## I negate.

## The standard is Util:

## 1. The impossibility to attain knowledge of every outcome or abuse leaves utilitarianism as the only option for most rational decision-making

### Goodin 95 – Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University (Robert E., Cambridge University Press, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy” pg 63)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first the argument from necessity. **Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty,** and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. **All choices**-public and private alike- **are made under some degree of uncertainty**, of course. **But** in the nature of things, **private individuals will usually have more complete information** on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. **Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed** as **to the effects that their choices will have on individuals**, one by one. **What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates**. **They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices.** But that is all. **That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus** – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule.

## 2. Equal respect for human worth proves util.

### Cummiskey 90 Cummiskey, David. Associate professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago. “Kantian Consequentiaism.” Ethics 100 (April 1990), University of Chicago. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2381810

**By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, we fail to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction.** In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? A morally good agent recognizes that the basis of all particular duties is the principle that “rational nature exists as an end in itself”. Rational nature as such is the supreme objective end of all conduct. If one truly believes that all rational beings have an equal value, then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives and liberties of as many rational beings as possible. In order to avoid this conclusion, the non-consequentialist Kantian needs to justify agent-centered constraints. As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non- value-based rationale. But we have seen that Kant’s normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? If I sacrifice some for the sake of others, I do not use them arbitrarily, and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. **Persons** may **have “dignity,** that is, an unconditional and incomparable worth” **that transcends any market value** (GMM 436), **but persons also have a fundamental equality that dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others** (chapters 5 and 7). The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then equal consideration suggests.

**C1: Teamwork**

# Subpoint A: Going to and exploring space allows for positive impacts in the world

## 1. Space is essential to researching and managing Climate Change

### Chaturvedi 20

(Aditya Chaturvedi, 1/30/2020, “How satellite imagery is crucial for monitoring climate change, https://www.geospatialworld.net/blogs/satellites-for-monitoring-climate-change/)

**“If you can’t measure it, you can’t manage it”**, said María Fernanda Espinosa Garcés, President of the United Nations General Assembly at the COP 24 in Katowice Poland, summing up how crucial satellites are for measuring climate change. **Satellite measurements of Earth’s temperature, greenhouse gas emissions, sea levels, atmospheric gases**, dwindling ice and forest cover etc, **are essential for improving the understanding of Climate change and predicting future** of the Earth. Innovation such as miniaturization of sensors, high-speed data transfer, and upgraded storage capabilities have made satellites an integral part of the climate change mission. It is simply inconceivable to assess climate change sans insights provided by satellites. **Without precise data and other inputs provided by satellites, environmentalists and scientists won’t be able to understand, analyze and predict the impact of climate change, and policymakers won’t be able to formulate effective strategies**. Using an array of satellites, organizations like NASA, NOAA and ESA monitors ocean conditions, clouds, temperature, sea levels and heat content, to get information on how fast Earth’s temperature is changing. ESA map shows ocean salinity Satellite data provides authoritative information about more than half of the 50 crucial climate change variables. These insights include satellite radar altimetry, which measures distance between a satellite and the earth’s surface and gives us precise information about sea levels. Atmospheric chemical composition and greenhouses gases like Methane are also measured using satellites. Currently, there are around 162 satellites in-orbit that measure the various indicators related to climate change. New generation satellites have enhanced optical and temporal resolutions that have improved weather forecasting, climate modeling and the ability to obtain real-time details. Within the next five years, many new satellite missions will be launched, including Eumetsat’s second-generation polar-orbiting satellites, third-generation Meteosats and Chinese satellites.

## 2. Space has provided countless benefits to Earth and society as a whole

### NASA 13

<https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/files/Benefits-Stemming-from-Space-Exploration-2013-TAGGED.pdf>

**There are numerous** cases of **societal benefits linked to** new knowledge and technology from **space** exploration. Space exploration has contributed to many diverse aspects of everyday life, from **solar panels** to **implantable heart monitors**, \ **cancer therapy** to **light‐ weight materials**, and from **water‐purification systems** to **improved computing systems and** to **a global search‐and‐rescue system**4 . Achieving the ambitious future exploration goals as outlined above will further expand the economic relevance of space. **Space exploration will continue to be an essential driver for** opening up **new domains in science** and technology, **triggering other sectors to partner with the space sector for joint research** and development. **This will return immediate benefits back to Earth** in areas such as materials, power generation and energy

# SB: Teamwork

## 1. Public Sector is Designed to Cooperate with Private Sector.

### Fernholz 19

Fernholz, Tim. “How to Build a Space Economy That Avoids the Mistakes of Terrestrial Capitalism.” Quartz, Quartz, qz.com/work/1767415/can-nasa-build-a-space-economy-that-leaves-capitalisms-problems-behind/.

The good news is that we aren’t close to a world like the one depicted in the movie Elysium, where the ultra-wealthy repair to space and leave the rest of us behind. Our **public and private interests will be far more intertwined**, in part **because governments have designed it that way. Most** of the **major space agencies** are compelled by law in their home countries to **support private economic activity**, which means for example that **NASA**, by law, **views the success of US companies in space as part of its mission, and not a distraction or a threat.** The reality is that public space agencies, particularly NASA in the United States, remain the largest spenders in space and control the conditions for private organizations acting in orbit. Their challenge—and opportunity—is to manage the transition to a new, multi-stakeholder world in orbit by successfully subsidizing new initiatives without letting the benefits escape the public at large.

## 2. If we choose to not allow for cooperation between the two sectors, we hold back both from completing important tasks.

### Houser 17

“Private Companies, Not Governments, Are Shaping the Future of Space Exploration.” Futurism, Futurism, 12 June 2017, futurism.com/private-companies-not-governments-are-shaping-the-future-of-space-exploration.

“We’re starting to see **advances made by private entities** that **are more significant than any** advances in the last three years **that were made by the government**,” Chris Lewicki, CEO and President of Planetary Resources, tells Futurism. Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origin and Tesla CEO Elon Musk’s SpaceX are arguably the two companies that are setting the pace. In November 2015, the former completed the first successful vertical rocket landing after sending their New Shepard 100 kilometers (62 miles) into the air. SpaceX landed its own rocket a month later, only they did so with a craft twice as heavy as Blue Origin’s and traveled all the way into space first. A month after that, **in** January **2016, Bezos’s company became the first entity to re-launch and re-land a previously used rocket. SpaceX followed suit** in 2017. **“The government was never able to [build reusable rockets], but** now, two **private companies** within the space of the same year **have** done that,” points out Lewicki. If all goes according to plan, when **SpaceX’s Falcon Heavy** launches in September, it’ll **take the title of the world’s most powerful rocket away from NASA**’s Saturn V. Virgin Galactic is already selling tickets for what it expects to be the first private spaceflights, which will take place aboard the sleek VSS Unity. SpaceX plans to send space tourists to the Moon in 2018, and then in 2024, the company hopes to launch a system that will take people all the way to Mars…roughly 5-15 years before NASA expects to do the same. Private companies may be in the lead, but the finish line for this Space Race isn’t exactly clear. The first iteration was arguably “won” when Neil Armstrong took his first steps on the Moon, so does this sequel end when we establish the first Moon base? When a human walks on Mars? When we leave the solar system? Truthfully, the likelihood of humanity ever calling it a day on space exploration is slim to none. The universe is huge, with galaxy estimates in the trillions, so the goalpost will continue moving back (to bring another sport into the analogy). Rather than focusing on competing in what is ultimately an unwinnable race, **private and government-backed space agencies can actually benefit from collaboration thanks to their** inherent **differences.** “The way that SpaceX, Planetary Resources, or Virgin Galactic approaches space exploration is going to be very different from NASA or the Air Force,” explains Lewicki. **Private companies aren’t beholden to the same slow processes that often stall government projects,** and they can secure or reallocate funding much more swiftly if need be. However, unlike agencies like NASA, they do have shareholders to keep happy and a need to constantly pursue profitability. **The two sectors**, therefore, **have a tremendous opportunity to help one another. Private companies can generate revenue through government contracts** —for example, NASA has contracted Boeing to transport astronauts to the International Space Station (ISS), and SpaceX just closed a deal with the U.S. Air Force to launch its secretive space drone. **This leaves the government agencies free to pursue the kind of** forward-thinking, **longer-term research that might not immediately generate revenue**, but that can be later streamlined and improved upon in the private sector. Ultimately, Space Race 2.0 has no losers. The breakthroughs happening in space exploration benefit us all, and truly, a little friendly competition never hurt anyone (unless you count the egos bruised by those tweets).

## 3. Therefore, by allowing for cooperation, we ensure we can make the most progress in helping society by allowing both parties into space. Thus, you negate.