I affirm

Standard Utilitarianism

Prefer for 3 reasons.

1. **Util is a prerequisite to any other framework: Threats to bodily security and life prevent the ability for moral actors to effectively use other frameworks since they are in a constant state of crisis that destroy the ideal conditions which other theories assume.**
2. **Util is the only way to treat rational beings equal**

Cummiskey 90 (Dr. David Cummiskey, Bates College. "Kantian Consequentialism."Ethics, Vol. 100, No. 3 (Apr., 1990), pp. 586-615 Published by: The University of Chicago Press. Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2381810)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good." Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Robert Nozick, for example, argues that "to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has."

But why is this not equally true of all those whom we do not save through our failure to act? 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, but persons also have a fundamental equality that dictates that some must sometimes give way for the sake of others. 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.

3. **Existential impacts outweigh. A one percent risk of extinction takes priority over anything else**

Bostrom 2- is a Swedish philosopher at the University of Oxford known for his work on existential risk, the anthropic principle, human enhancement ethics, superintelligence risks, the reversal test, and consequentialism. (Nick, "Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards; Published in the Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, No. 1. 2002. http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html) ZachDiesel

In combination, these indirect arguments add important constraints to those we can glean from the direct consideration of various technological risks, although there is not room here to elaborate on the details. But the balance of evidence is such that it would appear unreasonable not to assign a substantial probability to the hypothesis that an existential disaster will do us in. **My subjective opinion is that setting this probability lower than 25% would be misguided, and the best estimate may be considerably higher.**

But even if the probability were much smaller (say, ~1%) the subject matter would still merit very serious attention **because of how much is at stake.** In general, the greatest existential risks on the time–scale of a couple of centuries or less appear to be those that derive from the activities of advanced technological civilizations. We see this by looking at the various existential risks we have listed. In each of the four categories, the top risks are engendered by our activities. The only significant existential risks for which this isn't true are "simulation gets shut down" (although on some versions of this hypothesis the shutdown would be prompted by our activities [27]); the catch–all hypotheses (which include both types of scenarios); asteroid or comet impact (which is a very low probability risk); and getting killed by an extraterrestrial civilization (which would be highly unlikely in the near future).[19] **It may not be surprising that existential risks created by modern civilization get the lion's share of the probability. After all, we are now doing some things that have never been done on Earth before, and we are developing capacities to do many more such things. If non–anthropogenic factors have failed to annihilate the human species for hundreds of thousands of years, it could seem unlikely that such factors will strike us down in the next century or two. By contrast, we have no reason whatever not to think that the products of advanced civilization will be our bane. We shouldn't be too quick to dismiss the existential risks that aren't human–generated as insignificant, however.** It's true that our species has survived for a long time in spite of whatever such risks are present. But there may be an observation selection effect in play here. The question to ask is, on the theory that natural disasters sterilize Earth–like planets with a high frequency, what should we expect to observe? Clearly not that we are living on a sterilized planet. But maybe that we should be more primitive humans than we are? In **order to answer this question, we need a solution to the problem of the reference class in observer selection theory [76]. Yet that is a part of the methodology that doesn't yet exist. So at the moment we can state that the most serious existential risks are generated by advanced human civilization, but we base this assertion on direct considerations. Whether there is additional support for it based on indirect considerations is an open** question. We should not blame civilization or technology for imposing big existential risks. Because of the way we have defined existential risks, a failure to develop technological civilization would imply that we had fallen victims of an existential disaster (namely a crunch, "technological arrest"). Without technology, our chances of avoiding existential risks would therefore be nil. With technology, we have some chance, although the greatest risks now turn out to be those generated by technology itself. Implications for policy and ethics **Existential risks have a cluster of features that make it useful to identify them as a special category: the extreme magnitude of the harm that would come from an existential disaster; the futility of the trial–and–error approach; the lack of evolved biological and cultural coping methods; the fact that existential risk dilution is a global public good;** **the shared stakeholdership of all future generations; the international nature of many of the required countermeasures; the necessarily highly speculative and multidisciplinary nature of the topic; the subtle and diverse methodological problems involved in assessing the probability of existential risks; and the comparative neglect of the whole area.** From our survey of the most important existential risks and their key attributes, we can extract tentative recommendations for ethics and policy:

Contention level

1. Climate Change

Warming is an impact filter for all other scenarios –wars, food shortages, migration flows and security threats are exponentially worse on a hotter planet

Swain 15 - Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden (Ashok, "Climate Change: Threat to National Security", p1-3, Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy, Third Edition) ZachDiesel

In the last two decades, many research works have pointed that **environmental stress is one main catalyst that creates societal insecurity Climate change** can also potentially **increase the number of poor people** by reducing the existing resource base, thereby pulling more people into poverty. It has also been argued that climate change will **compound the propensity for violent conflict, climate change pose a severe challenge to interstate relations**. However, it is the adverse impact on human security of a large number of nations is most worrying. A critical component of human security is **food security,** which **is going to be seriously affected through** the multiple impacts of **climate change.** The agriculture sector is very sensitive to changes in climate. Climate change will consequently lead to more frequent extreme weather events particularly in arid and tropical regions, such as droughts and floods, eventually affecting agricultural productivity and likely leading to food shortages and societal insecurity.[17] **Sea level rise** has posed a serious threat to the survival of some of the smaller island states. But it also **threatens** the sources of livelihood for **millions** of people that live in low-lying river deltas **in poor developing countries**. Rich and developed states might be able to mitigate the impact of rising sea levels to some extent, for instance, London with the Thames Barrier. Others rich countries have long experience with seawater intrusion, e.g., Netherlands, which shields parts of its inland through the Oosterscheldekering (Eastern Scheldt Storm Surge Barrier). But, the situation is quite precarious for poor developing countries• CLIMATE CHANGE AND CONFLICTS **Conflicts will increase owing to the impact of climate change**, though not through a direct singular causal mechanism. The debate, which evolved prominently during the 1990s, frequently refers to **population migration as one of the key linking points between climate change and armed conflict**. The anticipated increase in the number of climate change migrants will cause stress on receiving communities, which might themselves suffer under resource stress, and, thus, eventually lead to new security problems through increased competition.[5,7] Some preliminary research finds quantifiable connections between climate change and organized communal violence.[18] Raleigh and Kniveton[19] confirm the trend of high rainfall leading to increased risk of localized communal conflict. However, the findings indicate that **combination of socioeconomic and political factors with climate change factors lead to conflict**. The discussion regarding the causal relationship between climate change and conflicts has yet to produce consensus.[16] On the basis of the existing literature, it can be safely argued that climate change may not generate conflicts in itself, but that **climate change can**, and in some instances already does, **act as a "threat multiplier**." CLIMATE CHANGE AND WATER CONFLICTS As **climate change can** potentially **change** water supply and **demand patterns.**. **Large-scale transborder migration has several dimensions for inducing conflict between the receiver and sender states**. **migrants may be encouraged or be manipulated by the host state in their effort to take revenge because of existing political differences** between the host and the sender states. This will of course result in creating negative implications for regional security.[7] CONCLUSION Although **climate change** may not be the sole cause of conflict or large-scale population migration, it **is** considered **a threat multiplier**.[13,26] Social, economic, and political factors will also affect the vulnerability or resilience of communities. In most of the developing countries, the ability to cope with climate change decreases, and the likelihood of conflict increases, as a result of factors that include poverty, low levels of education/literacy, lack of skills, weak institutions, limited infrastructure, lack of technology and information, limited access to health care, poor access to resources, overexploitation of resources, etc. **Climate change is likely to exacerbate many of these problems**.

Warming means extinction through feedback loops

Spratt and Dunlop 2019 Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne and international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading May 2019 David and Ian, "Existential climate-related security risk: A scenario approach," Breakthrough - National Centre for Climate Restoration, https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0_b2c0c79dc4344b279bcf2365336ff23b.pdf ZachDiesel

An existential risk to civilisation is one posing permanent large negative consequences to humanity which may never be undone, either annihilating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtailing its potential. With the commitments by nations to the 2015 Paris Agreement, the current path of warming is 3°C or more by 2100. But this figure does not include "**long-term" carbon-cycle feedbacks**, which are materially relevant now and in the near future due to the unprecedented rate at which human activity is perturbing the climate system. Taking these into account, the Paris path would lead to around 5°C of warming by 2100. Scientists warn that warming of 4°C is incompatible with an organised global community, is **devastating to the majority of ecosystems, and has a high probability of not being stable**. The World Bank says it may be **"beyond adaptation**". But an existential threat may also exist for many peoples and regions at a significantly lower level of warming. In 2017, 3°C of warming was categorised as "catastrophic" with a warning that, on a path of unchecked emissions, low-probability, high-impact warming could be catastrophic by 2050. The Emeritus Director of the Potsdam Institute, Prof. Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, warns that "climate change is now reaching the end-game, where very soon humanity must choose between taking unprecedented action, or accepting that it has been left too late and bear the consequences." He says that if we continue down the present path "there is a very big risk that **we will just end our civilisation**. The human species will survive somehow but we will destroy almost everything we have built up over the last two thousand years." Unfortunately, conventional risk and probability analysis becomes useless in these circumstances because it excludes the full implications of outlier events and

possibilities lurking at the fringes. Prudent risk-management means a tough, objective look at the real risks to which we are exposed, especially at those "fat-tail" **events which may have consequences that are damaging beyond quantification, and** threaten **the survival of human civilisation**. Global warming projections display a "fat-tailed" distribution with a greater likelihood of warming that is well in excess of the average amount of warming predicted by climate models, and are of a higher probability than would be expected under typical statistical assumptions. More importantly, the risk lies disproportionately in the "fat-tail" outcomes, as illustrated in Figure 1. This is a particular concern with potential climate tipping-points — passing critical thresholds which result in step changes in the climate system that will be irreversible on human timescales — such as the polar ice sheets (and hence sea levels), permafrost and other carbon stores, where the impacts of global warming are non-linear and difficult to model with current scientific knowledge. Recently, attention has been given to a "hothouse Earth" scenario, in which **system feedbacks and their mutual interaction could drive the Earth System climate to a point of no return whereby further warming would become self-sustaining. This "hothouse Earth" planetary threshold could exist at a temperature rise as low as 2°C, possibly even lower**

2. Advocacy is the root cause - Current press's focus on advocacy minimizes the reality of Climate Change and its impacts

Journalists have a moral obligation to report objectively on matters of the climate - advocacy gets in the way and conflates fact and fiction.

Ellison 2021 Ellison, Jude. "Why Journalists – Not Just Advocates – Need To Report On Climate Change." The City Journal. March 31, 2021. Web. February 13, 2022. <http://thecityjournal.net/opinion/why-journalists-not-just-advocates-need-to-report-on-climate-change/>.

As temperatures climb, rivers rise and fires burn, the need for informed and effective coverage of climate change is clear. But who should provide that coverage? **Journalists specialising in it are few and far between, particularly in the Global South. In the absence of journalistic coverage, Non Government Organisations (NGOs) have produced news releases and other content for their in-house media centres. These** organisations **are openly** agenda-driven, **leaving readers to question if their accounts are accurate and unbiased.** Further, unlike most journalistic news outlets, NGOs often publish pieces without bylines. Such work can be difficult to trust – who writes them, and why aren't the writers credited? These **uncertainties give readers reason to doubt what is reported. Doubt compounds inaction, which is an unacceptable outcome for an urgent topic like climate change.** But even clear attribution and commitment to fact-based reporting isn't enough. Journalistic coverage has actively harmed the public perception of climate change's seriousness and discouraged readers from taking action. What went wrong? **Ironically, one of the values that journalists use to earn trust – balance – has caused result in the work becoming less trustworthy. One study found that** in a sample of articles from the United States' "prestige press" between 1988 and 2002, **not even 6% of articles stated that human activity alone was responsible for climate change.** Worse, **nearly the same proportion of articles said that human activity was not responsible for climate change.** More than half the articles equivocated, stating that some sources believed human activity to be responsible and some did not. Another piece said that journalists' sources on climate change issues are not only scientists and other subject experts, but also encompass "a broader range of stakeholders" that gives page space to public relations professionals and other non-experts. The situation is no better in the Global South. **A study from the Australian Centre for**

Independent Journalism found nearly one-third of the articles it examined "did not accept the scientific consensus that human beings are major contributors to global warming". What could go right? So far, journalistic values have not been helpful in climate change reporting. But it doesn't have to be that way. For example, **instead of perpetuating the illusion of a "he said, she said" debate about anthropogenic climate change, journalists could honour their commitment to balance (and accuracy) by quoting multiple experts who suggest different actions for readers to take.** These differences do not need to be balanced in the sense of "put at odds," which may bewilder readers into inaction – rather, they can be balanced in the sense of "complementary," giving readers multiple paths to meaningful engagement. **Two additional journalistic values, accuracy and fairness, may also support climate change reporters. A University of Kansas study found a neutral tone is more likely than an angry one to convince readers of an issue's seriousness, so much so that "the more coverage used anger as a way to discuss the issue, the less people felt it was important".** Also, journalistic norms around attribution (that it should be done) and transparency (that conflicts, payments and potential threats to independence should be disclosed) make journalists' work less susceptible to the scepticism mentioned earlier around byline-free, agenda-driven NGO content. Another thing that may alleviate readers' reservations is journalism's code of ethics. Codes vary between regions, but in democratic societies, practitioners pledge to observe a number of guidelines that hold their work to higher standards than that of non-journalists. Adherence to professional codes of ethics is imperfect because those who adhere to them are imperfect, but it is arguably better to have named writers striving to meet the codes' requirements – and sometimes facing career-ending consequences should they fall short – than to have unknown writers bound to no such codes and at risk of no such consequences.

AND a focus on advocacy over fact minimizes Climate Change and its impacts by framing it as a debate.

Harkins 19 Harkins, Steven. "Why Is Climate Change Still Not Top Of The News Agenda?." The Conversation. September 19, 2019. Web. February 12, 2022. <https://theconversation.com/why-is-climate-change-still-not-top-of-the-news-agenda-123800>.

They found that a group of scientific experts challenged the consensus on climate change on behalf of corporations and conservative think tanks. Some of the individuals involved in this had previously challenged scientific consensus on a range of issues including the negative health implications of tobacco smoke. Corporations engage in this creation of doubt through public relations activity because climate change requires international cooperation on environmental legislation. **By performing what Tuchman calls a "strategic ritual" of objectivity, journalists obscure the scientific consensus on climate change by reporting it as a debate. This framing makes climate breakdown seem less urgent and therefore less newsworthy.** How can we improve? **The notion of objectivity needs to be reclaimed through good journalism which invests resources in providing analysis and verification.** News organisations are in an important position to explain complex scientific concepts in a language that most people understand, but they need to improve their scientific literacy in order to verify the relative merit of competing claims. Journalists with a better grasp of the science (and indeed social science) of climate change would be less reliant on press releases, reducing the impact of corporate lobbyists and the need to include their public relations activity as part of the news. However,

these suggestions are optimistic considering the wider power structures that constrain how journalists operate.