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#### Interpretation: “the appropriation of outer space” is a generic indefinite singular. The aff may not defend a subset of appropriation of outer space by private entities being unjust.

#### The definite article “the” makes the rez a definite singular – it’s generic

CCC n.d. [Capital Community College, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation.] “Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers.” Capital Community College. <http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles> TG

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class.

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a definite singular

Leslie 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University.] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “the appropriation of outer space” – 1] upward entailment test – “the appropriation of outer space is unjust” doesn’t entail that “the use of outer space is unjust”, 2] adverb test – “the appropriation of outer space is usually unjust” doesn’t mean anything substantially different from the rez

#### **Violation –**

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – they can pick any form of appropriation from internet satellites to asteroid mining to moon basing to Mars colonization and there’s no universal disad since they’re all different and require different uses space – explodes neg prep and leads to random appropriation of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible. PICs don’t solve – it’s absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse. Limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### 3] Precision outweighs pragmatics A) All pragmatic arguments concede the authority of semantics in order to convey pragmatic messages B) Key to predictability- the topic is the only thing that we have beforehand. Explodes neg prep burden and outweighs every other pragmatic consideration. C) Jurisdiction – it’s not in the judge’s jurisdiction to vote for an illegitimate aff. Independent voter -- even if they prove pragmatics they lose for not defending the resolution.

CI, DTD, no RVIs
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#### Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else regresses – robust neuroscience proves

Blum et al. 18 Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10].

Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14].

Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals.

Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D

Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it.

It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring.

Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding.

There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health.

Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage.

Finding happiness is different between apes and humans

As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure.

Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered.

Desire and reward centers

It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation.

In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41].

Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42].

Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans.

In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45].

Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations.

Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50]

In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders.

In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS.

Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

**Morality is action guiding. Thus moral categories like ‘goodness’ must account for their action guiding properties. We can only understand moral actions as coherently action guiding if we adopt a principle of moral substitutability.**

**Sinnot Armstrong[[1]](#footnote-1) 1:**

**Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter. "An argument for consequentialism." Philosophical Perspectives 6 (1992): 399-421.**

**I have a** moral **reason to feed my child** tonight, both because I promised¶ my wife to do so, and also because of my special relation to my child along¶ with the fact that she will go hungry if I don't feed her. **I can't feed my child¶** tonight **without going home** soon**, and going home** soon **will enable me to¶ feed her** tonight**. Therefore, there is a** moral **reason for me to go home** soon.¶ It need not be imprudent or ugly or sacrilegious or illegal for me not to feed¶ her, but the requirements of morality give me a moral reason to feed her.¶ **This argument assumes** a special case of **substitutability (**MS) **If there¶ is a** moral **reason for A to do X, and if A cannot do X¶ without doing Y, and if doing Y will enable A to do X, then¶ there is a** moral **reason for A to do Y.** I will call this 'the principle¶ of moral substitutability', or just 'moral¶ substitutability**.¶**

**We cannot understand moral substitutability within non-consequentialist theories.**

**Sinnot Armstrong 2:**

**Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter. "An argument for consequentialism." Philosophical Perspectives 6 (1992): 399-421.**

**Of course, there are many other versions of deontology. I cannot discuss ¶ them all. Nonetheless, these examples suggest that it is the very nature of deontological reasons that makes deontological theories unable to explain moral substitutability. This comes out clearly if we start from the other side ¶ and ask which properties create the moral reasons that are derived by moral ¶ substitutabil ty. What gives me a moral reason to start the mower is the ¶ consequences of starting the mower. Specifically, it has the consequence that ¶ I am able to mow the grass s. This reason cannot derive from the same property ¶ as my moral reason to mow the lawn unless what gives me a moral reason ¶ to mow the lawn is its consequences s. Thus, any non-consequentialist moral ¶ theory will have to posit two distinct kinds of moral reasons: one for starting ¶ the mower and another for mowing the grass. Once these kinds of reasons ¶ are separated, we need to understand the connection between them But this ¶ connection cannot be explained by** the **substantive principles of the theory.**

#### **Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well being**

Prefer additionally:

#### **1]outweighs on actor specificity since governments make policies as a whole that benefit and help some people and side constraints freeze action – actor spec outweighs and turns since it’s better than no action, states don’t have wills and intentions since they are not indivuals actors, different agents have different obligations**

#### **2] no act omission distinction -- governments control everything that happens in the public sphere since they yes/no bills – act omission distinction would make the yemen war moral**

#### **3] extinction first**

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

#### **4] Intuitions come first** Huemer:[[2]](#footnote-2)

Huemer, Michael. "Moral Knowledge." Ethical Intuitionism. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2005. 99-127.

Other things being equal, it is reasonable to assume that things are the way they appear. I call this principle 'Phenomenal Conservatism' ('phenomenal' meaning 'pertaining to appearances'). I have discussed the principle elsewhere, so here I will be relatively brief.(1) There is a type of mental state, which I call an 'appearance', that we avow when we say such things as 'It seems to me that p', 'It appears that p', or 'p is obvious', where p is some proposition. Appearances have propositional contents--things they represent to be the case--but they are not beliefs, as can be seen from the intelligibility of, 'The arch seems to be taller than it is wide, but I don't think it is'. Nevertheless, appearances normally lead us to form beliefs. 'Appearance' is a broad category that includes mental states involved in perception, memory, introspection, and intellection. Thus, we can say, 'This line seems longer than that one', 'I seem to recall reading something about that', 'It seems to me that I have a headache', and 'It seems that any two points can be joined by a single straight line'.(2) All of those statements make sense, using the same sense of 'seems'. Appearances can be deceiving, and appearances can conflict with one another, as in the Müller-Lyer illusion: It initially seems that the top line is longer than the bottom line. But if you get out a ruler and measure them, you will find them to be of the same length. The top line will seem, when holding a ruler next to it, to be 2 inches long, and the bottom line will similarly appear to be 2 inches long. So, all things considered, it seems that the two lines are of the same length. As this example illustrates, an initial appearance can be overruled by other appearances (this does not mean the initial appearance goes away, but only that we don't believe it), and only by other appearances. Some appearances are stronger than others--as we say, some things are 'more obvious' than others--and this determines what we hold on to and what we reject in case of conflict. Presumably, it more clearly seems to you that the result of measuring the lines is accurate than that the result of eyeballing them is, so you believe the measurement result (this may have to do with background beliefs you have about the reliability of different procedures--which would themselves be based upon the way other things seem to you). Things can become complicated when many different beliefs and/or appearances are involved, but the basic principle is that we are more inclined to accept what more strongly seems to us to be true. Appearances can be intellectual, as opposed to sensory, mnemonic, or introspective. It seems to us that the shortest path between any two points must be a straight line; that time is one-dimensional and totally ordered (for any two moments in time, one is earlier than the other); and that no object can be completely red and completely blue at the same time. I accept those things on intellectual grounds. I am not looking at all the possible pairs of points and all the possible paths connecting each pair and seeing, with my eyes, that the straight path is the shortest in each case. Instead, I am 'seeing' intellectually that it must be true--that is, when I think about it, it becomes obvious. Logical judgments rest on intellectual appearances. We think the following inference logically valid (the premises entail the conclusion, regardless of whether the premises are true): Socrates is a man. All men are inconsiderate. Therefore, Socrates is inconsiderate. but the next one invalid: Socrates is inconsiderate. All men are inconsiderate. Therefore, Socrates is a platypus. We 'see' this, not with our eyes, but with our intellect or reason. All judgments are based upon how things seem to the judging subject: a rational person believes only what seems to him to be true, though he need not believe everything that seems true.(3) The function of arguments is to change the way things seem to one's audience, by presenting other propositions (premises) that seem true and seem to support something (the conclusion) that may not initially have seemed true to the audience. An argument has force only to the extent that its premises seem true and seem to support its conclusion. Intellectual inquiry presupposes Phenomenal Conservatism, in the sense that such inquiry proceeds by assuming things are the way they appear, until evidence (itself drawn from appearances) arises to cast doubt on this. Even the arguments of a philosophical skeptic who says we aren't justified in believing anything rest upon the skeptic's own beliefs, which are based upon what seems to the skeptic to be true.

#### You’ll say reasons override intuitions. That’s a false premise. The basis of logic isn’t justified by more logic; logic is just intuitive. Intuitions outweigh on bindingness.

#### B) Intuitions outweigh even dropped framework warrants. When I can’t refute someone’s rant on the moon landing being faked, I don’t discount this evidence, but given my stronger justification to the contrary I retain my belief. [This likewise takes out dropped a priori’s.]

#### 5] use epistemic modesty – multiply probability of the fwk times the magnitude of the impacts A) clash – encourages both substantive and phil debates so that we talk about all the offense B) leads to the net most morality and proves that only beating fwk is not enough to win the debate. Accessibility – util is the easiest to access A] it doesn’t require access to private sites like jstor B] it’s the easiest to understand which is good for novices – inclusion comes first since we need to maximize accessibility in order to have a real conversation

# 3

#### SAFE act passes now, but opposition means it’s still tough

**CNN 4/20**, "US lawmakers are warming up to the cannabis industry," No Publication, <https://www.kake.com/story/46328914/us-lawmakers-are-warming-up-to-the-cannabis-industry> //SR

April is typically a pretty eventful month for the cannabis industry, with 4/20 celebrations bringing abundant attention -- and sales. But things have been heating up much earlier this year. In the first four days of April, the US House of Representatives (once again and narrowly) passed a bill to decriminalize marijuana and then, days later, (overwhelmingly) approved legislation to ease barriers to cannabis research. In addition, Maryland lawmakers voted to put an adult-use cannabis measure on their state's November ballot; New Mexico became the latest state to begin recreational sales; and this Thursday, New Jersey will start selling recreational cannabis. The full-scale legalization of cannabis in America feels like it's closer than ever: More states have passed recreational-use laws; comprehensive legislation is gaining attention -- and votes -- in Congress; and the industry continues to steamroll to maturity with a stream of mega-mergers, high value investments and steady sales. "The fact that the House of Representatives has passed [the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act] in two successive sessions of Congress really is a sign that the end of federal prohibition is drawing near," said Steven Hawkins, president and chief executive officer of the US Cannabis Council, a trade and lobbying organization. However, while this is an industry that has long held a "not if, but when" belief toward legalization, what's viewed as inevitable is not necessarily imminent. The MORE Act, which mustered only three Republican votes, is not expected to succeed in the Senate. Additionally, a separate legalization bill that Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer is expected to introduce this summer also might not garner the 60 votes needed to pass. "In terms of passage of either [bill], it's still a tough path ahead in the Senate," Hawkins said. "But we're not ruling anything out." A $27 billion industry The absence of federal legalization has not slowed down one of the fastest-growing industries in the United States. The cannabis industry reeled in an estimated $27 billion in sales in 2021, up 35% from 2020, according to data released earlier this month by MJBiz, a cannabis trade publication and events organizer. And in the next five years, it projects sales will nearly double. "Right now, over 425,000 jobs in the economy are tied to the cannabis industry. With that, we see the continued increase for public support for legalization," Hawkins said. "And we continue to see both red and blue states pass laws to legalize cannabis for either adult or medical use." As more states allow for cannabis sales, companies within the budding industry aren't waiting for federal law changes to stake their claim. In the past year, there have been a couple of multibillion-dollar mergers. The latest: Cresco's $2.1 billion acquisition of Columbia Care. If the deal closes as expected in the fourth quarter, the combined company would have upward of 120 retail locations and dozens of facilities in 17 states and Washington, D.C. "It sets us up very well if federal change happens any time soon," Cresco CEO Charlie Batchell told CNN Business in an interview. Other paths to legal reform More than two-thirds of US states have legalized cannabis in some capacity: Of the 37 that have medical marijuana laws, 18 of them have recreational cannabis laws, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures. And more could be on the way. States such as Delaware, New Hampshire and Rhode Island are debating recreational cannabis legalization. Petition drives and legislative efforts for medical marijuana programs are also underway in states such as Kansas, Nebraska, North Carolina and South Carolina, said Karen O'Keefe, director of state policies for the Marijuana Policy Project, a lobbying and advocacy organization. One huge step toward broader reform is the Secure and Fair Enforcement (SAFE) Banking Act, which would make it easier for cannabis businesses to access banking services. Because marijuana remains illegal in the eyes of the federal government, and despite 2014 guidance from the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, some financial institutions have been wary of serving cannabis-related businesses for fear of violating anti-money laundering laws. The SAFE Act bill is gaining momentum in Congress and is now in a good position to become law, Hawkins said. Beyond making it easier for financial institutions to work with cannabis businesses, the SAFE Banking Act has long been touted as a public safety measure. Colorado Rep. Ed Perlmutter first introduced the legislation five years ago following deadly robberies at cash-only dispensaries. Re-upping those safety concerns after another recent stretch of criminal activity at dispensaries, Perlmutter asked Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen to "put the muscle of the administration behind getting it passed." Yellen responded that she was in support of the bill, in an exchange first reported by Marijuana Moment.

#### Space policy causes immense partisan backlash that wrecks the delicate balance

**Dreier 16** [Casey Dreier, Chief Advocate & Senior Space Policy Adviser for The Planetary Society, April 13, 2016. “Does Presidential Intervention Undermine Consensus for NASA?” https://www.planetary.org/blogs/casey-dreier/2016/0413-does-a-strong-president-help-or-hurt-consensus-on-NASA.html]

To see how this happens, I recommend reading the book “[Beyond Ideology](http://smile.amazon.com/Beyond-Ideology-Politics-Principles-Partisanship/dp/0226470768/ref=smi_www_rco2_go_smi_g2243582042?_encoding=UTF8&*Version*=1&*entries*=0&ie=UTF8)” by Frances Lee. The author’s larger premise is that issues having no intrinsic relation to stated party ideology have become increasingly polarized in recent years. This is a function of the two party nature of our political system. If your party coalition wins, the other one loses. It’s zero-sum. Your party can win in one of two ways: you can make a better pitch to voters by demonstrating the superiority of your agenda; or you can undermine and stymie the agenda of the opposition party, making them unpopular with voters, and pick up the seats that they lose. Since you’re the only other political party, you gain in either scenario. I’m not sure if you’ve noticed, but the “undermine and stymie” approach has been popular for quite some time now in the U.S. Congress. Given this situation, the President and their policies naturally become the symbolic target of the opposition party. Anything promoted by the President effectively induces opposition by association. Lee demonstrates the magnitude of this induced polarization on various types of issues. For highly polarized issues like the role of government in the economy, or social issues, the impact is minimal—the opposition has already been clearly defined and generally falls into clearly defined ideologies of the Republican and Democratic parties. But for issues that do not fit readily into a predefined political ideology—like space—the induced polarization by the President can be significant. In fact, Lee showed that space, science, and technology issues incur the greatest increase in partisanship based on their inclusion in the Presidential agenda. One need only look to at the responses by political operatives of the opposing party to the strong human spaceflight proposals by [Barack Obama in 2010](http://www.shelby.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/mobile/newsreleases?ID=25F3AD2E-802A-23AD-4960-F512B9E205D2), [George W. Bush in 2004](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/3950099/ns/technology_and_science-space/t/bush-sets-new-course-moon-beyond/#.Vw3UMRMrKHo), and [George H.W. Bush in 1989](http://www.nytimes.com/1989/07/21/us/president-calls-for-mars-mission-and-a-moon-base.html) to see this reflected in recent history. This isn’t to say that Presidents can’t have a significant impact on the space program. Clearly they can. But the broad consensus needed for stability after their departure from office may be undermined by the very priority they gave it during their tenure. It what amounts to a mixed blessing for NASA, the U.S. space program does have an unusually strong bipartisan group of politicians who support the program due to NASA centers in a variety of states throughout the union. Berger notes this throughout his article, and it does, in a way, act as force that is resistant to change for good and bad. This mitigates somewhat the pure polarization seen on other science and technology issues. But for a Journey to Mars—a major effort that would, at best, require stability and significant funding over many Presidential administrations—that may not be enough. Perhaps the solution is for the next President to maintain a light touch on space. Maybe they should speak softly through the budget process, and avoid the Kennedyesque speeches and declarations to Congress that induce the types of partisanship we so dearly need to avoid.

#### SAFE solves capital investment in cannabis

**Jergler 20** --- Don Jergler, Insurance Journal, “SAFE Banking in Stimulus Could Put Cannabis Industry on Steroids” May 14, 2020,<https://www.insurancejournal.com/news/west/2020/05/14/568608.htm> (BJN)

A big and long-awaited boost for cannabis – and those who offer financial products to cannabis businesses – now in the hands of Congress may not only help usher the industry through the coming pandemic-ridden economic slump, it could have an impact akin to putting the sector on steroids. The leadership of the U.S. House has included wording from the SAFE Banking Act in the latest proposed coronavirus economic relief package. A House vote on the COVID-19 package, a relief bill with a potential $3 trillion price tag that is being met with considerable political headwind, is expected as early as Friday. The proposed Health and Economic Recovery Omnibus Emergency Solutions Act, or the HEROES Act, includes more stimulus checks, moratoriums on evictions, pandemic pay for essential workers, and SAFE Banking provisions. The SAFE Banking bill had bipartisan momentum in the House until it stalled in committee last fall. If the SAFE Banking language remains the relief bill, and that bill is passed, it will pave the way for several large commercial carriers to get right into the cannabis market, as well as reinvigorate reinsurance interest, enable much-needed banking services, and bring in more capital, said Ian Stewart, a partner in Wilson Elser Moskowitz Edelman & Dicker LLP. “If it stays in there, it will put the cannabis industry on steroids,” Stewart said.

#### That’s key to ag tech innovation and food security

**Yamazaki 17** Kevin Yamazaki (founder and CEO of [Sidebench](http://sidebench.com/), a leading digital product and venture studio that creates custom software and apps), 3-27-2017, "High Tech: How Marijuana Legalization Breeds Innovation," Observer, https://observer.com/2017/03/high-tech-how-marijuana-legalization-breeds-innovation/, SJBE

With the competition blazing and increased legalization on the horizon, we can expect to see the weed market become a hotbed for tech innovations. Forecasts indicate that revenue in the U.S. from medical marijuana alone will reach at least [$10.8 billion by 2018](http://fortune.com/2016/02/01/marijuana-sales-legal/). When states expand to allow recreational use, this number will surely increase. As investors become more comfortable deploying capital around cannabis, tech will revolutionize the marijuana ecosystem for producers, distributors, and consumers alike. The future of marijuana innovation Innovation has begun to outpace legalization as tech organizations make groundbreaking strides in researching and developing applications for marijuana. For example, [Kalytera](https://kalytera.co/) is exploring how cannabidiol — a non-psychoactive cannabinoid with a number of potential medical applications — can be used to target diseases such as obesity and osteoporosis. The findings of such research could transform how people cope with chronic illness and pain. Companies are also experimenting with improvements in [weed-growing processes](http://www.ibtimes.com/legal-marijuana-cultivation-driving-technology-revolution-industrial-agriculture-1925167). Cannabis is a finicky crop, so the ability to fine-tune growing processes could generate products far superior to today’s. Several organizations are devising smart, energy-efficient systems that automatically adjust growing environments according to changes in moisture, temperature, and sunlight. Meanwhile, data-capture technologies enable growers to identify optimal conditions for their plants, leading to larger and better-quality yields. The primary speed bump for the industry at this point is that marijuana is still classified as a Schedule I drug and is illegal at the federal level. Even if this factor doesn’t inhibit marijuana-centric technology innovation directly, it certainly has a strong indirect effect, as many potential financiers (and entrepreneurs) are scared away by either fear of prosecution or skepticism about the industry’s stability. That said, as more states allow for medical marijuana or legalize the drug entirely, the potential market size for marijuana-centric products expands as well. Perhaps more importantly, with some form of state legalization becoming the norm rather than the exception, there is a degree of safety in numbers. Assuming we see the trend of legalization for medical and recreational uses continue, production will inevitably become an even bigger business. Technology will play an increasing role in ensuring quality, consistency, and efficiency on the production side. We’re already seeing startups like [Cannafuse](http://cannafuse.com/) and [Teewinoit Life Sciences](https://tlscorp.com/) focusing on providing a tech-enabled scientific approach to the mass scientific production and distribution of cannabis. Advances in the irrigation systems, efficiency lamps, and data tracking processes used to grow marijuana may have far-reaching effects beyond the cannabis industry. Industrial farmers could adopt these techniques to increase their outputs and reduce energy expenses, while building managers can use them to lower energy loads from their properties. On the consumer side, the medical marijuana industry, in particular, will likely see an explosion of on-demand delivery services. Consumers are accustomed to using their smartphones to book cars, buy groceries, and mail packages. Why wouldn’t they receive their medical marijuana that way, too? Expect to see personalized services as well — think apps that recommend strains of marijuana on the basis of your preferences. Apps such as [MassRoots](https://massroots.com/) bring the social media aspect to what is, for many people, a social product by connecting weed enthusiasts to one another through news updates and other types of content. Even Microsoft is throwing its hat into the ring with [marijuana tracking software](http://www.businessinsider.com/microsoft-marijuana-tracking-software-2016-11) that ensures growers comply with their tax obligations and prevents legally grown pot from ending up on the black market. As the cannabis industry expands, the opportunities for growth are diverse and extensive. Tech-enabled companies will inevitably spur that growth, driving breakthroughs in medicine, crop development, and customer experiences. The momentum created by legalization will transform a once-taboo drug into a mainstream commodity, and the tech world stands to benefit enormously.

#### Food insecurity causes extinction–now is key because of overpopulation

Julian **Cribb**, Distinguished science writer with more than thirty awards for journalism. He was a newspaper editor, founder of the influential ScienceAlert website and author of eight books, including The Coming Famine, Food as an Existential Risk. (**2019**). *Food or War, 174–202.///AHS PB*

Our demand for food is set to double by the 2060s – potentially the decade of ‘peak people’, the moment in history when the irresistible human population surge may top out at around 10 billion. However, as we have seen, many of the resources needed to supply it agriculturally could halve and the climate for the growing of food outdoors become far more hostile. Why food insecurity is an existential threat to humanity should, by now, be abundantly clear from the earlier chapters of this book: present systems are unsustainable and, as they fail, will pose risks both to civilization and, should these spiral into nuclear conflict, to the future of the human species. The important thing to note in this chapter is that food insecurity plays into many, if not all, of the other existential threats facing humanity. The food sector’s role in extinction, resource scarcity, global toxicity and potential nuclear war has already been explained. Its role in the suppression of conflict is discussed in the next chapter. Its role in securing the future of the megacities, and of a largely urbanised humanity, is covered in Chapter 8. And its role in sustaining humanity through the peak in population and into a sustainable world beyond is covered in Chapter 9. Food clearly has a pivotal role in the future of human population – both as a driver of population growth when supplies are abundant and as a potential driver of population decline, should food chains collapse. It is no exaggeration to state that the fate of civilisation depends on it. Pandemic Disease Disease pandemics have been a well-known existential risk to humanity since the plague of Athens in 430 BC – itself linked to a war. However, a point that escapes many people nowadays is that, as humans have become so numerous – indeed the predominant lifeform on the planet – we have also become the major food source for many microbes. We are now the ‘living compost heap’ on which they must dine and in which they must reproduce, if they are themselves to survive. As our own population grows, pandemics are thus likely to increase, as more and more viruses and bacteria are forced to take refuge in humans following the depletion or total extinction of their natural hosts, the wild animals we are exterminating. This process is greatly assisted by our creation of megacities, tourism and air travel, schools and child-minding centres, air-conditioned offices, night clubs, sex with strangers, pet and pest animals, insects which prosper from climate change or human modification of the environment (like mosquitoes), ignorance, poor public hygiene, lack of clean water, and deficient food processing and handling. So, while humanity is confronted with an ever-expanding array of parasites, we are simultaneously doing everything in our power to distribute them worldwide in record time – and to seed new pandemics. The World Health Organisation has identified 19 major infectious diseases with potential to become pandemic: chikungunya, cholera, Crimean-Congo haemorrhagic fever, Ebola, Hendra, influenza, Lassa fever, Marburg virus, meningitis, MERS-CoV, monkeypox, Nipah, plague, Rift Valley fever, SARS, smallpox, tularaemia, yellow fever and Zika virus disease.28 While none of these is likely to fulfil the Hollywood horror movie image of wiping out the human species – for the simple reason that viruses are usually smart enough to weaken to a sublethal state once comfortably ensconced in their new host – the apocalyptic horseman representing Pestilence and Death will nevertheless continue to play a synergetic role with his companions warfare, famine, climate change, global poisoning, ecological collapse, urbanisation and other existential threats. Food insecurity affects the progression of pandemic diseases, often in ways that are not entirely obvious. First, new pandemics of infectious disease tend to originate in developing regions where nutritional levels are poor or agricultural practices favour the evolution of novel pathogens such as, for example, the new flu strains seen every year – which arise mainly from places where people, pigs and poultry live side-by-side and shuffle viruses between them – and also novel diseases like SARS and MERS. Second, because totally unknown diseases tend to arise first in places where rainforests are being cut down for farming and viruses hitherto confined to wild animals and birds make an enforced transition into humans. Examples of novel human diseases escaping from the rainforest and tropical savannah in recent times include HIV/AIDS, Hendra, Nipah, Ebola, Marburg, Lassa and Hanta, Lujo, Junin, Machupo, Rift Valley, Congo and Zika.29 And thirdly, because the loss of vital micronutrients from heavily farmed soils and from food itself predisposes many populations to various deficiency diseases – for example, a lack of selenium in the diet has been linked with increased risk from both HIV/AIDS and bowel cancer.30 A key synergy is the way hunger and malnourishment exacerbate the spread of disease, classic examples being the 1918 Global Flu Pandemic which spread rapidly among war-starved populations, or the more recent cholera outbreak in war-torn Yemen. In a fresh twist, Dr Melinda Beck of North Carolina University has demonstrated that obesity – itself a form of malnutrition – may cause increased deaths from influenza by both aiding the virus and suppressing the patient’s immune response.31 At the same time, food is largely responsible for the fastest growing pandemic of all – the so-called ‘lifestyle’, chronic or noncommunicable diseases, such as cancer, heart disease, diabetes, obesity, kidney and liver failure and some mental conditions, all of which are diet-related. These are responsible for 71 per cent of deaths worldwide, killing around 42 million people a year.32 Food and dietary quality are therefore inseparable from worldwide efforts to prevent or contain new disease pandemics. Vaccines, public health and biosecurity alone are not enough. In an overpopulated world, people must be sufficiently well-fed to avoid becoming fertile soil for the germination of fresh plagues. Diseases must be prevented – not just ‘cured’, and the key to prevention lies in a healthy diet.33

# Case

## 1ar theory

Give us new 2AR responses

Don’t give them 1AR theory

1. It’s a bad norm because we have less speeches to have the theory debate – only three speeches
2. Leads to intervention since any counter interps or responses to the counter interps are new in the 2
3. Unfair since we only get one speech to respond so the 2ar can spin the shell and we can’t do anything about it
4. Cross apply neg flex

#### Evaluate substance before 1AR theory:

#### 1 ) Resolvability – more speeches develop substance, so there’s more weighing analysis and the judge won’t have to evaluate entirely new 2A responses to 2N counterinterps or arbitrarily decide what counts as a new argum

#### 2 ) The neg has 1 chance to respond – means we can’t resolve arguments or weigh like the aff; AND 2AR clarification furthers a massive skew in favour of the aff

#### 3 ) Prep skew—encourages bad theory debates since people have less prep time and less time to make responses—worse for norms setting—means even if they win their interp you should put low credence into it and look to resolve the debate elsewhere

#### 4 ) Solves abuse – we return the debate to substance

#### Presumption and permissibility affirm: A) we presume statements true before false– if I say my name is Saranya Singh then you believe me B) To negate means to deny the truth and if they neg hasn’t proved the aff wrong then they lose C) All truth statements depend on other statements so if we presume everything false then we can’t prove anything true D) we’d need to justify everything including breathing E) if anything is permissible then so is the aff because there’s no reason not to do it

## offense

#### Aliens don’t exist:

#### 1] Probes

Forgan 19 [Duncan Forgan, researcher in the School of Physics & Astronomy at the University of St Andrews.] “Predator-Prey Behaviour in Self-Replicating Interstellar Probes” 2 March 2019 (<https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.00770>) – MZhu

Why have we detected no sign of intelligent life beyond the Earth? This fundamental question continues to challenge our deepest-held beliefs about humanity and our place in the Universe. Fermi’s Paradox forces us to confront our Copernican assumptions about our lack of uniqueness with the lack of extraterrestrial intelligences (ETIs, see e.g. Brin, 1983; Cirkovi ´ c, 2009). Its strongest formulation can be given as follows ´ (Tipler, 1980). Imagine a civilisation constructs an interstellar probe that is self-replicating. Such a probe would be able to produce a copy every time it visits a new star system. As each copy makes copies, the number of self-replicating probes (SRPs) grows exponentially, and every star in the Milky Way is explored on a timescale much, much shorter than its age. Estimates for this exploration timescale vary, but are as short as ten million years (Nicholson & Forgan, 2013), and perhaps shorter still. Given that this timescale is much shorter than the age of the Earth, and only one ETI constructing SRPs is sufficient to produce this scenario, on balance we should expect to see an interstellar probe orbiting the Sun. And yet, we do not. How can this be resolved? Among many possibilities, we can include solutions that require civilisations to be rare. However, as a single civilisation is sufficient to swamp the galaxy in SRPs, we are effectively asking for humanity to be alone in the Universe.

#### 2] Fermis Paradox

Parsons 19 Humans are likely alone in the universe, study concludes Jeff Parsons 26 Feb 2019 <https://metro.co.uk/2019/02/26/humans-likely-alone-universe-study-concludes-8747817/> SM

Humans are likely alone in the universe, study concludes Jeff ParsonsTuesday 26 Feb 2019 9:51 am Share this article via facebookShare this article via twitterShare this article via messenger 162 SHARES A team of international researchers have put the brakes on any idea of humankind coming into contact with extraterrestrials in the near future. In a new study published online they conclude that we are the only intelligent life in the known universe. The team used the famous Fermi paradox as the basis for their study. The paradox looks at the contradiction between the high probability of existence of alien civilisations and the overwhelming lack of evidence we’ve found since starting to scan the stars. See all that? We’re the only smart ones in there, according to researchers (Science Photo Library) The researchers took the paradox, which was developed in the first half of the 20th century, then incorporated new elements such as bias and uncertainty. In a nutshell, they reckon it’s not as accurate as previously thought. The report is entitled ‘Dissolving the Fermi Paradox,’ and the researchers come to the conclusion we’re very much alone in the known galaxy. ”One can answer the Fermi Paradox by saying intelligence is very rare, but then it needs to be tremendously rare,’ said Anders Sandberg, a researcher at Oxford University and a lead author of the study. ‘Another possibility is that intelligence doesn’t last very long, but it is enough that one civilization survives for it to become visible,’ he told Universetoday.com. There are no intelligent alien civilisations out there say the scientists (Photographer’s Choice) In the report, the researchers go on to say that even if we did somehow stumble across aliens, they may not be intelligent ones. ‘When the model is recast to represent realistic distributions of uncertainty, we find a substantial ex ante probability of there being no other intelligent life in our observable universe, and thus that there should be little surprise when we fail to detect any signs of it,’ the team wrote. If they do exist, aliens are unlikely to look like this (Shutterstock) ‘This result dissolves the Fermi paradox, and in doing so removes any need to invoke speculative mechanisms by which civilizations would inevitably fail to have observable effects upon the universe.’

#### universalizable would be all private entities which is universalizable

#### Acquisition of property can never be unjust – to create rights violations, there must already be an owner of the property being violated, but that presupposes its appropriation by another entity.

Feser 1, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources; therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R. By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

#### Self-ownership justifies the appropriation of property – our freedom necessitates being able to set and pursue external things as our ends, including exercising our rights on property. Restricting this arbitrarily limits our freedom which is unjust.

Feser 3, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

V. Some Implications If what I have argued so far is correct, then the way is opened to the following revised case for strongly libertarian Lockean-Nozickian prop-erty rights: We are self-owners, having full property rights to our body parts, powers, talents, energies, etc. As self-owners, we also have a right, given the SOP, not to have our self-owned powers nullified —we have the right, that is, to act within the extra-personal world and thus to acquire rights to extra-personal objects that the use of our self-owned powers requires.39 This might involve the buying or leasing of certain rights or bundles of rights and, correspondingly, the acquiring of lesser or greater degrees of ownership of parts of the external world, but as long as one is able to exercise one’s powers to some degree and is not rendered incapable of acting within that world, the SOP is satisfied. In any case, such rights can only be traded after they are first established by initial acquisition. In initially acquiring a resource, an agent does no one an injustice (it was unowned, after all). Furthermore, [they] has mixed [their] labor with the resource, significantly altering it and/or bringing it under his control, and is himself solely responsible for whatever value or utility the resource has come to have. Thus, [they] has a presumptive right to it, and, if his control and/or alteration (and thus acquisition) of it is (more or less) complete, his own- ership is accordingly (more or less) full. The system of strong private property rights that follows from the acts of initial acquisition performed by countless such agents results, as a matter of empirical fact, in a market economy that inevitably and dramatically increases the number of resources available for use by individuals, and these benefited individuals include those who come along long after initial acquisition has taken place. (Indeed, it especially includes these latecomers, given that they were able to avoid the hard work of being the first to “tame the land” and draw out the value of raw materials.)40 The SOP is thus, in fact, rarely, if ever, violated. The upshot is that a system of Lockean-Nozickian private property rights is morally justified, with a strong presumption against tampering with exist- ing property titles in general. In any case, there is a strong presumption against any general egalitarian redistribution of wealth, and no case what- soever to be made for such redistribution from the general theory of prop- erty just sketched, purged as it is of the Lockean proviso, with all the egalitarian mischief-making the proviso has made possible.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### 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.
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