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# 1

#### The standard is maximizing expecting well being.

#### 1] Actor specificity

#### ---A] Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### ---B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments actively decide not to act so there is no omission

#### 2] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis – that inhibits the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose.

#### 3] Extinction matters under any framework:

#### ---A] It precludes the possibility of any kind of moral value – we can’t confer value onto anything if we’re not alive.

#### ---B] Future generations means infinite magnitude – we have to look towards future lives too

# 2

#### Commercial asteroid mining is coming now – lower costs and improving tech make it economically viable – and the legal basis is already in place in multiple countries– that helps acquire water for rocket fuel and rare earth metals

Gilbert 21 alex gilbert, is a complex systems researcher and a PhD student in space resources at the Colorado School of Mines. "Mining in Space Is Coming." Milken Institute Review, April 26, 2021, [www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming](http://www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming). [Quality Control]

Space exploration is back. after decades of disappointment, a combination of better technology, falling costs and a rush of competitive energy from the private sector has put space travel front and center. indeed, many analysts (even some with their feet on the ground) believe that commercial developments in the space industry may be on the cusp of starting the largest resource rush in history: mining on the Moon, Mars and asteroids.

While this may sound fantastical, some baby steps toward the goal have already been taken. Last year, NASA awarded contracts to four companies to extract small amounts of lunar regolith by 2024, effectively beginning the era of commercial space mining. Whether this proves to be the dawn of a gigantic adjunct to mining on earth — and more immediately, a key to unlocking cost-effective space travel — will turn on the answers to a host of questions ranging from what resources can be efficiently.

As every fan of science fiction knows, the resources of the solar system appear virtually unlimited compared to those on Earth. There are whole other planets, dozens of moons, thousands of massive asteroids and millions of small ones that doubtless contain humungous quantities of materials that are scarce and very valuable (back on Earth). Visionaries including Jeff Bezos imagine heavy industry moving to space and Earth becoming a residential area. However, as entrepreneurs look to harness the riches beyond the atmosphere, access to space resources remains tangled in the realities of economics and governance.

Start with the fact that space belongs to no country, complicating traditional methods of resource allocation, property rights and trade. With limited demand for materials in space itself and the need for huge amounts of energy to return materials to Earth, creating a viable industry will turn on major advances in technology, finance and business models.

That said, there’s no grass growing under potential pioneers’ feet. Potential economic, scientific and even security benefits underlie an emerging geopolitical competition to pursue space mining. The United States is rapidly emerging as a front-runner, in part due to its ambitious Artemis Program to lead a multinational consortium back to the Moon. But it is also a leader in creating a legal infrastructure for mineral exploitation. The United States has adopted the world’s first spaceresources law, recognizing the property rights of private companies and individuals to materials gathered in space.

However, the United States is hardly alone. Luxembourg and the United Arab Emirates (you read those right) are racing to codify space-resources laws of their own, hoping to attract investment to their entrepot nations with business-friendly legal frameworks. China reportedly views space-resource development as a national priority, part of a strategy to challenge U.S. economic and security primacy in space. Meanwhile, Russia, Japan, India and the European Space Agency all harbor space-mining ambitions of their own. Governing these emerging interests is an outdated treaty framework from the Cold War. Sooner rather than later, we’ll need new agreements to facilitate private investment and ensure international cooperation.

What’s Out There

Back up for a moment. For the record, space is already being heavily exploited, because space resources include non-material assets such as orbital locations and abundant sunlight that enable satellites to provide services to Earth. Indeed, satellite-based telecommunications and global positioning systems have become indispensable infrastructure underpinning the modern economy. Mining space for materials, of course, is another matter.

In the past several decades, planetary science has confirmed what has long been suspected: celestial bodies are potential sources for dozens of natural materials that, in the right time and place, are incredibly valuable. Of these, water may be the most attractive in the near-term, because — with assistance from solar energy or nuclear fission — H2O can be split into hydrogen and oxygen to make rocket propellant, facilitating in-space refueling. So-called “rare earth” metals are also potential targets of asteroid miners intending to service Earth markets. Consisting of 17 elements, including lanthanum, neodymium, and yttrium, these critical materials (most of which are today mined in China at great environmental cost) are required for electronics. And they loom as bottlenecks in making the transition from fossil fuels to renewables backed up by battery storage.

#### However, the legal framework that strikes the best balance of providing economic incentives for mining while preventing unbeneficial land claims requires a doctrine of appropriation – the plan prevents that

Meyers 15 Meyers, Ross. J.D. candidate at the University of Oregon Law School. "The doctrine of appropriation and asteroid mining: incentivizing the private exploration and development of outer space." Or. Rev. Int'l L. 17 (2015): 183. Italics in original. [Quality Control]

The doctrine of appropriation is a reasonable rule for adjudicating asteroid claims, and it could easily be modified to apply to asteroid mining. In the context of water rights, the doctrine of appropriation requires that the claimant be a landowner in order to claim the right to use a water source. It does not make sense, however, for the international community to grant complete ownership over asteroids toa single entity, so the landowner requirement of the rule should be removed. A similar modification would need to be made to the "beneficial use" language of the doctrine.

In the context of water rights, an appropriator obtains rights only to water that he or she can reasonably put to beneficial use. The metals contained in asteroids have a high level of marketability. For that reason, a mining entity could potentially put any amount of obtained metal to beneficial use, in the sense that the resources can be sold. This, however, would defeat the purpose of the rule, which is to limit such unreasonable claims. To ameliorate this problem, the doctrine of appropriation could be modified to define "beneficial use "constructively by providing that beneficial use is assumed for any resources that have been removed from the asteroid that the mining entity can reasonably hope to transport to market in a return journey. With the astronomical cost of undertaking a trip to such an asteroid, this modification would limit mining entities to only what they can carry back, thereby leaving the untapped resources available to other entities capable of making the same trip. Considering the size and profitability of metal deposits on asteroids, this modification to the doctrine of appropriation would not be overly burdensome to corporate interests. At the same time, it would satisfy the economic imperative of promoting the rapid development of asteroid resources.

By changing the landowner requirement, and qualifying the “beneficial use" language, the doctrine of appropriation would be essentially ready for application to asteroid mining claims. The only other changes necessary would be some additional requirements that are common to other space related provisions, like those found in the Outer Space Treaty of 1968. For example, a reporting requirement or clause guaranteeing asylum for other astronauts. A functional rule might read something like this:

*State parties or private entities may, upon actual possession, lay claim to natural resources found on or below the surface of asteroids. Rights to appropriate are given in order of seniority, starting with the first party to land on the surface of the asteroid and establish control over the resources, be it water, methane, metal, or any other beneficial substances. A party will be said to have established control over a resource once he has mined the substance and removed it from the asteroid. A senior appropriator may use as much of the asteroid's resources as he can take from the asteroid and put to beneficial use, and may continue to enlarge his share until another junior appropriator begins to appropriate resources from source for beneficial use. For the purposes of this Agreement, "beneficial use “refers to the amount of resources that an appropriator has removed from the asteroid that the actor may reasonably hope to bring home in a return voyage. Resources in excess of what an appropriator can reasonably hope to transport to market in a single voyage do not qualify as having a beneficial use, and are therefore not yet claimed. This means that the extraction of metal from an asteroid does not serve to provide ownership if the appropriator plans on letting the resources languish until another voyage is undertaken to secure the resources and bring them back to Earth. Junior appropriators receive rights in the source of resources (the asteroid) as they find it, and may prevent the senior appropriator from enlarging his share to the junior appropriator’s detriment under a no-injury rule. No state party will attempt to hinder other parties from landing on or using the asteroid, and parties will assist other entities on an asteroid, should they need emergency assistance. Mining claims on asteroids will be reported to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and state parties agree to release the location of the asteroid, and any scientific findings to the United Nations, the general public, and the scientific community. In the event that the asteroid is on a collision course with any other celestial body, all state parties agree to follow the course of action suggested by the United Nations. Should the United Nations decide the asteroid must be destroyed, no state party may claim liability for resources contained within the asteroid, but not yet captured. This provision applies only to asteroids as classified by the scientific community, and does not apply to planets, comets, meteorites, or any other celestial body not mentioned.*

There is no doubt that asteroids may be extremely beneficial to mankind, both as a source of resources and as a jumping-off point to far off locations in space. The human-race has progressed scientifically and technologically to the point that space travel is within commercial reach, and the need for new international laws governing the ownership of space has never been more apparent. The Outer Space Treaty of 1968made great strides in developing rational rules for space and many of its provisions should be maintained in their original form. However, by allowing ownership of asteroids under the doctrine of appropriation, the international community can incentivize the exploration and development of space in a way that reflects the needs of society in general, without vesting an absolute monopoly in a single entity. The doctrine of appropriation helped drive American westward expansion, and its application to space mining would help drive the human race in its expansion into the space, the final frontier.

#### Asteroid mining offsets terrestrial growth that ruins the environment and enables solar power satellites – both solve climate change

Taylor 19 Chris Taylor is a veteran journalist. Previously senior news writer for Time.com a year later. In 2000, he was named San Francisco bureau chief for Time magazine. He has served as senior editor for Business 2.0, West Coast editor for Fortune Small Business and West Coast web editor for Fast Company. Chris is a graduate of Merton College, Oxford and the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. "How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires." Mashable, 2019, mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy. [Quality Control]

The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its major problems. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a mountain of debt. It has to keep growing or it will implode, so we might as well take the majority of the industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.

Secondly, there’s the climate change fix. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build solar power satellites. Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, it’s always double high noon).

The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like the one China is said to be working on could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence.

“We're looking at a 20-year window to completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is millions of tons of construction materials in orbit. Asteroid mining can place it there.”

The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments.

# 3

#### NASA’s stuck in low orbit but the space race lets it extend further. Julie 12-9

Alyssa Julie, 12-9-2021, "How the private space race is allowing NASA to explore new frontiers ," Global News, <https://globalnews.ca/news/8408558/how-the-private-space-race-is-allowing-nasa-to-explore-new-frontiers/>, //hzheng

In February, NASA will launch the first un-crewed test flight of its Orion spacecraft and SLS rocket as it prepares to send astronauts back to the moon. Artemis I is the first in a series of increasingly complex missions to take place over the next few years. It will be followed by a second crewed test flight and a third flight that will land astronauts on the moon’s south-pole. NASA expects that will be in 2025, at the earliest. The agency says partnerships with private companies like SpaceX will build the lunar lander to ferry astronauts to the moon’s surface, making the Artemis program possible. The private space race has allowed NASA, and agencies like it, to turn their attention from Earth’s lower orbit and start planning for future missions, like Artemis. And as the agency plans to send astronauts to new frontiers, it is encouraging private industry to establish a greater presence in lower-Earth orbit — by collaborating with the private sector on a new space station. The International Space Station is now more than 20 years old, approved for use until 2024, with a likely extension only until the end of 2028 or 2030. NASA’s office of audits released a report at the start of December detailing the “costly repairs” to the orbiting laboratory that have been needed over time. It said maintenance and system upgrades to the ISS increased to approximately $169 billion in 2020. On Dec. 3, NASA announced three U.S. Companies that would receive over $400 million in government funding to develop commercial space stations — Jeff Bezos’ Blue Origin, Nanoracks and Northrop Grumman. Misty Snopkowski, Program Executive for the commercial LEO development program at NASA, says commercial stations, like the one’s these three companies are developing, will help the agency travel deeper into space. “We’re trying to go deeper into space and we can give this very well understood environment in LEO to commercial entities — for them to start establishing that LEO economy,” she says, adding that instead of owner and operator of a new space station, NASA would be one of many customers using the orbiting laboratory. With less of its funding tied up in the International Space Station, the agency will be free to throw more cash at deep space exploration, Snopkowski says. But there is still research that needs to be done in order to make these frontier missions possible. She says the agency has approximately 200 long-term experiments, most of which study the impact of space travel on the human body. The agency needs that work to continue after the International Space Station is decommissioned. “Those types of research, human research, [have] long lead times,” she explains. Such research not only helps further NASA’s ambitions in space, it is also helps us tackle big challenges on Earth, says York University astrophysicist Jesse Rogerson. “Going to the moon and going to Mars is going to push our understanding of how to do agriculture,” he says, as an example of how research in space can help us improve conditions on Earth. “Because we can’t do a permanent settlement on the moon or Mars without ‘living off the land.’ So pushing that science to the very edge so that we can grow something on Mars would inevitably help us do better on Earth.” Canadian astronaut Jeremy Hansen, who acts as CAPCOM at the Canadian Space Agency while he awaits his first flight assignment, says his agency is also involved in discussions about a future commercial space station. In addition to freeing-up funding for future deep space travel, he says such a partnership could reveal new ways to save money on research. “The space agency, we expect, will always be doing research in orbit. But the model on how we do that could change, could create more opportunities and could allow us to do more for less money,” he says. Hansen adds that collaborating with private industry will create more opportunities for astronauts to explore space, a boon for the Canadian Space Agency, whose astronauts have had to wait years to go to space as they wait for a seat to open on a mission. One upcoming mission Canada is taking part in will be Artemis II, the crewed test of the Orion spacecraft that will eventually transport astronauts to the moon. The private space race will also create more opportunities for scientists and astronomers hoping to conduct research in space, Rogerson adds.

#### We need to get off the rock – diversification ensures isolated populations prevent extinction and bolsters tech that mitigates existential threats. Reuter 12-9

Timothy Reuter (Head of Aerospace and Drones, World Economic Forum), 12-9-2021, "Why the human race must become a multiplanetary species," World Economic Forum, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/12/humans-multiplanetary-species/>, //hzheng

Supporters of space exploration sometimes suggest that sending robotic probes to the remote corners of the solar system and beyond can teach us what we need to know about the universe at less cost and risk than sending people. Yet, for the safety of our descendants and to reach humanity’s full potential, we must become a multiplanetary species. Humans have a one in six chance of going extinct this century according to Oxford Philosopher Toby Ord. In his book, The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity, Dr Ord lays out a variety of long-tail risks that are both existential and very difficult to mitigate. These include nature-based risks like asteroids, large-scale volcanic eruptions and stellar explosions. Although we can track many of these phenomena, we do not have the technology (nor are we likely to develop it anytime soon) to prevent large eruptions or redirect large asteroids. Initial efforts to nudge space objects are just beginning. This is to say nothing of the human-created risks of nuclear war or bioweapons intentionally or unintentionally released on the public, a scenario made easier to imagine by the current pandemic. As long as humanity is grouped together on a single planet there will always be a possibility that all of us can be killed at once. It is equivalent to having everyone in a single building: there is always a risk greater than zero of a collapse or fire that kills everyone. By establishing, at first, small outposts and eventually larger scale settlements on other planets, the risk of our species being destroyed is significantly curtailed. On a more positive note, human habitation in a greater variety of settings will radically expedite science and commerce. While we currently have small-scale experimentation with manufacturing items in micro and zero gravity on the International Space Station, the potential for us to set up large-scale industry in different physics requires us to have a presence on other celestial locations. Large-scale settlements of people are hubs of innovation and human flourishing. Just think of how many more discoveries and marvels could be created by 80 billion people in the future instead of today’s 8 billion. Our current planet has a limited carrying capacity but our solar system can accommodate many more people than any single planet can. Just as cultural and geographic variety contributes to the richness of our current society, further expanding the diversity of human settings would continue to expand the creativity of our species. Space travel itself has already been an incredible inspiration to numerous scientists, engineers and artists with many people citing seeing the moon landing as one of the most formative events of their lives. The technologies we develop on our way to becoming a multiplanetary species will also benefit us here on earth. Today, satellites are used to monitor carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions to give us a better picture of the causes of global warming and promote accountability. In her first speech devoted to space, US Vice-President Kalama Harris said: “I truly believe space activity is climate action.” In a recent report, the World Economic Forum's Global Future Council on Space laid out the many ways satellite data is being used to address climate change and suggests feeding data from space-based assets into an “Earth Operations Centre” to provide a real-time picture of activities and phenomena that contribute to warming. Less well known are the many other technologies developed on our way to space but used in our daily lives. The CMOS sensor was first invented at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory in the 1990s. No one could have predicted that this technology would eventually be part of all our phones, enabling high-quality digital images and affecting everything from how we document human rights abuses to how we present ourselves to potential mates on dating apps.

#### And, solves climate change via monitoring and tech race. Broom 12-2

Douglas Broom (Senior Writer, Formative Content), 12-2-2021, "The space tech keeping tabs on COP26 carbon pledges," World Economic Forum, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/12/satellites-ai-saving-planet>, //hzheng

At the COP26 climate conference last month, world leaders pledged to stop and reverse the loss of the world’s forests by 2030. Now satellite technology is taking a hand in ensuring those promises are kept and protecting the environment more generally.

The stakes could not be higher. The World Economic Forum’s 2021 Global Risks Report identified “climate action failure” as the second most likely long-term existential risk facing the world and the second biggest risk by impact.

As well as measuring shrinking ice caps and warning of extreme weather, satellite imagery is increasingly being interpreted by artificial intelligence (AI) to measure the density of woodland, track the growth of new trees, and even calculate how much CO2 is being absorbed.

By combining satellite pictures with 3D laser-scanning Lidar technology on drones, AI applications can provide much more detail about our changing environment than conventional observations. This technology is beginning to be used around the world.

Google’s little-known Earth Engine has transformed access to satellite imagery. Its library of images covers 30 years and is updated daily with new images from space. The data is in a format that allows individuals and organizations to analyze it using their own algorithms.

While better-known Google Earth includes satellite imagery, Earth Engine, which describes itself as “a tool for analyzing geospatial information”, has its own collection. This data can be analyzed to create a time sequence showing, for example, how tree cover has changed.

The World Resources Institute’s (WRI) Global Forest Watch uses Earth Engine to monitor the state of the world’s woodlands. WRI CEO Dr Andrew Steer says it is a world-first: “Global Forest Watch would not exist without it.”

The COP26 plan involves individuals, companies and governments investing in what are known as carbon credits - effectively paying landowners to protect and grow more trees, which capture carbon in order to offset emissions elsewhere in the world.

It has been estimated that a single mature tree captures around 22 kilograms of carbon each year - making it possible to produce rough estimates of the amount of CO2 taken out of the atmosphere by planting in a carbon offset scheme.

But now AI is enabling greater accuracy. Pachama: Forest Carbon Credits - a start-up developing a market for forest carbon credits featured on the Forum’s Uplink innovation crowdsourcing platform - uses satellite imagery to monitor the veracity of reforestation projects.

In addition to space imagery, Pachama uses drone-based Lidar laser scanning to measure the number of trees planted and to spot deforestation. So far, it has validated 30 reforestation projects in three continents confirming that carbon offsetting is taking place.

Another tech start-up says it can provide accurate carbon data for small areas of forest. Reforestum & Ecosphere+ has developed an AI solution that not only monitors tree growth, but also determines the exact amount of carbon captured by the growing forest.

The technology allows individuals to sponsor small parcels of land and still get accurate information: on carbon, or about the number of trees and hectares of forest protected or restored, and the jobs supported in the local area.

Connecting forest owners with people and organizations that want to offset their emissions is part of the solution offered by Treeconomy. Founded by two graduates of Imperial College London, the platform helps owners to secure a fair price for carbon offset by their woodlands.

As well as conventional forests, Treeconomy says its AI technology can be used to monitor marine Blue Carbon projects. The aim is to restore natural coastal habitats like mangrove forests and salt marshes, as well as underwater seagrass, to increase their ability to capture carbon.

Alongside climate change, oceans are also vulnerable to the effects of illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, which not only depletes fish stocks at a cost of $ 23.5 billion every year, but harms all marine life. That’s where Uplink contributor Unseenlabs can help protect the marine environment.

Unseenlabs’ satellite-based AI technology is able to identify a vessel’s unique electromagnetic signature from space. So, even if illegal fishers turn off their boat’s identification beacon, the vessel can still be tracked. A fifth of the world’s fish supplies come from illegal fishing.

UN Climate Change Executive Secretary Patricia Espinosa describes the potential of satellite technology in combating climate change and protecting the environment as “enormous”.

In a joint report by the UN and the International Telecommunication Union, she says: “Technologies such as satellite 2.0 and artificial intelligence offer enormous opportunities when it comes to identifying and addressing climate risks and their impacts, as well as promoting climate-resilient development.”

Former US Vice-President Al Gore pithily summed up the impact of advances in satellite and computer analysis in the fight against climate change at the COP26 summit when he told The New York Times: “That changes everything.”

# Case

### P&P negate

#### Permissibility negates- Lack of obligation proves the resolution false- the res specifically says you have to prove an obligation, you cannot be obligated and lack an obligation simultaneously.

#### Presume Neg- [A] We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories. [B] Resolved denotes to firmly state, since I have, the neg obligation is met. [C] Statements are more often false than true. If I say this pen is red, I can only prove it true one way where I can prove it false in an infinite number of ways.

### Epistemic Modesty

#### 1] Debaters can’t solve all of ethics in 45 minutes—it is highly unlikely that their framework finds the ultimate truth, you should use the framework with the biggest impact under it, we can predict the specific consequences of a political action much better than things that have been debated for 1000’s of years with no resolution.

#### 2] TJF—phil incentives independent voters and NIBs hidden in frameworks

#### a] moots AC/NC strat on substance, drop 1 nib or trick and the debate is over

#### b] no topic ed—they get to dump on framework and restart the debate ignoring substance, topic ed comes first, we come to the round to debate the topic and we have lifetimes to learn phil but 2 months on the topic

#### Extinction is its own ethical level, it comes before other ethical thought—and we lose the means to our ends, that precludes all other ethical theories

Burke et al 16 Associate Professor of International and Political Studies @ UNSW, Australia, 2016 (Anthony, Stefanie Fishel is Assistant Professor, Department of Gender and Race Studies at the University of Alabama, Audra Mitchell is CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, Simon Dalby is CIGI Chair in the Political Economy of Climate Change at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, and, Daniel J. Levine is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Alabama, “Planet Politics: Manifesto from the End of IR,” Millennium: Journal of International Studies 1–25)

8. Global ethics must respond to mass extinction. In late 2014, the Worldwide Fund for Nature reported a startling statistic: according to their global study, 52% of species had gone extinct between 1970 and 2010.60 This is not news: for three decades, conservation biologists have been warning of a ‘sixth mass extinction’, which, by definition, could eliminate more than three quarters of currently existing life forms in just a few centuries.61 In other words, it could threaten the practical possibility of the survival of earthly life. Mass extinction is not simply extinction (or death) writ large: it is a qualitatively different phenomena that demands its own ethical categories. It cannot be grasped by aggregating species extinctions, let alone the deaths of individual organisms. Not only does it erase[s] diverse, irreplaceable life forms, their unique histories and open-ended possibilities, but it threatens the ontological conditions of Earthly life. IR is one of few disciplines that is explicitly devoted to the pursuit of survival, yet it has almost nothing to say in the face of a possible mass extinction event.62 It utterly lacks the conceptual and ethical frameworks necessary to foster diverse, meaningful responses to this phenomenon. As mentioned above, Cold-War era concepts such as ‘nuclear winter’ and ‘omnicide’ gesture towards harms massive in their scale and moral horror. However, they are asymptotic: they imagine nightmares of a severely denuded planet, yet they do not contemplate the comprehensive negation that a mass extinction event entails. In contemporary IR discourses, where it appears at all, extinction is treated as a problem of scientific management and biopolitical control aimed at securing existing human lifestyles.63 Once again, this approach fails to recognise the reality of extinction, which is a matter of being and nonbeing, not one of life and death processes. Confronting the enormity of a possible mass extinction event requires a total overhaul of human perceptions of what is at stake in the disruption of the conditions of Earthly life. The question of what is ‘lost’ in extinction has, since the inception of the concept of ‘conservation’, been addressed in terms of financial cost and economic liabilities.64 Beyond reducing life to forms to capital, currencies and financial instruments, the dominant neoliberal political economy of conservation imposes a homogenising, Western secular worldview on a planetary phenomenon. Yet the enormity, complexity, and scale of mass extinction is so huge that humans need to draw on every possible resource in order to find ways of responding. This means that they need to mobilise multiple worldviews and lifeways – including those emerging from indigenous and marginalised cosmologies. Above all, it is crucial and urgent to realise that extinction is a matter of global ethics. It is not simply an issue of management or security, or even of particular visions of the good life. Instead, it is about staking a claim as to the goodness of life itself. If it does not fit within the existing parameters of global ethics, then it is these boundaries that need to change. 9. An Earth-worldly politics. Humans are worldly – that is, we are fundamentally worldforming and embedded in multiple worlds that traverse the Earth. However, the Earth is not ‘our’ world, as the grand theories of IR, and some accounts of the Anthropocene have it – an object and possession to be appropriated, circumnavigated, instrumentalised and englobed.65 Rather, it is a complex of worlds that we share, co-constitute, create, destroy and inhabit with countless other life forms and beings. The formation of the Anthropocene reflects a particular type of worlding, one in which the Earth is treated as raw material for the creation of a world tailored to human needs. Heidegger famously framed ‘earth’ and ‘world’ as two countervailing, conflicting forces that constrain and shape one another. We contend that existing political, economic and social conditions have pushed human worlding so far to one extreme that it has become almost entirely detached from the conditions of the Earth. Planet Politics calls, instead, for a mode of worlding that is responsive to, and grounded in, the Earth. One of these ways of being Earth-worldly is to embrace the condition of being entangled. We can interpret this term in the way that Heidegger66 did, as the condition of being mired in everyday human concerns, worries, and anxiety, to prolong existence. But, in contrast, we can and should reframe it as authors like Karen Barad67 and Donna Haraway68 have done. To them and many others, ‘entanglement’ is a radical, indeed fundamental condition of being-with, or, as Jean-Luc Nancy puts it, ‘being singular plural’.69 This means that no being is truly autonomous or separate, whether at the scale of international politics or of quantum physics. World itself is singular plural: what humans tend to refer to as ‘the’ world is actually a multiplicity of worlds at various scales that intersect, overlap, conflict, emerge as they surge across the Earth. World emerges from the poetics of existence, the collision of energy and matter, the tumult of agencies, the fusion and diffusion of bonds. Worlds erupt from, and consist in, the intersection of diverse forms of being – material and intangible, organic and inorganic, ‘living’ and ‘nonliving’. Because of the tumultuousness of the Earth with which they are entangled, ‘worlds’ are not static, rigid or permanent. They are permeable and fluid. They can be created, modified – and, of course, destroyed. Concepts of violence, harm and (in)security that focus only on humans ignore at their peril the destruction and severance of worlds,70 which undermines the conditions of plurality that enables life on Earth to thrive.

### Top Level

#### 1] Hijack—only util can account for degrees of wrongness, telling someone their shirt looks nice when it doesn’t is better than telling a slave owner where a runaway slave is which means aggregation controls the internal link to your fw

#### 2] NC collapses to the AC—if each person has infinite value, having more of that value is a good thing so you have to aggregate

#### 3] Epistemology hijack—epistemology outweighs in terms of fw justifications—it determines how we create knowledge and determine a fw in the first place; only util accounts for all forms of epistemology such as aposteriori knowledge

#### 4] Choice architecture like pulling on a push door proves instinct comes before rationality and maintaining it is an impossible burden

#### 5] Schmagency objection—people can shift out of their rationality based obligations and just be a schmagent which means lib can never hold anyone culpable and permits atrocities

#### 6] Deduction fails—it’s grounded in the transcendent world which means it never has an implication in our factitious world and no one would be held morally obligated for anything within a factitious world

### AT Bindingness

#### 1] No impact to bindingness even if a fw isn’t binding that doesn’t disprove the normative goodness of it

#### 2] Schmagency objection- shift out of our constitutive obligations and be an agent

### AT is ought

### AT Action Theory

#### 1] No implication, just proves that reason is used to explain actions not why it ought to come first

#### 2] Turn, we decide a course of action based on material circumstances so util controls the internal link to intending an action in the first place

### AT Universality

#### 1] Just because math is universal doesn’t mean all truth is – moral truth has some universal rules like “maximize pleasure minimize pain” but the way those rules are applied is contextual

### A2 Calc indicts

#### Reject calc indicts

1. we use util until it doesn’t beome useful anymore
2. empirically falsified – just prove util is hard not impossible – people use it all the time
3. cross supply 1
4. not true, you can use reason to think things through

#### Predicting consequences solves a

#### Cross apply problem of deduction – takes out b – also no impact to problem of induction because it just means that there’s always some probability we’re wrong but empirics show that’s super low

#### C is wrong – certain things are biologically painful for everyone like death – even if they aren’t we maximize everyone’s individual pleasure

#### Last proves its hard not impossible

### Contention - Kant

#### 1] Hijack—only util can account for degrees of wrongness, telling someone their shirt looks nice when it doesn’t is better than telling a slave owner where a runaway slave is which means aggregation controls the internal link to your fw

#### 2] NC collapses to the AC—if each person has infinite value, having more of that value is a good thing so you have to aggregate

#### 3] Epistemology hijack—epistemology outweighs in terms of fw justifications—it determines how we create knowledge and determine a fw in the first place; only util accounts for all forms of epistemology such as aposteriori knowledge

#### 4] Kantian philosophy is homophobic—universality justifies homophobic actions since Kant held that actions like gay sex weren’t universizable and means you should reject their fw because its bad for inclusion---a] you set a precedent for people being allowed to use oppressive theories within debate---makes debate actively unsafe and pushes marginalized groups out of debate---that’s an independent reason to drop you because the judge has an apriori obligation to reject oppression to make debate more inclusive---access is a multiplier to all your impacts b] any other model of debate leads to a race to the bottom where debaters say “this is not bad enough” which is bad for inclusion and also pushes marginalized debaters out