## 1

#### A] Interpretation: The affirmative may only defend that member nations of the wto oought to reduce ip for medicines and may only garner offense off hypothetical enactment of that resolution.

#### B] Violation –

#### Resolved means a policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### No cheaty I-meets – they’re clearly not T

#### C] Vote neg to preserve substantive engagement --

#### 1] Preparation- repacking the topic gives the aff a huge edge, they don’t affirm the resolution and that catches us by surprise. Preparation is better than thinking on your feet- research demonstrates pedagogical humility and research skills are the only portable debate training – the process of debate outweighs the content – only our interp generates the argumentative skills needed to rigorously defend their affirmative out of round and create engaged citizens who have the self reflexivity to advocate for positive change. Neg prep is on aff implementation and the aff decks key neg strategy.

#### 2] Limits- there are an infinite number of non topical affirmatives. Consider this our “library disad”- implementing the resolution gives them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months. And the neg can’t read da’s or cp’s because the aff isn’t being implemented

#### 3] Switch side debate is good -- it forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives which prevents ideological dogmatism. Even if they prove the topic is bad, our argument is that the process of preparing and defending proposals is an educational benefit of engaging it.

#### 4] Clash. Neg arguments on this topic center around hypothetical enactmenet of the topic- not rhetorical ones. I can’t properly engage with the aff which decreases in round educationo

#### E] Even if you don’t by our education impacts, fairness is an intrinsic good and the only possible impact to your ballot -- debate is a game: forced winner/loser, competitive norms, and the tournament invite prove. Alternative impacts like activism or education can be pursued in other forums – the ballot can’t change our subjectivities BUT it can rectify in round fairness

#### F] Paradigm issues

#### 1] T has to be drop the debater – it indicts their method of engagement and proves we couldn’t engage fairly with their aff –

#### 2] Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary, you can’t be reasonably topical, and causes a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### 3] RVIs and impact turns encourage all in on theory which decks substance and incentivize baiting theory with abusive practices.

#### 4] No impact turns— every argument is framework in that we have to attempt to exclude aff offense and the process of

## 2

#### Capitalism fail inev, and aff reform gives power to the broken system, pinning the consequences on IP, regulations fail

Svart 19 [Maria Svart, “Capitalism isn't 'broken'. It's working all too well - and we're the worse for it”, Guardian, Wed 12 Jun 2019 02.00 EDT, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jun/12/capitalism-isnt-broken-its-working-all-too-well-and-were-the-worse-for-it>] //NR

Capitalism is not broken. It is working all too well, concentrating money in the hands of the few by exploiting the work of the many. Runaway climate change, war, mass migration, widespread poverty and ever-increasing authoritarianism are the inevitable results of an economic system that rewards corporate actors for their absolute commitment to profit, regardless of the broader consequences. Richard Reeves, guest editor of this series, suggests we can simply “fight to crowbar the doors open for women and people of color,” allowing them to benefit from market capitalism alongside white men. But that misses the point. A job with “a decent wage … some satisfaction and security” is quickly becoming a thing of the past, including for those of us in the wealthiest countries. It’s not just that “corporations hoard power and extract value from workers, without letting those workers share in the massive wealth they help create”, as Cory Booker argues; it’s that these dynamics at the individual level, felt by each of us, are also at play globally, felt by whole countries and regions. Exploitation is not a bug in capitalism, it is a feature. That giant sucking sound we can all hear is capital benefiting from decades of political, economic and ideological war against the rest of us. We must invest in public health and education infrastructure at home and abroad to increase community resiliency in a climate-fractured world, and build a global economy based on democratic control of production. When the system incentivizes making quarterly profits, rather than long-term balance and safety for all, it jeopardizes our very survival. We also need to democratize energy production and disband the dirty fossil fuel industry that is driving us off the climate cliff. Some billionaires are finally expressing concern about the status quo. But even they can’t escape a system where the ease of externalizing costs and exploiting labor makes it impossible to be both competitive and sustainable. Exploitation is not a bug in capitalism, it is a feature There has only been one period in which the fruits of labor were shared relatively equally: the post-second world war capital-labor compromise. Strong worker movements fought for robust welfare states under unique economic and political circumstances. But this arrangement could not hold. In response to François Mitterrand’s move to massively expand labor rights and nationalize a quarter of French industry, business interests launched a capital strike which spurred recession and became a portent of things to come. The threat of real working-class power was too great, and the system self-corrected. Today, we have as few as 12 years to transform our economic system and reverse the climate crisis. Yet just last month Donald Trump signed two executive orders to make it easier for fossil fuel corporations to build oil and gas pipelines and limit our ability to block them. This has been a bipartisan betrayal, however: in 2015 President Obama granted Shell Oil a permit to drill in the Arctic four days after declaring that the US would be a leader against the climate crisis. Desperate times call for radical measures. This starts with upending a system that was built to redistribute wealth and power from the many to the few. Working people and our families will not only survive, but thrive, from the jobs created by massive public investment in restructuring our energy grid and transforming our world. And we know the only ones willing to make that demand are those of us who are currently being squeezed by private interests for every last drop of profit. Young people know this, especially, but it will take all of us. Rather than trying to fix capitalism, we should be seeking to replace it.

#### Aff is an example of slash and burn capitalism which discloses socialist goals, and promotes unregulated capitalism

Williams 20 [Joan C. Williams and Ro Khanna, Harvard Buisness Review, “It’s Time to End Slash-and-Burn Capitalism”, October 28, 2020. https://hbr.org/2020/10/its-time-to-end-slash-and-burn-capitalism]

The conversation about stakeholder capitalism is heartening evidence that the business community recognizes that capitalism has gone seriously off track. The obvious criticism is that, while CEOs are well-placed to pursue profits, they are ill-suited to weigh and balance the needs of the environment and many different stakeholders, as has been cogently argued in The New York Times. And so far, the follow-through on the embrace of stakeholder capitalism has been decidedly mixed. What’s needed is not to make CEOs into central planners but to evolve toward sustainable capitalism — and away from the slash-and-burn capitalism of recent decades. In their pursuit of quarterly profits and high salaries, there has emerged since the 1980s a dysfunctional version of capitalism that does to the economy what clearcutting does to forests — destroys the conditions necessary for long-term success by focusing excessively on short-term profits. We don’t need to reinvent capitalism. We just need to practice it. That means that corporations that embrace market mechanisms and decry government intervention in the good times should not change the rules when times turn tough. Privatizing profits while socializing risks isn’t capitalism: It’s rigged roulette. Equally important, practicing capitalism does not mean insisting on special treatment from government that benefits shareholders at the expense of other stakeholders. And it means treating government as the vital partner to business, one that supports the physical and social infrastructure, and the political stability, that make business possible. The pattern of privatizing profits while socializing risk goes back to the 2008 recession, and has continued in the current crisis: in the U.S., the Pandemic Unemployment Assistance covers independent contractors, but American companies pay into the tax that finances unemployment insurance only for workers classified as employees. So, in effect, companies that rely on gig workers have shifted the cost of those workers’ unemployment insurance onto taxpayers. So have traditional companies that pay so little that their workers qualify for Medicaid and other programs, shifting their health insurance costs onto the U.S. taxpayer; in fact, there’s a company that provides a service used throughout the U.S. to help corporate employees shift over from company benefits to government programs. But the airlines are the best example. During the flush times, airlines happily pocketed the profits on the grounds that they are private. But when travel tanked during the pandemic, suddenly airlines insisted on huge bailouts on the grounds that saving them entails a public good. As we saw in 2008, this creates moral hazards that undermine the incentive structures that make capitalism work. Starving Government Sustainable capitalism requires paying a fair share in taxes, but slash-and-burn capitalism aims to do exactly the opposite. In the process, it has severely hobbled government’s ability to deliver basic services. As the pandemic has shown so dramatically, the instinctive assumption that businesses thrive better when taxes are as low as possible is factually incorrect. “Starving the beast” led to the gutting of public health departments, which during the pandemic has had devastating effects for the economy and the businesses that operate within it. Even if the administration had wanted to take the kinds of effective steps that have worked so well in countries that have reopened, we did not have the public health infrastructure to do so. Digging deeper, slash-and-burn capitalism has undermined trust in government. That trust has been plummeting for decades, often fueled by business-financed campaigns against “over-regulation” and government programs. Only 17% of Americans say they trust government most or all of the time, among the lowest levels in the past half-century. The social contract to adhere to basic public health measures has collapsed, former CDC Director Dr. Richard Besser has pointed out. As elected officials and public health leaders respond to the pandemic, they have to contend with public indifference at best and death threats at worst: Dr. Anthony Fauci now has round-the-clock protection. The cumulative effects of distrust in, and defunding of, government have led us unable to launch an effective response to the pandemic. The U.S. has the highest death count in the world, the worst death rate among major countries, and an economy unable to reopen effectively. This is not an isolated example. The anti-tax movement has led to an evisceration of property taxes in California and elsewhere. One result is that California public schools went from the first to the worst — and now schools in California and elsewhere don’t have the funds to make distance learning effective or to reopen in a way that’s safe. Schools are part of the basic infrastructure needed to get Americans to work. Massive public disinvestment also affects literal infrastructure: Our collapsing bridges make it literally impossible for workers to show up. Distrust of government also means we lack the care infrastructure that enables workers to show up for work, most notably paid family leave and childcare. As a result, some companies offered frontline workers $100 per shift to cover child care at the start of the pandemic, and paid leave is now financed through private employers rather than, as in virtually every other industrialized country, through the government. Is this really better for business? Profit and Pay Globalized supply chains are yet another example of slash-and-burn capitalism that looks different today than it did six months ago. Prominent members of both parties now recognize that globalized supply chains have created an economy that is hyper profitable but not resilient, to quote U.S. Senator Marco Rubio’s insightful analysis. The U.S.’s reliance on China for medical supplies from PPE to pharmaceuticals highlights again the vulnerability of an economy hyper focused on short-term profits without a thought to sustaining economic stability not just through thick, but also through thin. But the single most important example of slash-and-burn capitalism concerns wages. The current business philosophy that wages are just another cost to be cut is relatively recent. In 1914, Henry Ford — Henry Ford! — doubled wages because he recognized that workers need enough money to create demand, and he wanted his workers to be able to afford his cars. Half a century later, Kodak’s annual report listed the generous wages and benefits it paid its staff as proud accomplishments in its report to shareholders. That’s such a contrast to large, rich companies today that classify a third or more of their workforces as contractors even though they often work full time, sometimes for years. The unspoken core belief of contemporary capitalism reflects an old adage: to make the rich work harder, pay them more; to make the poor work harder, pay them less. That’s the logic behind the fact that executive salaries have ballooned from 20 times to over 300 times the average employee’s wage in recent decades, while wages for the formerly middle class have barely budged. Shareholder capitalism is really managerial-capture capitalism, as is evidenced by the company after company where CEOs’ compensation has skyrocketed during the pandemic. No wonder the 1% keeps getting richer: it’s not hard to win at rigged roulette. Slash-and-burn capitalism’s obsession with controlling labor costs has led to a sharp diminution in the sharing of productivity gains with the workforce that created them. During the decades after World War II, wages used to rise when productivity did; if that trend had continued, wages would be twice what they are today. As a result, only half of Americans born in 1980 will do better than their parents; virtually all Americans used to. The resulting pain and fury at the loss of the American dream has fueled economic populism. Many Trump voters are from the fragile or formerly middle class, deeply rooted in communities that are being left behind: voters in counties suffering economic distress trended for Trump. “We’re voting with our middle finger,” said one. The result is a dysfunctional economic populism that’s bad for business. It’s not just the trade wars, whose cost has been born chiefly by American consumers and businesses. The economic fury driving far-right populism is leading to the kind of political instability American business has rarely had to worry about. We have a president openly talking about not leaving office if he loses, and white supremacists just thwarted in a plan to kidnap the governor of Michigan. It’s time to replace slash-and-burn capitalism with sustainable capitalism that provides the economic and political infrastructure needed to support a healthy economy. Policy proposals are important, but first things first: let’s stop letting ideology distort our discussions of government and the market. The right is starry eyed about the market but coldly realistic about the limitations of government. The left is starry eyed about government but coldly realistic about the limitations of the market. As Churchill once said about democracy, it’s the worst possible system except for all the others. Both the market and the government are deeply flawed tools. But they are all we have. Let’s start a conversation about how to use them to restore the American dream of a stable government, a thriving economy, and a healthy middle class.

#### The aff’s belief in the ability of a singular legal act to create a just and stable society is a fantasy that serves to cover up the unsustainable violence at the heart of capitalist ideology

Wardle in 2016

Benjamin James; PhD; The Four Axes of Legal Ideology; Griffith Law School; PhD thesis; http://hdl.handle.net/10072/367046

Žižek draws on and extends Marx’s understanding of ideology to posit a multifaceted conceptualisation. For Žižek ideology operates around three axes: a complex of ideas; the materiality of ideology; and the ‘spontaneous’ ideology at work at the heart of social ‘reality’ itself (1994, p. 9). Žižek illustrates his conclusion with liberalism which is ‘a doctrine (developed from Locke to Hayek) materialized in rituals and apparatuses (free press, elections, market, etc.) and active in the “spontaneous” (self-) experience of subjects as “free individuals”’ (1994, p. 10). Under this definition ideology can be produced by a ruling class, it can function largely unconsciously through material forms like commodities, and it can be produced by the exploited spontaneously through their daily experiences. By viewing the topography of ideology as multi-dimensional rather than a singular, monolithic structure Žižek draws together most of the insights in Marx’s three definitions and, in doing so, overcomes many of the contradictions between these definitions. In addition to overcoming a number of the inconsistencies between Marx’s three definitions of ideology Žižek draws on Lacanian psychoanalysis to develop new insights into how ideology ‘grips its subjects’ (Glynos 2001, p. 195). Lacanian psychoanalysis is difficult to briefly summarise without falling into essentialism and structuralism and so what follows should be treated as a crude impression of Jacque Lacan’s complex work.4 Lacan argues that the structure of subjectivity reflects the structure of language. Language is an incomplete, fragmented system of signification that never adequately encapsulates that which it describes. For example, the word “tree” never adequately describes a specific, individual tree. One result is that signification causes lack. As our consciousness is largely made up of a collection of signifiers there is a fundamental and unfillable lack at the heart of subjectivity just as there is a fundamental lack at the heart of signification. Lacan calls this fundamental lack the “Real.” While the response of subjects to fundamental lack is varied, in general we cannot accept the anxiety, uncertainty and sense of incompleteness that stems from lack and so elevate ideas, ideals, people, places, commodities or any other object in never-ending cycles to attempt to fill this lack. Lacan names this process “fantasy” as the void is unfillable and there is consequently an endless movement from object to object (1973/1998, p. 209). Fantasy structures the way subjects perceive reality. An ordinary object, person or idea can be seen as a sublime object capable of completing the subject. Coupled with fantasy is repression. The void at the heart of social reality produces anxiety and so a subject’s response to anything that threatens the perceived completeness produced by fantasy is often relegated from consciousness. Fantasy and repression can be integral in sustaining hierarchical, exploitative and violent social relations. Subjects obtain enjoyment from fantasy and this can overshadow the violent, exploitative and oppressive aspects of ideologies while repression can maintain a subject’s belief in an ideology by preventing experiences that highlight the inconsistencies, incompleteness or violent consequences of ideological beliefs from entering consciousness. As such fantasy and repression offer an explanation why individuals cling to ideological ideas or practices even when to do so is against ones self-interest, the interests of loved ones or humanity in general. Psychoanalytic theory can also offer a reason why individuals maintain these beliefs even following exposure to information or practices that expose the inaccuracy or oppressive nature of ideological beliefs.

#### The impact is racial capitalism: the global system that is recognized by war, colonialism, slavery, genocide, fascism, and dispossession – it deploys liberalist ideals of individualism that corrupts movements and undermines any and all social change.

Jodi Melamed, 2015, is associate professor of English and Africana Studies at Marquette University. She is the author of Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism (University of Minnesota Press, 2011) and has published many articles and chapters in a wide array of journals and editions “Racial Capitalism” published in Critical Ethnic Studies , Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 2015), pp. 76-85. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.1.0076

This contribution to the inaugural volume of the Critical Ethnic Studies seeks to strengthen the activist hermeneutic “racial capitalism” to respond to three conditions with which critical ethnic studies must reckon in the present. The first is that so-called primitive accumulation—where capital is accrued through transparently violent means (war, land-grabbing, dispossession, neo/colonialism**)—has become everywhere interlinked and continuous** with accumulation through expanded reproduction, which we used to think of as requiring only “the silent compulsion of economic relations.”1 **With the top 10 percent taking 50 percent of total U.S. income** in 2012, and the top 1 percent taking a striking 95 percent of all post-Recession income gains, it has become increasingly plain that accumulation for financial asset owning classes requires violence toward others and seeks to expropriate for capital the entire field of social provision **(land, work, education, health).**2 The second condition is the **degree to which ideologies of** individualism, liberalism, and democracy, shaped by and shaping market economies and capitalist rationality from their mutual inception, monopolize the terms of sociality, despite their increasing hollowness in the face of neoliberalism’s predations. The third condition is the emergence of new horizons of activism that challenge the interpretative limits of ethnic studies in that they exceed the antimonies of political/economic activism, bust up old terms and geographies of solidarity, and are often Indigenous-led, requiring a rethinking of activist scholarship in light of the importance of Indigenous activism and critical theory. Our dominant critical understanding of the term racial capitalism stays close to the usage of its originator, Cedric Robinson, in his seminal Black Marxism: The Making of a Black Radical Tradition. 3 Robinson develops the term to correct the developmentalism and racism that led Marx and Engels to believe mistakenly that European bourgeois society would rationalize social relations. Instead, Robinson explains, the obverse occurred: “The development, organization, and expansion of capitalist society pursued essentially racial directions, so too did social ideology. As a material force . . . racialism would inevitably permeate the social structures emergent from capitalis**m**. I have used the term ‘racial capitalism’ to refer . . . to the subsequent structure as a historical agency.”4 Thus the term “racial capitalism” requires its users to recognize that capitalism is racial capitalism. Capital can only be capital when it is accumulating, and it can only accumulate by producing and moving through relations of severe inequality among human groups—c

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only the vertical dual power organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct unproductive tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation.

**Escalante 18**  
(Alyson Escalante, you should totally read her work for non-debate reasons, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> rvs)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: **in order** to mobilize the base **which base builders hope to create,** we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable,

## FW

**The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing**

1. **First, pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. People consistently regard pleasure and pain as good reasons for action, despite the fact that pleasure doesn’t seem to be instrumentally valuable for anything.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues**.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values**.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable**.** You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes**:** “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.

1. **Moreover, *only* pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. All other values can be explained with reference to pleasure; Occam’s razor requires us to treat these as instrumentally valuable.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

I think several things should be said in response to Moore’s challenge to hedonists. First, **I do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain why we should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable.** Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, **there is something peculiar about the list of additional intrinsic values** that counts in hedonism’s favor**: the listed values have a strong tendency to be well explained as things that help promote pleasure and avert pain.** To go through Frankena’s list, life and consciousness are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; activity, health, and strength bring about pleasure; and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as “pleasures and satisfactions.” The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and “proportion in objects contemplated,” and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena’s list, such as understanding, **wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly.** **Morally good dispositions and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, contribute a happy society, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after.** To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values. Indeed, pluralists’ suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism’s: “Hedonists,” he writes “do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend.”24 Ross writes that “[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors.”25 Roger Crisp observes that “those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy.”26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that if **the suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values are potentially explainable by appeal to just pleasure and pain** (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), **then—by appeal to Occam’s razor—we have at least a pro tanto reason to resist the introduction of any further intrinsic values and disvalues. It is ontologically more costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case all values admit of explanation by reference to a single intrinsic value and a single intrinsic disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts.** **The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists.** The challenge can be phrased as the following question: **If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they tend to point toward pleasure and away from pain?**27

1. **Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority.  
   Bostrom 12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]  
   These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.
2. **Reducing the risk of extinction is always priority number one.   
   Bostrom 12** [Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford.], Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.  Forthcoming book (Global Policy). MP. http://www.existenti...org/concept.pdfEven if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the   possibility of space colonization and software minds, **we find that the expected loss of an existential   catastrophe is greater than the value of 10^16 human lives**.  **This implies that the expected value of   reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least a hundred times the   value of a million human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 10  54 humanbrain-emulation subjective life-years (or 10  52  lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even   more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a   technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected   value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth   a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives. **One might consequently argue that even the tiniest reduction of existential risk has an   expected value greater than that of the definite provision of any ordinary good, such as the direct   benefit of saving 1 billion lives.**  And, further, that the absolute value of the indirect effect of saving 1  billion lives on the total cumulative amount of existential riskâ€”positive or negativeâ€”is almost   certainly larger than the positive value of the direct benefit of such an action.