## Fwk

#### I value Social Justice, meaning treating all members of society as they’re due. Since no one’s inherently worth more than another, we should maximize happiness and minimize suffering.

Young 03: Young, Iris Marion. [Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago] “Political Responsibility and Structural Injustice.” University of Kansas, May 5, 2003.

This, then, is what it means to me to say that structures are the subject of justice. Justice and injustice concern primarily an evaluation of how the institutions of a society work together to produce outcomes that support or minimize the threat of domination, and support or minimize everyone’s opportunities to develop and exercise capacities for living a good life as they define it. Social justice concerns the actions of particular individuals on the policies of particular institutions only secondarily, as these contribute to constituting structures that enable and constrain persons. Structural injustices are harms that come to people as a result of structural processes in which many people participate. These participants may well be aware that their actions contribute to the processes that produce the outcomes, but for many it is not possible to trace the specific causal relation between their particular actions and some particular part of the outcome. Some upper income urban dwellers, for example, may be aware that their decisions to buy condominiums in renovated center city buildings contributes to processes that displace lower income renters like Sandy. No one can say, however, that their decisions and actions have directly caused Sandy’s landlord to sell the building to a condo developer, thus necessitating Sandy’s apartment search. Thus I come to the main question of this essay: How should moral agents – both individual and organizational – think about their responsibilities in relation to structural social injustice? This questions presents a puzzle for two reasons that I referred in my account of social structure and structural injustice. First, although structures are produced by actions, in most cases it is not possible to trace which specific actions of which specific agents cause which specific parts of the structural processes or their outcomes. The effects of particular actions often influence one another in ways beyond the control and intention of any of the actors. Second, because it is therefore difficult for individuals to see a relationship between their own actions and structural outcomes, we have a tendency to distance ourselves from any responsibility for them. The dominant concept of responsibility, I suggest, operates on a liability model that seeks causally to connect an agent to a harm in order to assign the agent responsibility for it. Because the relation of any actions to structural outcomes cannot be assigned in that direct way, we have a tendency to conclude that those structural processes and outcomes are misfortunes rather than injustices, circumstances we must live with rather than try to change.

#### My value criterion is maximizing well-being, or utilitarianism

#### Util treats everyone equally

**Nathanson ND**, Stephen Nathanson, Professor at Northeastern University, “Act and Rule Utilitarianism” Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, a peer-reviewed academic resource <https://iep.utm.edu/util-a-r/> Livingston RB

To illustrate this method, suppose that you are buying ice cream for a party that ten people will attend. Your only flavor options are chocolate and vanilla, and some of the people attending like chocolate while others like vanilla. **As a utilitarian**, **you** should **choose** the flavor **that will result in the most pleasure** for the group as a whole. If seven like chocolate and three like vanilla and if all of them get the same amount of pleasure from the flavor they like, then you should choose chocolate. This will yield what Bentham, in a famous phrase, called “**the greatest happiness for the greatest number**.” An important point in this case is that you should choose chocolate even if you are one of the three people who enjoy vanilla more than chocolate. **The utilitarian method requires you to count everyone’s interests equally**. **You may not weigh some people’s interests**—including your own—**more heavily than others**. Similarly, if a government is choosing a policy, it should give equal consideration to the well-being of all members of the society.

#### 2] Death is bad: agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security which constrains every ethical theory

#### 3] Only utilitarianism explains degrees of wrongness—breaking a promise to meet for lunch is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital1

#### I affirm the resolution, the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### Appropriation in the context of the resolution defintion

Leon 18 (Amanda M., Associate, Caplin & Drysdale, JD UVA Law) "Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources." Virginia Law Review, vol. 104, no. 3, May 2018, p. 497-547. HeinOnline.

Appropriation. The term "appropriation" also remains ambiguous. Webster's defines the verb "appropriate" as "to take to oneself in exclusion of others; to claim or use as by an exclusive or pre-eminent right; as, let no man appropriate a common benefit."16 5 Similarly, Black's Law Dictionary describes "appropriate" as an act "[t]o make a thing one's own; to make a thing the subject of property; to exercise dominion over an object to the extent, and for the purpose, of making it subserve one's own proper use or pleasure."166 Oftentimes, appropriation refers to the setting aside of government funds, the taking of land for public purposes, or a tort of wrongfully taking another's property as one's own. The term appropriation is often used not only with respect to real property but also with water. According to U.S. case law, a person completes an appropriation of water by diversion of the water and an application of the water to beneficial use.167 This common use of the term "appropriation" with respect to water illustrates two key points: (1) the term applies to natural resources-e.g., water or minerals-not just real property, and (2) mining space resources and putting them to beneficial use-e.g., selling or manufacturing the mined resources could reasonably be interpreted as an "appropriation" of outer space. While the ordinary meaning of "appropriation" reasonably includes the taking of natural resources as well as land, whether the drafters and parties to the OST envisioned such a broad meaning of the term remains difficult to determine with any certainty. The prohibition against appropriation "by any other means" supports such a reading, though, by expanding the prohibition to other types not explicitly described.168