen Gorove, noted that under it, “[A]n individual acting on his own behalf or on behalf of another individual or a private association or an international organization could lawfully appropriate any part of outer space, including the [M]oon and other celestial bodies.”32 This clearly provides support for the concept of individual claims off planet under Article II.

#### 3] Space appropriation and exploration originates from private companies such as Space X and Blue Origin. Preventing such is a restriction on the ability of companies to set and pursue their ends and these companies gain contracts with the government for projects which turns promise breaking offense.