## Case

### Property Rights Good

#### To deny property rights is impossible – non-contradiction proves

Dominiak 17

Łukasz Dominiak (Associate Professor at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Poland; he holds a PhD and habilitation in political philosophy and is a Fellow of the Mises Institute). “Libertarianism and Original Appropriation.” Historia i Polityka, 29/2017: 22. Pp. 43-56. JDN. <https://apcz.umk.pl/HiP/article/view/HiP.2017.026/13714>

In this last paragraph we would like to focus on what we claim is the best justification for the first possession theory of **original appropriation** and what are the ramifications of both this theory and its justification. We suggest that the ultimate justification of this theory is not usually evoked avoidance of conflicts – although it is a necessary consequence of the justification we are going to present here – but **a necessary condition of rationality of a conceptual system** (it is good to remember that rights have form of deontic propositions and therefore they also form a conceptual or theoretical system). Let us present a sketch of our argument.

For a conceptual system to be rational it is necessary to be non-contradictory (Popper, 2002). Nothing that violates the law of non-contradiction can be true, justified or for that matter rational (Łukasiewicz, 1987, 1988). In a system of rationally justified rights – so-called natural rights – existence of contrary rights and duties, let alone contradictory ones is ex definitione off limits since contrary rights violate the law of non-contradiction. As Steiner puts it with reference to rights as such, although his argument seems to work impeccably only with natural rights, “mutual consistency – or compossibility – of all the rights in a proposed set of rights is at least a necessary condition of that set being possible one. A set of rights being a possible set is, I take it, itself a necessary condition of the plausibility of whatever principle of justice generates that set. Any justice principle that delivers a set of rights yielding contradictory judgements about the permissibility of a particular action either is unrealizable or (what comes to the same thing) must be modified to be realizable” (1994). Hence, systems of rights in which there are contradictory or contrary rights is off limits insofar as its rational justification is concerned. Basically, such a system can never be rationally justified. It is obvious on the other hand that one of the most important and direct ramifications of a system of non-contradictory rights is avoidance of conflicts. It is the case be-cause for a person who abides by the norms of such a system it is impossible to find himself in the situation of conflicting rights or duties. So, on our account it is not so much that property rights are justified functionally or teleologically as being conducive to conflict avoidance as that their function of conflict avoidance is a logical consequence of their fundamental vindication as rational (non-contradictory) allocations of individual jurisdictions (Barnett, 2004) or spheres of freedom (Steiner, 1994).Now the question is: What set of rights can be a set of non-contradictory rights? Following Steiner we can say that rights predicate about human action. Because each action-token always takes place in a specific time and space, it can be given an exhaustive description in extensional terms of its spatio-temporal components. We can therefore say that two action-tokens are incompossible when they share at least one physical component; on the other hand, action-tokens are com-possible when they do not have any physical components in common. Now, rights that “oblige” people to perform two or more action-tokens that share at least one physical component are perforce contradictory rights – they “oblige” people to do what is incompossible to do; whereas rights which oblige people to perform action-tokens that do not have common components are non-contradictory rights. How to make sure that rights never become contradictory? It is necessary and sufficient to construe of rights as rights to **exclusive control of physical components** of actions, i.e. As rights to possess tangible things. If physical components of actions are unequivocally distributed amongst people, if each and every physical component is unambiguously and exclusively assigned to one and only one person, then there can never be rights to action-tokens that share physical components with each other and therefore there can never be rights that oblige people to perform incompossible action-tokens (Steiner, 1994). As Steiner points out, “a set of categorically compossible domains, constituted by a set of property rights, is one in which each person’s rights are demarcated in such a way as to be mutually exclusive of every other person’s rights... we will interpret this to mean that no two persons simultaneously have rights to one and the same physical thing” (1994).

Because the nature of possession is such that it is impossible for two or more people to possess the same thing at the same time – although it seems possible for two or more people to simultaneously mix their labour with the same thing (e.g. when two people chase the same wild animal) – then **assigning rights to** people who took **first possession** of a thing, who are first-comers, perforce avoids non-contradictoriness of rights and conflicts between people since the dawn of time. For it is always and from the very beginning clear who has title to which physical resource as well as which resources are still up for appropriating and which are not so available. As Hans-Hermann Hoppe writes, “with regard to the purpose of conflict avoidance, **no alternative to private property and original appropriation exists.** In the absence of prestabilized harmony among actors, conflict can only be prevented if all goods are always in the private ownership of specific individuals and it is always clear who owns what and who does not. Also, conflicts can only be avoided from the beginning of mankind if private property is acquired by acts of original appropriation (instead of by mere declarations or words of latecomers)” (2012). It is **by definition inconceivable** for more than one person to be in a position in which it is physically possible to deal with a thing at will to the exclusion of others. Neither is it conceivable for more than one person to simultaneously come to such a position. Thus, taking first possession of scarce resources as basis of title and as principle of justice in original appropriation guarantees non-contradictoriness of rights and avoidance of conflicts since the dawn of time.

#### Logic constrains everything – every argument implicitly contains a deductive syllogism where one moves from premises to conclusions, which concedes the authority of logic.

#### Prefer on argumentation ethics – the act of engaging in discourse presupposes it

Mises Institute, "A Primer on Hoppe's Argumentation Ethics,", <https://mises.org/wire/primer-hoppes-argumentation-ethics> JS

I demonstrate that only the libertarian private property ethic can be justified argumentatively, because it is the praxeological presupposition of argumentation as such; and that any deviating, nonlibertarian ethical proposal can be shown to be in violation of this demonstrated preference. Such a proposal can be made, of course, but its propositional content would contradict the ethic for which one demonstrated a preference by virtue of one’s own act of proposition-making, i.e., by the act of engaging in argumentation as such. For instance, one can say “people are and always shall be indifferent towards doing things,” but this proposition would be belied by the very act of proposition-making, which in fact would demonstrate subjective preference (of saying this rather than saying something else or not saying anything at all). Likewise, nonlibertarian ethical proposals are falsified by the reality of actually proposing them.

To reach this conclusion and to properly understand its importance and logical force, two insights are essential.

First, it must be noted that the question of what is just or unjust — or for that matter the even more general question of what is a valid proposition and what is not — only arises insofar as I am, and others are, capable of propositional exchanges, i.e., of argumentation. The question does not arise vis-à-vis a stone or fish because they are incapable of engaging in such exchanges and of producing validity claiming propositions. Yet if this is so — and one cannot deny that it is without contradicting oneself, as one cannot argue the case that one cannot argue — then any ethical proposal as well as any other proposition must be assumed to claim that it is capable of being validated by propositional or argumentative means. (Mises, too, insofar as he formulates economic propositions, must be assumed to claim this.) In fact, in producing any proposition, overtly or as an internal thought, one demonstrates one’s preference for the willingness to rely on argumentative means in convincing oneself or others of something. There is then, trivially enough, no way of justifying anything unless it is a justification by means of propositional exchanges and arguments. However, then it must be considered the ultimate defeat for an ethical proposal if one can demonstrate that its content is logically incompatible with the proponent’s claim that its validity be ascertainable by argumentative means. To demonstrate any such incompatibility would amount to an impossibility proof, and such proof would constitute the most deadly defeat possible in the realm of intellectual inquiry.

Second, it must be noted that argumentation does not consist of free-floating propositions but is a form of action requiring the employment of scarce means; and that the means which a person demonstrates as preferring by engaging in propositional exchanges are those of private property. For one thing, no one could possibly propose anything, and no one could become convinced of any proposition by argumentative means, if a person’s right to make exclusive use of his [their] physical body were not already presupposed. It is this recognition of each other’s mutually exclusive control over one’s own body which explains the distinctive character of propositional exchanges that, while one may disagree about what has been said, it is still possible to agree at least on the fact that there is disagreement. It is also obvious that such a property right to one’s own body must be said to be justified a priori, for anyone who tried to justify any norm whatsoever would already have to presuppose the exclusive right of control over his body as a valid norm simply in order to say, “I propose such and such.” Anyone disputing such a right would become caught up in a practical contradiction since arguing so would already imply acceptance of the very norm which he was disputing.

Furthermore, it would be equally impossible to sustain argumentation for any length of time and rely on the propositional force of one’s arguments if one were not allowed to appropriate in addition to one’s body other scarce means through homesteading action (by putting them to use before somebody else does), and if such means and the rights of exclusive control regarding them were not defined in objective physical terms. For if no one had the right to control anything at all except his own body, then we would all cease to exist and the problem of justifying norms simply would not exist. Thus, by virtue of the fact of being alive, property rights to other things must be presupposed to be valid. No one who is alive could argue otherwise.

#### There is a crucial distinction between colonization in places like Africa or the “third world” as Moten describes it and outer space, for outer space has no state that currently owns it now whereas people existed in the nations where colonization happened – the former can never be unjust.

Feser, E. (2005). THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION. Social Philosophy and Policy, 22(1), 56–80. doi:10.1017/s0265052505041038 JS

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 acquisition 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 someone 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.

#### That negates – space is not under ownership by any state now, which proves that acquisition cannot be unjust

### Presumption

#### 1] The aff can’t solve – public entities like NASA and many countries around the world also attempt to appropriate outer space and have space exploration so they can’t solve the problem of private property.

#### 2] If western mindsets are fundamentally seeped with the desire to appropriate, then there’s no way they can solve that – they should have to prove solvency, not just affirm that a particular impact is bad – anything else insulates the 1AC from proper testing and affirm by proving literally any moral wrong to be wrong which makes negating impossible.

#### 3] They lack an advocacy text – we have no idea what the aff does or what they defend – vote neg since they don’t defend anything – obviously it should be in the aff, we shouldn’t need to CX check what your advocacy is that’s a basic aff burden.

### Space Col Good

#### They argue that all ownership and forms of space exploration is colonialist, which we’ll impact turn in the context of your ROB – the African Space Agency prevents the exploitation of African countries by spacefaring states.

Mwangi Elizabeth Wangari, M.A. International Studies, University of Nairobi, ’16, “AFRICA’S INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN OUTER SPACE ACTIVITIES” http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/99415/Wangari\_Africa%E2%80%99s%20International%20Relations%20In%20Outer%20Space%20Activities.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Outer space development in Africa seems to be caught between the desire to come up with one united front of an African Space Agency and the reality of independent States interest to establish national agencies first. Peter Martinez as cited by Augustine17 cautions the idea of establishing an Africa Space Agency (ASA) as premature, arguing that other African countries that have not yet participated in space endeavours need first to develop their own capabilities so that they can participate fully in the development of the ASA. However, Gottschalk18 differs, stating that the development of the ASA could provide the vehicle for the continent to negotiate better offers for satellite construction, space launches, technology transfer and infrastructure, than could individual countries alone. Attesting to this, Abiodun19 states that space activities is a total global engagement and therefore continents ought to have one voice towards space utilization.

Cooperation agreements on space activities have allowed emerging spacefaring nations from Africa to reap social and economic benefits from space applications. In 2009, after years of discussion, Nigeria, Algeria, South Africa, and Kenya signed a regional cooperation agreement for an African Resources Management Satellite (ARMS) Constellation.20 Many of Africa's developmental challenges transcend national, cultural and linguistic differences; therefore, collective impact of national space programmes can be greatly enhanced through cooperation. Regional and interregional cooperation and coordination provide essential mechanisms for advancing such efforts.21

1.5.2 Africa’s Relations with Other State and Non-State Space Actors

Hans Morgenthau, a classical realist in his textbook Politics among Nations, states that Africa did not have a history before the First World War hence was a politically empty space.22 However a South African author Nasila Rembe 23 contradicts this and argues that before the colonial period, Africa had evolved kingdoms and civilisations of sizable expanse and longevity that enjoyed and conducted trade, diplomatic and other forms of interaction within and between it and the outside world. He further argues that post-independence Africa had lost their initial powers structures to enter into International relations as it comprised of States formed by the European colonial powers. This is because external relations had changed to be conducted under International law identified with the European powers.24

This incoordination has led to dominant perspectives in International Relations sometimes dismissing Africa as a weak and marginal continent, a battleground for great power rivalries littered with failed states and vestiges of pre-modern societies.25 Other authors view Africa as a key actor in International Relations and like no other continent has a complex pattern of national boundaries, ethnic, religious and tribal sub-systems interacting with sectoral systems26. These diverse and now sovereign States of Africa have distinctive foreign policies that sometimes present challenges to a single continental policy.

Harman and Brown27 site Africa’s significance within International relations in various ways. First, it is the geographical space where much that is systemically important in international relations has played out, from colonial rule to resource competition to post-conditional aid dependency. It is also the site of much empirical research into the practice of international relations, with regard to old and new security threats such as weak state contagion or piracy, and also with regard to the impact of orthodox neo-liberal economics on policy-making and state reform. Thirdly, Africa is both the site of social change and uprising, as recently in North Africa, and the space in which new power configurations emerge, as in the case of Nigeria and South Africa, and old power configurations play out. The research on Africa in these areas is rich in empirical detail and would suggest that the continent represents a flourishing field for IR.

During the Cold War, many African nations were aligned to either the Soviet Union or the United States despite the notion of some forming the non-aligned movement. The two powers were also the Space powers. The scenario today is different. In addition to relations with the West and the now defunct Soviet Union, Africa has also included economic and trade relations with powerful emerging economies: China, India, Brazil, Russia (BRICS) and others such as the Middle East and Malaysia. Likewise, there now exists various bilateral and multilateral agreements in relation to cooperation in the outer space within and without Africa. Many nations have a presence in Space and many other nations plan to join them.28

1.5.3 Africa’s Challenges in Its International Relations in Outer Space Activities

Authors Christian Brunner and Alexander Soucek, 29 indicate that Africa lacks capacity and interest in outer space applications. They argue that National Space agencies and space activities do exist throughout Africa, but the level of commitment and development is less high than most other regions of the world.

Most African States are predominantly suffering from the absence of an innovative scientific culture, institutional failure, or state collapse, which generally results in poor policy formulation, implementation, output and poor service delivery to its population. This vicious political cycle often reinforces itself and results in socioeconomic and political instability. In the absence of optimally functioning state institutions, African states are in no position to ratify any international treaty, nor implementing obligations resulting from this ratifying a particular treaty. In cases where African states have ratified these and other treaties, it often lacks the institutional and scientific capacity, and political will to comply with its treaty obligations.

In addition to Africa challenges in cooperation and competition in the area of outer space activities, the continent has to also deal with the emerging trends and implications of the global development of Outer space as well articulated by Author Edythe E. Weeks. She describes the concept of an international regime where she argues that the outer space is in the process of being developed, and that the likely implications of the current development scenario will include extreme new forms of wealth which will dramatically impact the global political economy.30

The regime on outer space has resulted in States with innovative space industries being under pressure to enhance their national space interests. Africa’s lack of competitiveness in this area results in lesser, or no, pressure on its governments to maintain and forward a stronger position in COPUOS. Though UN Treaties on outer space reflects certain idealism, this is incompatible with the blunt realism of states’ space capabilities, and political and commercial interests as clearly demonstrated by Steven Lambakis 31 African States face the possibility of continued marginalisation in space affairs if they continue as passively and reactively as before.32

Africa’s united front to stop arms races in space would be naive considering that it has barely established a regional space programme. With no space programme and poverty and the many problems facing the African continent, using space for military purposes would put Africa into a completely submissive position dominated by strong space exploring nations. Realists argue that every State should strive to meet its national interest, African States should ensure that they are not caught up with all the technological advances that other countries in the West and East are coming up with to equip themselves with defenses against any threat these states through such advances.

This research incorporates views by Michael Sheehan33 who discusses about the complexity of establishing outer space activities programmes by states given the political considerations and alliances that exist. A lot of information used in this research has also been through the help of Manzione’s book, Multinational Investment in the Space Station: An Outer Space Model for International Cooperation 34 these contain the global development of Outer space activities and investment.

1.6 Justification of the Study

Space is no longer reserved for a few nations. More than fifty nations own and operate space object such as satellites. Reliance on benefits from satellites and other space objects is immense. This especially is due to the advent of Information and Communication Technology (ICT). It is therefore important to understand the relations of Africa in the now very important space matters. The research is intended to start a conversation within the continent to enhance beneficial cooperation for Africa in this newest field. Some of the justified reasons for this study are:

1.6.1 Contribution to Academia

There is little knowledge on the outer space relations that Africa is involved in. This project enhances knowledge on the same and explore opportunities in the intraAfrican relations that will inform future decisions. There is also very limited literature in regards to outer space activities in Africa not to mention the continent’s International relations aspect of the same. This study therefore provides a base for future studies on the same.

1.6.2 Contribution to Policy Formulation

Findings of this research are expected to positively influence the Policy makers in African states and even at the AU level to prioritize funding of outer space cooperation initiatives hence move Africa from consumer of space technologies to a global player in the conception of space technologies. The research is also expected to stir up discussions on how African governments can to increase the capacities of their experts to value the outer space projects launched from their territories and therefore have a say on what programme should be launched on their land and even negotiate on the returns.

Given that space science also has a political bearing, African policy makers should emphasise on some of the common ground priorities that are beneficial to all participating countries and that the programmes drawn up are workable and will effectively be implemented. Policymakers should look at successful space projects, such as Cape Peninsula University of Technology’s (CPUT) satellite launch,35 and see how such activities can be encouraged, while adding value by bringing together continental activities and growing the African space market.

This study employs the realist theory of international relations. The realist theory argues that States are always engaged in a struggle for power and that the cooperation and coalitions they make in this regard is only but to enhance their interest.36 The theory further states that for the sole objective of the survival of a state, which is the key most important ambition, a state will opt to cooperate with other states but simply to ensure its survival.37 In this regard, countries and regions pursue technologies to enhance their domestic and international position. No wonder, outer space activities has been key to America’s position as a world leader.38 Some of the factors attributed to maintenance of the United States as a world leader is directly linked to Space programmes39 for example leading the world in high technology (Silicon Valley), finance and business (Wall Street), higher education (17 of the top 20 universities in the world as per the Shanghai’s Jaotong University survey) and first World trade profile (massive exports of consumer and technology goods and imports of natural resources)

According to Robert Pfaltzgraff in his exploration of the growing interrelationship between realist theory and space power,40 realist theory can be examined in each of its three major variations. These include classical realist theory as set forth by Hans Morgenthau;41 structural realist theory developed by Kenneth Waltz;42 and neoclassical realist theory by Gideon Rose among others.43 Among the key variables of all the three forms of realist theory are the concepts of power and competing national interests in a world of anarchy, with states comprising an international system that requires them to rely extensively on their own means of survival or to join alliances or coalitions with others sharing their interests like the African states have had to do.

According to the classical realist theory, a State pursues its national interest defined by a variety of factors such as geography, ideology, resources, and capabilities based on the need to ensure its survival in a world of anarchy. Because international politics is a struggle for power, it can easily be concluded that space power is a manifestation of such a struggle. With the advent of space technologies, national interests now includes space. This informs why African countries individually are now establishing their independent national space agencies and initiatives. Classical realism is about how States deal with each other on earth and if international rivalries on earth are being projected into space, then the same theory can also be extended into space. Africa is therefore viewed through the lenses of either trying or failing to position itself in the globe in regards to its development in the crucial Outer space sector.

States need to protect themselves from any external threats of other states or even terrorist groups capable, for example, of destroying or disabling vital infrastructures in telecommunications, transportation, and banking and other financial infrastructures, and food production and distribution systems.44 Such a threat would arise from a nuclear weapon detonated above the earth's surface. However, States best able to safeguard their earth-bound interests through the exploitation of new technologies are also likely to be able to utilize space for that purpose.

Adherents of the realist theory view space as the new frontier that will be exploited as part of an inevitable and enduring struggle for power. More than forty years ago, President John F. Kennedy expressed this idea when he declared, "The activities of space will go ahead, whether we join in it or not, and it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in the race for space.” 45 In the absence of space leadership, states will lose preeminence on earth. In recognition of this essential fact, competition in space began as soon as technologies became possible. During the Cold War, the Soviet Union challenged the United States in space.

After the cold war, there is an increase in the number of States whose power and prestige has been enhanced by their space programmes. The advent of space technologies has therefore added this new dimension of Space to the national interest concept of realist theory. Developing countries including those in Africa that cannot afford resources to space or that simply lack such capabilities are more likely to favor the extension of the common heritage principle to space while attempting to place drastic limits on developed countries and perhaps calling for mandatory transfers of space technology to developing countries. Such countries view space through a different prism of national interest, seeking to restrict or retard more developed states even within their region for example South Africa and Nigeria in Africa from exercising full control or from maximizing space power. Such behavior on the part of states large and small with regard to space issues is in keeping with realist theory. Each state operates according to perceptions of national interest.

Structural realist theory offers other insights into future space relationships. According to Kenneth Waltz, the international structure shapes the options available to states. Levels of interdependence have increased greatly. The foreign policy options available to states differ between bipolar and multipolar international systems. Structure shapes how states align with or against each other. States will strategically position themselves into space if they have not already started doing that and this provides an important basis for theorizing about their relative importance themselves, other states and regions. Space activities and exploitation will create interactive patterns and power relationships. Space control is held by many to be indispensable to power on earth. Space power will therefore become the essential basis for earth power. This is why any country that has a positive economic development track record including those in Africa strive to be represented in space as well.

Neoclassic realism is also viewed in the way African states desire to form a coalition to secure their interests. There have also been concerted efforts and calls from African States fronted by the AU, for the formation of AfriSpace, a pan-African space agency to gradually mark their own regional space ambitions. There are arguments that if Africa doesn’t arise and take charge of its international relations strategies and policies in outer space and things are left to the current paradigm of western powers, outer space activities from Africa will go the same way as minerals, oil and gas have, where the global powers wrestle control of vital resources leading to further chaos and conflict as can be seen in the continent.

In 2010 the African Union controversially approved a feasibility study for the creation of an African Space Agency that led to the AU Ministers Summit decision to draft a common space policy for the AU member states in collaboration with the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. In 2012, the Sudanese president, Omar Hassan al-Bashir reiterated this and said “Africa must have its space agency that will liberate Africa from the technological domination of the West”. 46 Space politics is therefore influencing national and regional agendas.4

#### Next, Extinction outweighs because it precludes the possibility of future value, and existential focus is good and valuable – acknowledging and discussing possibility of self-destruction shifts targets away from each other and towards extinction.

Khan ‘18

Risalat Khan is an activist and intrapreneur from Bangladesh passionate about addressing climate change, biodiversity loss, and other existential challenges. He was featured by The Guardian as one of the “young climate campaigners to watch” (2015). As a campaigner with the global civic movement Avaaz (2014-17), Risalat was part of a small core team that spearheaded the largest climate marches in history with a turnout of over 800,000 across 2,000 cities. After fighting for the Paris Agreement, Risalat led a campaign joined by over a million people to stop the Rampal coal plant in Bangladesh to protect the Sundarbans World Heritage forest, and elicited criticism of the plant from Crédit Agricolé through targeted advocacy. Currently, Risalat is pursuing an MPA in Environmental Science and Policy at Columbia University as a SIPA Environmental Fellow. He also regularly consults with mission-driven organizations on building effective and loving team cultures. Previously, he graduated magna cum laude from Amherst College, where he launched a campaign that eventually resulted in the replacement of the College’s racist mascot ‘Lord Jeff’ with a cuddly ‘Mammoth’. Finally, Risalat is absolutely blown away to be alive at this amazing time in history, and approaches life like a roller-coaster ride, “5 reasons why we need to start talking about existential risks”, World Economic Forum, 10 January 2018, accessed: 15 December 2020, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/01/5-reasons-start-talking-existential-risks-extinction-moriori/>, R.S.

I find the story of the Moriori profound. It teaches me two lessons. Firstly, that human culture is far from immutable. That we can struggle against our baser instincts. That we can master them and rise to unprecedented challenges. Secondly, that even this does not make us masters of our own destiny. We can make visionary choices, but the future can still surprise us.

This is a humbling realization. Because faced with an uncertain future, the only wise thing we can do **is prepare** for possibilities. Standing at the launch pad of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the possibilities seem endless. They range from an era of abundance to the end of humanity, and everything in between. How do we navigate such a wide and divergent spectrum?

I am an optimist. From my bubble of privilege, life feels like a rollercoaster ride full of ever more impressive wonders, even as I try to fight the many social injustices that still blight us. However, the accelerating pace of change amid uncertainty elicits one fundamental observation. Among the infinite future possibilities, only **one outcome is** truly **irreversible: extinction.**

Concerns about extinction are often dismissed as apocalyptic alarmism. Sometimes, they are. But repeating that mankind is still here after 70 years of existential warning about nuclear warfare is a straw man argument. The fact that a 1000-year flood has not happened does not negate its possibility. And there have been far too many nuclear near-misses to rest easy.

As the World Economic Forum’s Annual Meeting in Davos discusses how to create a shared future in a fractured world, here are five reasons why the possibility of existential risks should raise the stakes of conversation:

1. **Extinction is the rule, not the exception**

More than 99.9% of all the species that ever existed are gone. Deep time is unfathomable to the human brain. But if one cares to take a tour of the billions of years of life’s history, we find a litany of forgotten species. And we have only discovered a mere fraction of the extinct species that once roamed the planet.

In the speck of time since the first humans evolved, more than 99.9% of all the distinct human cultures that have ever existed are extinct. Each hunter-gatherer tribe had its own mythologies, traditions and norms. They wiped each other out, or coalesced into larger formations following the agricultural revolution. However, as major civilizations emerged, even those that reached incredible heights, such as the Egyptians and the Romans, eventually collapsed.

It is only in the very recent past that we became a truly global civilization. Our interconnectedness continues to grow rapidly. “Stand or fall, we are the last civilization”, as Ricken Patel, the founder of the global civic movement Avaaz, put it.

2. **Environmental pressures can drive extinction**

More than 15,000 scientists just issued a ‘warning to humanity’. They called on us to reduce our impact on the biosphere, 25 years after their first such appeal. The warning notes that we are far outstripping the capacity of our planet in all but one measure of ozone depletion, including emissions, biodiversity, freshwater availability and more. The scientists, not a crowd known to overstate facts, conclude: “soon it will be too late to shift course away from our failing trajectory, and time is running out”.

In his 2005 book Collapse, Jared Diamond charts the history of past societies. He makes the case that overpopulation and resource use beyond the carrying capacity have often been important, if not the only, drivers of collapse. Even though we are making important incremental progress in battles such as climate change, we must still achieve tremendous step changes in our response to several major environmental crises. We must do this even while the world’s population continues to grow. These pressures are bound to exert great stress on our global civilization.

3. **Superintelligence**: unplanned obsolescence?

Imagine a monkey society that foresaw the ascendance of humans. Fearing a loss of status and power, it decided to kill the proverbial Adam and Eve. It crafted the most ingenious plan it could: starve the humans by taking away all their bananas.

Foolproof plan, right? This story describes the fundamental difficulty with superintelligence. A superintelligent being may always do something entirely different from what we, with our mere mortal intelligence, can foresee. In his 2014 book Superintelligence, Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom presents the challenge in thought-provoking detail, and advises caution.

Bostrom cites a survey of industry experts that projected a 50% chance of the development of artificial superintelligence by 2050, and a 90% chance by 2075. The latter date is within the life expectancy of many alive today.

Visionaries like Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk have warned of the existential risks from artificial superintelligence. Their opposite camp includes Larry Page and Mark Zuckerberg. But on an issue that concerns the future of humanity, is it really wise to ignore the guy who explained the nature of space to us and another guy who just put a reusable rocket in it?

4. Technology: known knowns and **unknown unknowns**

Many fundamentally disruptive technologies are coming of age, from bioengineering to quantum computing, 3-D printing, robotics, nanotechnology and more. Lord Martin Rees describes potential existential challenges from some of these technologies, such as a bioengineered pandemic, in his book Our Final Century.

Imagine if North Korea, feeling secure in its isolation, could release a virulent strain of Ebola, engineered to be airborne. Would it do it? Would ISIS?

Projecting decades forward, we will likely develop capabilities that are unthinkable even now. The unknown unknowns of our technological path are profoundly humbling.

5. **'The Trump Factor'**

Despite our scientific ingenuity, we are still a confused and confusing species. Think back to two years ago, and how you thought the world worked then. Has that not been upended by the election of Donald Trump as US President, and everything that has happened since?

The mix of billions of messy humans will forever be unpredictable. When the combustible forces described above are added to this melee, we find ourselves on a tightrope.

What choices must we now make now to create a shared future, in which we are not at perpetual risk of destroying ourselves?

Common enemy to common cause

Throughout history, we have **rallied against the ‘other’.** Tribes have overpowered tribes, empires have conquered rivals. Even today, our fiercest displays of unity typically happen at wartime. We give our lives for our motherland and defend nationalistic pride like a wounded lion.

But like the early Morioris, we 21st-century citizens find ourselves on an increasingly unstable island. We may have a violent past, but we have no more dangerous enemy than ourselves. Our task is to find our own Nunuku’s Law. Our own shared contract, based on equity, would help us navigate safely. It would ensure a future that unleashes the full potential of our still-budding human civilization, in all its diversity.

We cannot do this unless we are humbly grounded in the possibility of our own destruction. Survival is life’s primal instinct. In the absence of a common enemy, we must find **common cause in survival.** Our future may depend on whether we realize this.

#### Space col possible within decades

Armstrong & Sandberg 13 [Stuart Armstrong and Anders Sandberg, \* James Martin Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford University, \*\* PhD in computational neuroscience from Stockholm University, and is currently a Senior Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, “Eternity in six hours: Intergalactic spreading of intelligent life and sharpening the Fermi paradox,” 2013, *Acta Astronautica*, Vol. 89, pp. 1-13, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actaastro.2013.04.002, EA]

We have shown that, given certain technological assumptions, intergalactic colonisation appears to be possible given known natural laws and the resources within a solar system. This process could be initiated on a surprisingly short timescale (decades)—well within timescales we know some human societies have planned and executed large projects. A star-spanning civilisation would find the energy and resources requirement to be so low that they could do this project as an aside to their usual projects. Thus if interstellar expansion can be attempted, then intergalactic expansion should also be feasible. Indeed, there is likely no inherent limitation on the scales of activities of technological civilisations beyond those imposed by the laws of nature and available resources [51].

#### Only private sector solves it

Diakovska & Aliieva 20 [Halyna Diakovska and Olga Aliieva, Ph.D.s in Philosophy, Associate Professors, Donbass State Pedagogical University, “Consequentialism and Commercial Space Exploration,” 2020, *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Vol. 24, pp. 5-24, https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/24/1, EA]

The experience of the USA showed that leadership in space exploration, which is maintained solely through public funding, could be erroneous. Since 1984, the share of public funding has gradually decreased in space telecommunications, commercial space transportation, remote sensing, etc., while the share of participation of non-state enterprises has increased rapidly. A legal and regulatory framework has been modified to stimulate space commercialization. The stages of space law development are discussed in the research of Valentyn Halunko (Halunko, 2019), Larysa Soroka (Soroka & Kurkova, 2019), etc. Larysa Soroka and Kseniia Kurkova explored the specifics of the legal regulation of the use and development of artificial intelligence for the space area (Soroka & Kurkova, 2019).

As a result of changing the legal framework and attracting private investors to the space market, the US did not lose its leadership in space exploration, but rather secured it. Private investment along with government funding have significantly reduced the risk of business projects in the space industry. The quality and effectiveness of space exploration programs have increased.

In 2018, Springer published an eloquent book The Rise of Private Actors in the Space Sector. Alessandra Vernile, the author of the book, explores a broad set of topics that reveal the role of private actors in space exploration (Vernile, 2018). The book covers the following topics: “Innovative Public Procurement and Support Schemes,” “New Target Markets for Private Actors,” etc. In the “Selected Success Stories,” Vernile provides examples of successful private actors in space exploration (Vernile, 2018).

The current level of competition, which has developed on the space market, allows us to state the following fact. Private space companies have been able to compete with entire states in launching spacecraft, transporting cargo to orbital stations, and exploring space objects. The issue of mining on space objects, the creation of space settlements and the intensive development of the space tourism market are on the agenda.

In the 21st century, the creation of non-governmental commercial organizations specializing in the field of commercial space exploration, is regarded as an ordinary activity. They are established as parts of the universities around projects funded by private investors. For example, Astropreneurship & Space Industry Club based on the MIT community (Astropreneurship, 2019).

Large-scale research in the field of commercial space exploration, as well as the practical results achieved, led to the formation of a new paradigm called “New Space” ecosystem. The articles of Deganit Paikowsky’s (Paikowsky, 2017), Clelia Iacomino (Iacomino & Ciccarelli, 2018) et al. reveal its key meanings and the opportunities it offers in the space sector. The “New Space” ecosystem is a new vision for commercial space exploration. It is the formation of a cosmic worldview, in which the near space with all the wealth of its resources and capabilities, becomes a part of the global economy and the sustainable development of the society. The “New Space” ecosystem offers the following ways for commercial space exploration (Iacomino & Ciccarelli, 2018):

1. Innovative public procurement and support schemes, which significantly expand the role of commercial actors in space exploration.

2. Attracting new entrants in the space sector. First of all, these are companies working in the domain of Information and communications technology, artificial intelligence, etc. that are expanding their research in space markets. They offer innovative business models and new solutions to space commercialization.

3. Innovative industrial approaches based on new processes, methods, and industrial organization for the development and production of space systems or launchers.

4. Disruptive market solutions, which significantly reduce commercial space exploration prices, increase labor productivity, provide new types of services, etc.

5. Substantial private investment from different sources and involving different funding mechanisms. For instance, these are private fortunes, venture capital firms, business angels, private equity companies, or banks, etc.

6. Involvement of an increasing number of space-faring nations investing in the acquisition of turnkey space capabilities or even in the development of a domestic space industrial base. This expands the space markets and makes it more competitive.

The analysis of the research and advances in commercial space exploration allows us to draw the following conclusions:

1. In fact, the space market has already been created. It is currently undergoing continuous development that will integrate the resources and capabilities of the near space into the global economy over the next decade.

2. A new paradigm, denoted by the term “New Space” ecosystem, is at the heart of the created space market. The “New Space” ecosystem is a step towards the formation of cosmic thinking, in which outer space, with its resources and capabilities, is considered as a sphere of human activities.

3. Space market regulates space law, which is constantly evolving. The space law develops within the bounds of international law. In essence, the space market is integrated into the international legal field and is governed by its laws.

#### Massive spillover effects, solves resources and ex risks

Green 21 [Brian Patrick Green, director of technology ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, “Space Ethics,” 2021, Rowman, pp. 4-5, EA]

In favor of going into space are such basics as gaining scientific knowledge and developing beneficial new technologies, both of which space exploration and use have already begun to accomplish with dramatic and sometimes unexpected effects for humankind. Scientific advancements include astronomical and cosmological knowledge from various orbiting experiments and telescopes that have let us gain unprecedented understanding about our universe. But space activities have also contributed to a great deal of scientific knowledge about our Earth, including measurements of environmental status, habitat conversion and destruction, detailed knowledge of anthropogenic climate change, and much about Earth’s chemistry and geology. We have also learned a great deal about our local planets, for example, that a runaway “greenhouse effect” in the atmosphere of Venus makes the surface scorchingly hot, while too little greenhouse effect on Mars leaves the surface quite cold. There have also been significant contributions made to medical science, especially concerning the behavior of the human body when subjected to radiation, microgravity, nutritional restrictions, and so on.

On the technological side, everything with American global positioning system (GPS), Russian Glonass, or other global navigation systems—from smartphones to military vehicles—relies on a network of satellites above us, placed there by rocketry and painstakingly tracked with instruments developed for the task. So many technologies have been pioneered by space exploration and use that it is hard to list them all, but some of the more important ones include weather satellites (which are not only convenient but also allow preparation for and evacuation from severe weather), communication satellites, solar photovoltaic (PV) cells, advances in electronics and computers, advances in materials science, and so on.

Space is also an important location for the contention of national interests in a geopolitical and military sense. As the ultimate “high ground” in battle, space allows certain asset classes such as spy satellites to exist in a position unassailable by many or most opponents. While permanent weapons stations and weapons of mass destruction are banned from space by the United Nations Outer Space Treaty (OST), 6 that has not stopped the development of weapons that are impermanent (such as missiles, missile interceptors, and antisatellite weapons) or the research and development of possible space-based weapons platforms, such as were envisioned by U.S. president Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, nicknamed “Star Wars.” While military and political interests may ultimately seem to be a less noble reason to explore and use space, relative power, safety, and security certainly are very human interests and are valuable to those who feel they are being protected by them.

Space activities are also a key way of promoting international cooperation and global awareness. While the international competition of the “space race” fueled one nation all the way to the Moon, shortly afterward, the Apollo-Soyuz program announced a thawing of this competition and commenced a period of cooperation between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Currently the International Space Station continues this cross-national cooperation in space, with five space agencies (representing Canada, the European Space Agency nations, Japan, Russia, and the United States) participating. In addition to cooperation in space exploration itself, the perspective given from space has itself helped to produce some feelings of unity on Earth, with the famous “Blue Marble” and “Earthrise” pictures showing Earth’s oneness and scientific discoveries supported by space science, such as those related to climate change, helping to promote international cooperation to address these problems.

Gaining access to new critical resources may be another reason to go into space. Earth is a finite planet, and certain elements on Earth are very rare in the planetary crust, particularly platinum group metals that are very dense and siderophilic (iron-loving) and so have tended to sink toward the core over the natural history of the planet. However, asteroids and other objects in space (for example, planets, comets, and moons) can sometimes have these elements in abundance and in more available locations, making them potentially excellent sources for these valuable materials. Now-defunct asteroid-mining startup Planetary Resources once estimated that one “platinum-rich 500 meter wide asteroid contains . . . 1.5 times the known world-reserves of platinum group metals (ruthenium, rhodium, palladium, osmium, iridium, and platinum).” 7 In addition to returning elements to a resource-hungry Earth, further exploration and development of space will require access to resources that are not purely sourced from Earth. In particular, it will be necessary to gain access to water, which is relatively rare in the inner solar system and which would be far too costly to transport in any significant amounts from the Earth’s surface.

Another reason that humans may want to explore space would be to create a “backup Earth” to hedge against global catastrophic and existential risks (risks that may cause widespread disaster or human extinction, respectively) on our home planet. 8 Earth has always been a dangerous place for humans, with asteroid impacts, supervolcanic eruptions, pandemic disease, and other natural hazards threatening civilization. Now, in addition to these natural threats, human-made hazards such as nuclear weapons, climate change, biotechnology, nanotechnology, and artificial intelligence may threaten not only the viability of technological civilization but perhaps the survival of human life itself. A serious global-scale catastrophe could set back civilization many decades or centuries, and the worst disasters could cause human extinction. In one scenario, in which 100 percent of humanity dies, all of human effort for all of history would be for nothing. However, were the same global catastrophe to happen to Earth, yet humans were a multiplanetary species with just one self-sustaining settlement off-Earth, it would not result in the end of human civilization or human extinction. Instead while the same unimaginable fate would befall the Earth (certainly no mere triviality, with perhaps the deaths of 99.999 percent of all humans and possibly the destruction of the ecosphere and everything in it), at least all of human and planetory history would not be for nothing. Human life and culture would go on elsewhere, as well as other Earth species. This is a dire fate, but less terrible than the first.

#### Space colonization solves otherwise inevitable extinction.

Zarkadakis 19 [George; December 26; Ph.D. in Artificial Intelligence; George Zardakis, “Abandoning the metropolis: space colonisation as the new imperative,” <https://georgezarkadakis.com/2019/12/26/abandoning-the-metropolis-space-colonisation-as-the-new-imperative/>]

Space colonization is not only the subject of fiction but of serious science too. The late physicist Stephen Hawking argued that unless colonies were established in space the human race would become extinct. There are several natural phenomena beyond our control that could spell our obliteration. Over a long enough period of time our planet is vulnerable to catastrophic meteorite strikes, or getting exposed to the deadly radiation of a nearby supernova explosion. As our Sun burns its fuel it will start to expand and, in a few million years, will scorch Earth. We can also self-destruct by waging nuclear war, or by tilting our planet’s climate towards a runaway greenhouse effect. Space colonization is therefore the ultimate insurance policy of long-term human survival[4].

#### Independently brings immeasurable expected value

Baum 16 – Executive Director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute [Seth D. Baum, “The Ethics of Outer Space: A Consequentialist Perspective,” 2016, Springer, pp. 115-116, EA]

Space colonization is notable because it may be able to bring utterly immense increases in intrinsic value. Early colonies might start small, given that other planets and moons have inhospitable environments. However, it may be possible to build large indoor colonies or create more hospitable outdoor environments (i.e., terraforming). Even just on other planets and moons in the Solar System, space colonies could multiply the total area available for human habitation. And there are many more planets around other stars, as ongoing research on exoplanets is now learning. One recent study estimates 22 % of Sun-like stars have Earth-like exoplanets (Petigura et al. 2013), implying billions to tens of billions of potentially habitable planets across the galaxy.

Opportunities at any given star may also be quite a bit greater than those available only on planets. Earth only receives about one two-billionth of the Sun’s radiation. To collect all the Sun’s radiation, humanity would need a Dyson swarm (named after Dyson 1960), which is a series of structures that surrounds a star, collecting its radiation to power a civilization. A Dyson swarm around the Sun could potentially enable a civilization a billion times larger than is possible on Earth. Likewise, Dyson swarms around one billion stars would bring humanity approximately 1018 (one billion–billion) times more energy per unit time.

Space colonies could also increase the amount of time available for human civilization. Earth will remain habitable for a few billion more years (O’Malley-James et al. 2014). Stars will continue shining for about 1014 more years (Adams 2008). That gives us an additional 105 times more energy, for a total of 1023 times more energy than is available on Earth. After the stars fade, other energy sources may be available. And even if our current universe eventually becomes uninhabitable, it may be possible to move to other universes (Kaku 2005). The physics here is speculative, but it cannot be ruled out, and hence there is a nonzero chance of a literally infinite opportunity for space colonization (Baum 2010a).

Whether the opportunity is infinite or merely, say, 1023 times larger than what can be done on Earth, the opportunity is clearly immense. As long as space colonization is an improvement (Sect. 8.3.1), then it would seem that the consequentialist should prioritize space colonization. The sooner space colonization begins, the more of its immense opportunity can be gained. Indeed, Ćirković (2002) estimates 5 × 1046 human lifetimes are lost for every century in which space colonization is delayed.

There can also be large value for space colonization under ecocentric intrinsic value. It is sometimes argued that Earth would be better off without humans. For example, the Voluntary Human Extinction Movement states that “Phasing out the human race by voluntarily ceasing to breed will allow Earth’s biosphere to return to good health” (http://vhemt.org, accessed 25 October 2015). However, this makes sense only if extraterrestrial locations are not intrinsically valued. Otherwise, exterminating humanity ruins the opportunity for humans to bring flourishing ecosystems into outer space. Terraforming other planets or bringing ecosystems into Dyson swarms could bring immense amounts of ecosystem flourishing.

#### Only profit motive solves debris.

Nelson & Block 18 [Peter Lothian Nelson and Walter E. Block, \*\* Harold E. Wirth Endowed Chair and Professor of Economics, College of Business, Loyola University New Orleans, “Space Capitalism: How Humans will Colonize Planets, Moons, and Asteroids,” 2018, Springer, pp. 108, EA]

Space debris is a major challenge to space exploration (Goldsmith 2015). The higher the speed (see Chap. 1 on the need for hyper speeds), the worse will be the issue of impact avoidance or damage in the event of impact. It is through the unregulated free market that solutions to intractable problems are found. Explorers will be well motivated to develop methods for detection of both minuscule and massive invisible objects and quick reaction mechanisms for avoidance of things large and small.

### ROB

#### The ROB is to vote for the better debater in the context of the resolution –

#### 1] Anything else is arbitrary and self-serving since it only allows one particular type of offense – prefer our ROB – all your offense proves that appropriation of space is bad, so you can get all your education and read your aff anyway – means there’s no net benefit to your framing.

#### 2] Aff should have to defend their assumptions – obviously winning space colonization good should be sufficient to win the round – any ROB that precludes that is a bad model of debate.

#### 3] Anything else moots 7 minutes of the 1NC and there’s no possibility for a 2NR restart.

#### All actions presuppose a unitary notion of individual agency, which the 1AC rejects

Korsgaard 89

Korsgaard, Christine (A rational autonomous agent; also, a professor at Harvard). 1989. Personal identity and the unity of agency: A Kantian response to Parfit. Philosophy and Public Affairs 18, no. 2: 101-132. JDN. http://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/3219881/Korsgaard\_UnityofAgency.pdf?sequence=2

The second element in this pragmatic unity is the unity implicit in the standpoint from which you deliberate and choose. It may be that what actually happens when you make a choice is that the strongest of your conflicting desires wins. But that isn't the way you think of it when you deliberate. When you deliberate, **it is as if there were something over and above all of your desires**, something that is you, and **that chooses which one to act on.** The idea that you choose among your conflicting desires, rather than just waiting to see which one wins, suggests that you have reasons for or against acting on them.21 And it is these reasons, rather than the desires themselves, which are expressive of your will. The strength of a desire may be counted by you as a reason for acting on it; but this is different from its simply winning. This means that there is some principle or way of choosing that you regard as being expressive of yourself, and which provides reasons that regulate your choices among your desires. To identify with such a principle or way of choosing is to be "a law to yourself," and to be unified as such. This does not require that your agency be located in a separately existing entity or involve a deep metaphysical fact. Instead, it is a practical necessity imposed upon you by the nature of the deliberative standpoint.22 It is of course important to notice that the particular way you choose which desires to act on may be guided by your beliefs about certain metaphysical facts. Parfit evidently thinks that it should. When he argues about the rationality of future concern, Parfit assumes that my attitude about the desires of the future inhabitant of my body should be based on the metaphysics of personal identity. That is, I should treat a future person's desires as mine and so as normative for me if I have some metaphysical reason for supposing that she is me.23 But this argument from the metaphysical facts to normative reasons involves a move from "is" to "ought" which requires justification. I will be arguing shortly that there may be other, more distinctively normative grounds for determining which of my motives are "my own"; metaphysical facts are not the only possible ground for this decision. For now, the important points are these: first, the need for identification with some unifying principle or way of choosing is imposed on us by the necessity of making deliberative choices, not by the metaphysical facts. Second, the metaphysical facts do not obviously settle the question: I must still decide whether the consideration that some future person is "me" has some special normative force for 11 me. It is practical reason that requires me to construct an identity for myself; whether metaphysics is to guide me in this or not is an open question. The considerations I've adduced so far apply to unification at any given moment, or in the context of any given decision. Now let's see if we can extend them to unity over time. We might start by pointing out that the body which makes you one agent now persists over time, but that is insufficient by itself. The body could still be a series of agents, each unified pragmatically at any given moment. More telling considerations come from the character of the things that human agents actually choose. First of all, as Parfit's critics often point out, most of the things we do that matter to us take up time. Some of the things we do are intelligible only in the context of projects that extend over long periods. This is especially true of the pursuit of our ultimate ends. In choosing our careers, and pursuing our friendships and family lives, we both presuppose and construct a continuity of identity and of agency.24 On a more mundane level, the habitual **actions we perform for** the sake of **our health presuppose ongoing identity.** It is also true that we think of our activities and pursuits as interconnected in various ways; we think that we are carrying out plans of life. In order to carry out a rational plan of life, you need to be one continuing person. You normally think you lead one continuing life because you are one person, but according to this argument the truth is the reverse. **You are one** continuing **person because you have one life to lead.** You may think of it this way: suppose that a succession of rational agents do occupy my body. I, the one who exists now, need the cooperation of the others, and they need mine, if together we are going to have any kind of a life. The unity of our life is forced upon us, although not deeply, by our shared embodiment, together with our desire to carry on long-term plans and relationships. But actually this is somewhat misleading. To ask why the present self should cooperate with the future ones is to assume that the present self has reasons with which it already identifies, and which are independent of those of later selves. Perhaps it is natural to think of the present self as necessarily concerned with present satisfaction. But it is mistaken. Your present self must, in order to make deliberative choices, identify with something from which you will derive your reasons, but not necessarily with something present. The sort of thing you identify yourself with may carry you automatically into the future: and I have been suggesting that this will very likely be the case. Indeed, the choice of any action, no matter how trivial, takes you some way into the future. And to the extent that you regulate your choices by identifying yourself as the one who is implementing something like a particular plan of life, **you need to identify with your future** in order **to be what you are even now**.25 When the person is viewed as an agent, no clear content can be given to the idea of a merely present self.26