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### 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them and before the next round they debate.

#### Violation – they don’t – missing multiple rounds from multiple tournaments

#### Graphical user interface, table Description automatically generated

#### 1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who can’t bypass paywalled articles.

Louden 10 – Allan D. Louden, professor of Communication at Wake Forest (“Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century” Wake Forest National Debate Conference. IDEA, 2010)

Groups interested in engaging in competitive National Debate Tournament (NDT)-Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA)-style policy debate are entering an exciting time in the debate community where **digital resources are making research and networking increasingly accessible**. Those developing programs should be encouraged to choose their own topics and resolutions, but they should also make use of the massive resources available by focusing on the official NDT-CEDA resolution. **New initiatives in the field of open-source debate make evidence sharing, such as the Open Caselist, a powerful tool for new programs to engage and compete against established teams**. It is no coincidence that **the winners of the NDT tend to be the schools with the largest coaching staffs, but the increased distribution and free sharing of evidence and resources have made smaller debate programs increasingly capable of competing against larger institutions**. We are now seeing the beginnings of **increased resource sharing**, with multiple initiatives focusing on regional evidence sharing for groups of developing debate programs. This **is one example of dramatic changes occurring in the community that are capable of opening the doors for new participation in debate**. Regardless of outside influence, such as an organized campaign by preexisting debate organizations to increase resource distribution, students are independently capable of establishing the foundations for a larger competitive program. The following suggestions are a nonlinear set of options available to students who wish to establish a struc-tured and coached debate program, and eventually developing the capability to maintain multiple professional teaching positions, such as those discussed earlier in the chapter.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### 3] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality ev comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

#### 4] Don’t let them say it’s the same every round - proven by them saying the aff is purple flowers but the only aff on the wiki has different cards – means they can get away with doing thingsl ike breakign new ev every round

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### 2

#### CP: I endorse the entirety of the aff except for the appropriation of mega constellations in the lower earth orbit via Asian private entities.

Don’t let them delink – they read the resolution

#### Private LEO constellations are economically viable in the long term, but require upfront investment – those uniquely solve disaster response because of satellite internet’s connectivity options for island countries

Garrity and Husar 21 Garrity, John, and Arndt Husar. John Garrity is an economist, policy advisor, and project manager focusing on digital inclusion, universal internet access policy, and last-mile connectivity. He has coauthored numerous reports on technology and development and has presented around the world on efforts to close the digital divide. Arndt Husar facilitates the effective use of digital technology, advising ADB clients, regional departments, as well as sector and thematic groups on digital transformation. " Digital Connectivity and Low Earth Orbit Satellite Constellations: Opportunities for Asia and the Pacific." (2021).

Satellite communication plays a necessary role in the global connectivity ecosystem, connecting rural and remote populations, providing backhaul connectivity to mobile cellular networks, and rapidly establishing communication in emergency and disaster response scenarios. This Asian Development Bank (ADB) Sustainable Development Working Paper, the first in a series reviewing emerging innovations in connectivity technologies, focuses on low Earth orbit (LEO) satellites, which have been in deployment for decades and are again a subject of intensive investment as new large constellations are in early stages of deployment. These new LEO constellations, such as those being deployed by Starlink by SpaceX, Project Kuiper by Amazon, OneWeb, Lightspeed by Telesat, among others, may prove to be transformational to the connectivity landscape based on their global coverage and their suitability for areas not served by fiber optic cable networks. ADB’s developing member countries are well placed to leverage and benefit from this expansion of internet connectivity, particularly for underserved geographies and countries with limited international internet bandwidth, such as landlocked developing countries and small island developing states. With their global reach and coverage, LEO constellations are expected to dramatically expand the availability of high-speed broadband internet access with levels of service that rival fiber optic cables in terms of speed and latency, and at significantly reduced price levels compared to traditional geostationary satellites. A proactive engagement with LEO solutions is likely to yield benefits as the relevant business models are still evolving. Well-informed early action by regulators and investors can ensure that developing member countries prepare for opportunities presented by the anticipated expansion of connectivity bandwidth. I. IntRoDUCtIon This Emerging Connectivity Innovations Case Study on SpaceX Starlink and low Earth orbit (LEO) satellite constellations is intended to provide readers, particularly in developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, with a background understanding of the role of satellite communications in global internet connectivity and an exploration of the potential impact of the next generation of LEO constellation systems. While the adoption of internet connectivity across the world has generally increased incrementally, some innovations have been transformational, dramatically expanding the geographic reach of connectivity and bandwidth capacity. For example, the introduction of basic mobile phones in the late 1990s and early 2000s led to rapid adoption of mobile telephony across low- and middle-income countries (a phenomenon known as the “mobile miracle”). Similarly, public and private investment in undersea fiber optic cables circling sub-Saharan Africa in the 2000s significantly reduced the cost of bandwidth in many countries in the region. Satellites have used low Earth orbits since the beginning of space exploration; however, private investment in LEO constellations, consisting of hundreds or thousands of satellites, has been limited because significant up-front capital expenditure is required. While it remains to be seen how the next generation of LEO satellite constellations will evolve, LEOs are forecasted to significantly increase the available internet bandwidth in remote and rural geographies not currently served by fiber optic cables. This increased bandwidth could be leveraged to increase economic and social development opportunities for individuals, organizations, businesses, and government facilities (including public schools) located in these areas, provided that the private sector satellite companies investing in LEO constellations see market opportunities to extend service to these areas. This case study is intended to introduce to Asian Development Bank developing member countries how to start preparing for the expansion of LEO satellite communication services. II. BACKGRoUnD: sAteLLIte ConneCtIVItY As A MeAns FoR BRoADBAnD InteRnet Internet connectivity has become a necessary component of every country’s critical infrastructure given the reliance of all aspects of economic activity, governance, and social development on internet communications. The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic dramatically increased the importance of internet communications infrastructure. Trade, employment, learning, leisure, and communications quickly shifted into the digital sphere and countries with robust internet infrastructure and high adoption rates of internet-enabled devices were better able to adjust and adapt to the shift to digital activity. The United Nations estimates that 1.6 billion learners were affected by school closures in 2020, affecting 94% of the world’s student population and up to 99% in low and lower middle-income countries.1 1 United Nations. 2020. Policy Brief: Education during COVID-10 and beyond. 2 ADB Sustainable Development Working Paper Series No. 76 Access to distance learning opportunities varies greatly by country and income groups, with estimates of less than half of students in low-income countries able to access distance learning.2 Internet access and adoption in the developing member countries (DMCs) of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) continues to grow, particularly as a result of public and private investment in telecommunications infrastructure, increased competition, and allocation of shared resources, such as spectrum auctions and assignment. Despite these efforts, large access gaps remain in Asia, where the most remote, difficult to reach, or sparsely populated districts remain disconnected, leaving more than half of the population without access to the internet. This lack of digital infrastructure represents a missed opportunity to accelerate economic and social development. Despite the rapid expansion of internet connectivity infrastructure across the world, significant gaps in internet adoption and infrastructure access remain. This highlights the importance of satellite communications that can bridge gaps, swiftly expand network coverage, and enhance existing infrastructure. The latest estimates from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) show that 3.7 billion people are still not participating online (49% of the global population), and 63% of rural households are without internet access (Figure 1).3 Also, 1.5 billion people reside in areas without high-speed mobile data coverage (fourth generation long-term evolution or 4G LTE), while 607 million people reside in areas with no mobile data coverage at all (at least 4G or third generation [3G] coverage). Furthermore, 313 million people reside in areas with only basic voice and short messaging service (SMS) coverage (second generation [2G]), and 220 million people reside in areas with no cellular coverage. The ITU estimates that nearly $428 billion is required to achieve universal access to broadband globally, $251 billion of which is required for Asia, with approximately 75% coming from the private sector and the remainder with support from the public sector.4 The majority of the world’s population, over 5 billion people, live more than 10 kilometers (km) away from any fiber optic cable infrastructure (3.6 billion reside more than 25 km away).5 Other issues, such as affordability, digital literacy, and the lack of relevant or local language content, have resulted in 2.4 billion people who live within 4G coverage not subscribing to 4G data services. [FIGURE 1 OMITTED] Satellite connectivity is predominantly used for backhaul connectivity for remote cellular base stations and as a last-mile connection for individual subscribers and enterprises. Figure 2 provides an overview of the internet infrastructure network components, from international connectivity to the last mile. Because of the higher relative cost of bandwidth transmitted via satellite versus terrestrial technologies, satellite is currently primarily used in situations where fiber optic cables and other high-capacity technologies are not financially viable due to low population densities and large distances between high-capacity networks and last-mile networks.6 However, in a few cases, satellite connectivity is relied upon for international internet gateway traffic or as part of a country’s core network. For landlocked developing countries that are dependent on terrestrial fiber connectivity, in some cases, satellite connectivity serves as a substitute to complex bilateral and multilateral negotiations to extend costly fiber connectivity to their country. [FIGURE 2 OMITTED] Satellite connectivity is predominantly used for backhaul connectivity for remote cellular base stations and as a last-mile connection for individual subscribers and enterprises. Figure 2 provides an overview of the internet infrastructure network components, from international connectivity to the last mile. Because of the higher relative cost of bandwidth transmitted via satellite versus terrestrial technologies, satellite is currently primarily used in situations where fiber optic cables and other high-capacity technologies are not financially viable due to low population densities and large distances between high-capacity networks and last-mile networks.6 However, in a few cases, satellite connectivity is relied upon for international internet gateway traffic or as part of a country’s core network. For landlocked developing countries that are dependent on terrestrial fiber connectivity, in some cases, satellite connectivity serves as a substitute to complex bilateral and multilateral negotiations to extend costly fiber connectivity to their country. Particularly in situations where a high degree of data throughput is required per site, such as satellite backhaul for broadband cellular networks, the data volumes as well as the distance to the nearest backbone node play a significant role in cost comparisons between satellite connectivity versus terrestrial network deployments (microwave backhaul, in particular). Figure 4 illustrates how higher data bandwidth requirements are more cost-effectively supplied by terrestrial ground networks; however, a crossover point occurs where satellite capacity may end up being more cost-competitive, depending on different price points of satellite bandwidth and total traffic demand per month.12 Satellite connectivity is also well- suited to deploy in emergency situations, such as in response to natural disasters or other external shocks, that require expeditious deployment of network connectivity where terrestrial infrastructure

is either nonexistent or destroyed. For many rural and remote communities, satellites are the only connectivity option. For geographies without direct access to fiber optic cable infrastructure or at great distances from high- capacity bandwidth capacity, satellite connectivity is the only option available. Even where terrestrial network infrastructure that could be used for backhaul connectivity is available, satellite deployments may still be preferred because satellite terminals require only electrical power and a clear line of sight to the sky. However, an expansion of terrestrial infrastructure usually requires extensive civil works (underground fiber ducts, pole attachments, or tower construction for cellular base stations), which comes with challenges such as securing the rights-of-way, permits, and having to pay the related fees. Satellite broadband is poised to become an even more important technology for addressing the growing digital divide. As information and communication technologies play an increasingly important role in commerce, government services, health care, education, and other sectors, satellite connectivity allows communities to get connected swiftly, bypassing the infrastructure deployment challenges that come with terrestrial infrastructure deployments. The role of satellite connectivity in emergency telecommunications has also been vital where the communications satellites are heavily relied upon in disaster recovery efforts.13 Satellite technology may also be complementary with traditional wired and mobile broadband, which are better suited for densely populated areas. Satellite service could become a default solution for remote areas, allowing terrestrial services to focus on improving access in their current coverage areas. Satellite connectivity is already being used for network redundancy at national levels for international internet capacity, as well as for backup in core and backhaul networks.14 The recent $50 million loan to Kacific by ADB for the deployment of a broadband satellite, which covers large parts of Southeast Asia and the Pacific, demonstrates the relevance of satellite connectivity for unserved and underserved regions.15 By deploying new satellite technology (in the Ka-band16), Kacific’s service offering is commercially viable despite the existing presence of other major competitors in Asia and the Pacific, including global entities such as Intelsat, SES, and Eutelsat, as well as more regional players such as AsiaSat, Thaicom, MEASAT, and SKY Perfect JSAT.

#### The Asia-Pacific is the most disaster-prone region in the world – the next catastrophe is a question of when, not if

Thomas Bickford et al 15, Ph.D., senior research scientist in CNA Corporation’s China Studies division, “The Role of the U.S. Army in Asia,” May, https://www.cna.org/CNA\_files/PDF/CRM-2015-U-010431-Final.pdf

Natural disasters As Typhoon Haiyan amply demonstrated when it hit the Philippines in November 2013, natural disasters can represent a significant threat to human security. In 2012, the Asia-Pacific region experienced 93 natural disasters, which affected some 75 million people.206 It is one of the most disaster-prone regions in the world:207 it is prone to typhoons and cyclones; it contains some of the world’s most active faults and volcanos; and many areas experience massive flooding. As former USARPAC commander Lieutenant General Wiercinski has noted, the only questions are when and where the next big disaster will occur. Admiral Locklear, Commander, USPACOM has noted that climate change is one of the region’s most pressing security challenges.209 While the ability to respond to natural disasters varies widely among countries in the region, even advanced countries can require international assistance, as Japan did after the March 2011 earthquake and tsunami.

#### Natural disasters are an existential threat – but increased preparation solves – outweighs all other risks

Anders **Sandberg 18**. Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford. 02/26/2018. “Human Extinction from Natural Hazard Events.” Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Natural Hazard Science. oxfordre.com, doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780199389407.013.293.

Systemic Risks

**Localized** disasters or slow-moving risks are unlikely **on their own** to spell doom for H. sapiens. It may appear that an unlikely intense global event or confluence of disasters need to occur in order to cause extinction. **However**, many risks are potentially **systemic**: a **sequence** or **combination** of disasters may **reduce resiliency** and the ability to **recover**, especially when interacting with the **human systems**. A model of how compound risks can act is the synchronous failure model of Homer-Dixon et al. (2015). **Multiple stresses** (such as climate change, resource shortages, or conflicts) can **interact** and **accumulate** in a social-ecological system, **pushing** **it** **to**ward a state where its **coping capacity** is **diminished**. Different sub**systems** become **coupled** because they require support from each other to function in the stressed state. When a **crisis occurs** (either externally triggered or because an internal component finally fails) it **rapidly cascades through the system**, spreading between subsystems and causing the **whole to fail**. Simultaneous damage is often **multiplicative in severity**. Many **human systems** such as **food, energy, finance and comm**unication**s** are **global**, densely interconnected systems where failures can **cascade** **rapidly** (Helbing, 2013). They have **developed** in a locally rational way: the gains in efficiency and reliability have been significant. However, the probability of global failures also has **increased** compared to more local, modular and redundant systems (Goldin & Vogel, 2010). While societal collapse does not imply extinction, humans are **dependent** on complex societies and their high productivity, and **any** long-term **collapse** would **reduce the human carrying capacity significantly**. A stressor such as **climate change** may **increase** the probability and severity of global failure, and once this occurs **vulnerability to further risks increases**. Various example scenarios can be constructed where plausible events produce gradual deterioration of the human system before it can recover; see, for example, Tonn and MacGregor (2009) and other papers in the same issue. Another example is sudden geoengineering cessation. If, as a response to climate change, solar radiation management geoengineering is used to maintain temperature, this will require ongoing technological maintenance. If a global disaster disrupts civilization, besides the damage from the primary disaster there would also be a rapid temperature change to close to what the un-modified climate would have been. This will likely produce massive **disruptions of ag**riculture and other human systems at the time when **vulnerability is maximal** (Baum, Maher, & Haqq-Misra, 2013). In this case a risk mitigation effort adds to systemic risk. Systemic effects are **hard to predict** (trade can both strengthen human societies by providing an adaptive system of distribution, prosperity, and incentives for innovation as well as destabilize them due to market bubbles, dependencies, and spread of pathogens). Taking uncertainty into account is possible but tends to lead to conservative policies (Weitzman, 2009). Another approach is to engineer human systems so they are naturally redundant, modular, and otherwise resilient to systemic stresses (Helbing, 2013). Probabilities Estimating existential risks can be done in many ways, each with their own merits and drawbacks; see (Tonn & Stiefel, 2013) for a review. It is possible to place upper bounds on extinction risks due to natural disasters by considering the fossil record. This can be done in several ways; the following will be based on the work of Toby Ord (2017). The simplest bound is based on the observation that H. sapiens has existed for 200,000 years: this observation would be unlikely if the extinction risk was higher than about 1 in 3,000 per century. One can say that an extinction rate of 0.15% or higher per century is ruled out at a 95% confidence level. Another bound uses now-extinct related hominin species as a reference class, producing estimates in the range 0.001% to 0.05% per century. This is in line with survival times for mammalian species, which typically is 1–2 million years (Raup, 1978) but shorter than for the entire fossil record where lifetimes of 5–10 million years are typical (Raup, 1986; May, Lawton, & Stork, 1995). H. sapiens is an unusually populous, well-dispersed, and adaptable large mammal species. However, it also has high food requirements and a long generation time. It may then be that the most likely risk to lead to extinction would be a mass-extinction level risk. Large mass extinctions occur at a rate of about 1 in 100 million years, producing a risk estimate of 0.0001% per century. One issue is that we are still discovering new kinds of existential risks. As noted above, supernovas have been recognized as a risk since the 1950s but gamma ray bursts were recognized as a risk first in the 1990s. High-energy physics risks were suggested in 1970s and later. Recognition of supervolcanism as a risk dates to the 1990s, in turn based on the models of nuclear winter in the 1980s. “Big rip” early endings of the universe were noticed in 2003 (Caldwell, Kamionkowski, & Weinberg, 2003). Since the rate of discovery does not seem to have slacked off, it is plausible that more natural hazards exist that we are unaware of, yet could pose a threat. At the same time, the above estimates bound the total risk: we are merely refining our understanding of what hazard categories exist. It should be noted that using past geological or fossil records to estimate risks that could have influenced the emergence of the species doing the risk estimation requires some care: risks that would have precluded the emergence of the species would naturally be underrepresented (Ćirković, Sandberg, & Bostrom, 2010). It is also clear that the peculiarities of the current situation may exacerbate some risks (e.g., pandemics) while reducing others (e.g., local disasters); these estimates merely show the risk magnitude for the earlier stages of the species’ history. The current probability is dynamically changing depending on human action. Probability estimates are on their own irrelevant: the point of risk assessment is to motivate rational risk management. This includes prioritizing mitigation efforts (typically toward the largest, most urgent, and most controllable risks) and research to reduce uncertainty and find more options. Mitigation Human extinction is an unusual risk since it can only occur once. Mitigation efforts need to succeed every time. Mitigating extinction risk can be done by reducing the probability of sufficiently severe hazards occurring, improving resilience mechanisms to reduce the damage, and endurance mechanisms to ensure that survivors can rebuild and repopulate. Many astrophysical extinction risks, supervolcanism and the emergence of new diseases are likely impossible to prevent, requiring resilience strategies. Impacts from near earth objects or comets can in principle be prevented given enough lead time and the right technological level (NRC, 2010). The amount of impulse needed to avoid an earth collision scales inversely with the lead time and proportional to the impactor mass: with enough time, even a high-precision weak intervention can move large objects. Managing atmospheric emissions and possibly intervening with geoengineering can influence climate risks (Wigley, 2006; Moreno-Cruz & Keith, 2013). Human systems can be designed to be resistant to various forms of systemic risks (Helbing, 2013). Prediction of extreme events is often impossible since they are the outcome of cascades in noisy, chaotic systems with hidden variables, and past data of less extreme cases often does not constrain models of phenomena of this magnitude. This requires using robust strategies taking large uncertainty into account (Weitzman, 2009). Although exact prediction may not be possible, rapid and improved response is possible and can enhance the resiliency against many of the listed threats. This includes better risk surveillance, preparation of responses and resources, as well as intergovernmental coordination. Many extinction risks have joint pathways. For example, supervolcanism, large meteor impacts, and nuclear winters (not discussed in this article) do most of their harm by precluding agricultural/fishing over a span of years leading to widespread starvation (Engvild, 2003). While they also cause other harms this particular shared pathway can be dealt with by emergency food stores or alternative food sources (Denkenberger & Pearce, 2014). Shielding in space against radiation sources could in principle mitigate the risk from supernovas, GRBs, superflares, and similar risks (Ćirković & Vukotić, 2016). Improved resiliency against particular damage pathways can hence improve chances against a large set of risks. Endurance mechanisms aim at ensuring survival, adaptation, and eventual recovery after a near-extinction disaster (Maher & Baum, 2013). An occasionally suggested endurance mechanism against extinction risks is the deliberate construction of refuges where people can survive (or the encouragement of natural refuges in isolated regions, nuclear submarines etc.). Ideally such refuges would be self-sufficient and independent of the earth’s surface (Baum, Denkenberger, & Haqq-Misra, 2015; Jebari, 2015). However, refuges only help against certain categories of disasters and their cost-effectiveness depends on the relative value of current and future generations (Beckstead, 2015). Undersupply of Mitigation Preventing extinction is important; **at least** as important as saving the lives of 7.2 billion people, and quite possibly **far more important** when taking future generations and their value into account (Parfit, 1984; Bostrom, 2003; Bostrom, 2013; Häggström, 2016). **Mitigating** extinction risk is an **undersupplied global public good**. For example, traditional statistical life valuations suggest that a $16–$32 billion annual investment in asteroid defense would be cost-effective yet U.S. government spending on asteroid detection (with no mitigation) is around $4 million per year, orders of magnitude smaller than funding for hazardous waste sites per unit of risk (Gerrard, 2000; Matheny, 2007). The annual cost to the world due to pandemic influenza has been estimated to $570 billion per year or 0.7% of global income, comparable to estimates of the long-term costs of climate change (Fan, Jamison, & Summers, 2016): the global influenza vaccine market has been estimated to less than $4 billion per year (Kaddar, 2013). These estimates merely take lives saved into account, not the value of future generations. Since existential risk mitigation is non-excludable and non-rivalrous there is a free-rider problem (non-participants gain the benefit without having to pay) and each producer of risk reduction would only gain a fraction of the total benefit. This is amplified by the transgenerational nature of risk reduction: most of the benefit will accrue to future generations. In principle the value to them of our present preventing extinction is near-infinite, but they cannot pay us any compensation (Matheny, 2007; Bostrom, 2013). Beside the normal logic of undersupply and lack of global coordination mechanisms there are also **cognitive** and **cultural** factors making existential risk mitigation rare. Part of the problem may be discomfort with the topic leading to willful denial or ignorance (Epstein & Zhao, 2009). Part of the problem is the difficulty to fit the topic with human **cognitive biases** (Yudkowsky, 2008; Wiener, 2016). Humans have **heuristics** that provide quick and adequate answers for many situations but lead to **systematic biases** in many situations removed from our ancestral everyday ones. For example, since extinction has not occurred in the past, the **availability heuristic** (“probabilities of events are roughly proportional to how easy examples of past events come to mind”) will underestimate likelihood. **Scope neglect** makes us relatively **insensitive** to the **number of lives** affected, making the willingness to make an effort scale sublinearly with the size of the problem. In general, without rich context information people are generally bad at judging differences between low probability events (Kunreuther, Novemsky, & Kahneman, 2001). Risks are judged not just by probability and severity but also by psychological aspects such as outrage and dread (Slovic, 1987). This can sometimes support efforts to mitigate global risks (since they tend to score highly on dread) but makes the focus strongly dependent on what is and is not discussed in public (Yudkowsky, 2008). This makes constructing risk management strategies that are resistant to behavioral biases vitally important for extreme risks (Kunreuther & Heal, 2012; Wiener, 2016). Conclusion There is **clear ev**idence that **natural events could cause** **the** **extinction** **of H. sapiens**. While astronomical risks may be the most dramatic, geophysical risks to food security and pathogenic risks appear to be more significant. It is unlikely that a **single disaster** will be severe enough to directly cause extinction, but it is plausible that it could place the species in **a vulnerable situation** for a long time, during which **other risks** could lead to **further vulnerability and** **extinction**.

## Case

#### **Vote neg on presumption**

#### **1] Allies – debate is an unsustainable form of activism because reading the aff forces us to negate it – especially true vs another asian american debater bc it forces us to negate our own identity**

#### 2] No spill up –

#### a] your ballot in dubs of cal can’t change the rhetoric of the debate community writ large – losing rounds makes ppl write more blocks, not reconsider orientations, which disproves subject formation

#### b] melancholia is not a METHOD it’s a diagnosis - their last card indicates melancholia causes psychological violence but what does acknowledging melancholia exists do to undo that - diagnosing the problem should not be enough for an aff ballot or else affs would be encouraged to race to the margins of trivial truth statements like “our method is recognizing racism is bad” w/o any active solution which encourages performative abstraction

#### 3] The role of the ballot/judge is to determine if the aff’s a good idea—anything else is self-serving, arbitrary and begs the question of the rest of the debate. Solves their offense since they can weigh the aff. Evaluate consequences

Christopher A. Bracey 6, Associate Professor of Law, Associate Professor of African & African American Studies, Washington University in St. Louis, September, Southern California Law Review, 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1231, p. 1318

Second, reducing conversation on race matters to an ideological contest allows opponents to elide inquiry into whether the results of a particular preference policy are desirable. Policy positions masquerading as principled ideological stances create the impression that a racial policy is not simply a choice among available alternatives, but the embodiment of some higher moral principle. Thus, the "principle" becomes an end in itself, without reference to outcomes. Consider the prevailing view of colorblindness in constitutional discourse. Colorblindness has come to be understood as the embodiment of what is morally just, independent of its actual effect upon the lives of racial minorities. This explains Justice Thomas's belief in the "moral and constitutional equivalence" between Jim Crow laws and race preferences, and his tragic assertion that "Government cannot make us equal [but] can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law." [281](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=cd9713b340d60abd42c2b34c36d8ef95&_docnum=9&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkVA&_md5=9645fa92f5740655bdc1c9ae7c82b328) For Thomas, there is no meaningful difference between laws designed to entrench racial subordination and those designed to alleviate conditions of oppression. Critics may point out that colorblindness in practice has the effect of entrenching existing racial disparities in health, wealth, and society. But in framing the debate in purely ideological terms, opponents are able to avoid the contentious issue of outcomes and make viability determinations based exclusively on whether racially progressive measures exude fidelity to the ideological principle of colorblindness. Meaningful policy debate is replaced by ideological exchange, which further exacerbates hostilities and deepens the cycle of resentment.

#### Extinction first – not fearmondering

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

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

#### Their focus on discourse can’t solve

Saloom 06 (Rachel JD Univ of Georgia School of Law and M.A. in Middle Eastern Studies from U of Chicago, Fall 2006, A Feminist Inquiry into International Law and International Relations, 12 Roger Williams U. L. Rev. 159, Lexis)

Because patriarchy is embedded within society, it is no surprise that the theory and practice of both international law and international relations is also patriarchal. 98 Total critique, however, presents no method by which to challenge current hegemonic practices. Feminist scholars have yet to provide a coherent way in which total critique can be applied to change the nature of international law and international relations. Some [\*178] feminist scholars are optimistic for the possibility of changing the way the current system is structured. For example, Whitworth believes that "sites of resistance are always available to those who oppose the status quo." 99 Enloe suggests that since the world of international politics has been made it can also be remade. 100 She posits that every time a woman speaks out about how the government controls her, new theories are being made. 101 All of these theorists highlight the manner in which gender criticisms can destabilize traditional theories. They provide no mechanism, however, for the actual implementation of their theories into practice. While in the abstract, resistance to hegemonic paradigms seems like a promising concept, gender theorists have made no attempt to make their resistance culminate in meaningful change. The notion of rethinking traditional approaches to international law and international relations does not go far enough in prescribing an alternative theoretical basis for understanding the international arena. Enloe's plea for women to speak out about international politics does not go nearly far enough in explaining how those acts could have the potential to actually change the practice of international relations. Either women are already speaking out now, and their voices alone are not an effective mechanism to challenge the system, or women are not even speaking out about world politics currently. Obviously it is absurd to assume that women remain silent about world politics. If that is the case, then one must question women's ability to speak up, challenge, and change the system.

#### Futurity and scenario analysis is good

**Stevens ’18** [Tim; 2018; Senior Lecturer in Global Security at Kings College London; *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, “Exeunt Omnes? Survival, Pessimism and Time in the Work of John H. Herz,” p. 283-302]

Herz explicitly combined, therefore, a political realism with an ethical idealism, resulting in what he termed a ‘survival ethic’.65 This was applicable to all humankind and its propagation relied on the generation of what he termed ‘world-consciousness’.66 Herz’s implicit recognition of an open yet linear temporality allowed him to imagine possible futures aligned with the survival ethic, whilst at the same time imagining futures in which humans become extinct. His pessimism about the latter did not preclude working towards the former.

As Herz recognized, it was one thing to develop an ethics of survival but quite another to translate theory into practice. What was required was a collective, transnational and inherently interdisciplinary effort to address nuclear and environmental issues and to problematize notions of security, sustainability and survival in the context of nuclear geopolitics and the technological transformation of society. Herz proposed various practical ways in which young people in particular could become involved in this project. One idea floated in the 1980s, which would alarm many in today’s more cosmopolitan and culturally-sensitive IR, was for a Peace Corps-style ‘peace and development service’, which would ‘crusade’ to provide ‘something beneficial for people living under unspeakably sordid conditions’ in the ‘Third World’.67 He expended most of his energy, however, from the 1980s onwards, in thinking about and formulating ‘a new subdiscipline of the social sciences’, which he called ‘Survival Research’.

68 Informed by the survival ethic outlined above, and within the overarching framework of his realist liberal internationalism, Survival Research emerged as Herz’s solution to the shortcomings of academic research, public education and policy development in the face of global catastrophe.69 It was also Herz’s plea to scholars to venture beyond the ivory tower and become – excusing the gendered language of the time – ‘homme engagé, if not homme révolté’.70 His proposals for Survival Research were far from systematic but they reiterated his life-long concerns with nuclear and environmental issues, and with the necessity to act in the face of threats to human survival. The principal responsibilities of survival researchers were two-fold. One, to raise awareness of survival issues in the minds of policy-makers and the public, and to demonstrate the link between political inaction now and its effect on subsequent human survival. Two, to suggest and shape new attitudes more ‘appropriate to the solution of new and unfamiliar survival problems’, rather than relying on ingrained modes of thought and practice.71 The primary initial purpose, therefore, of Survival Research would be to identify scientific, sociocultural and political problems bearing on the possibilities of survival, and to begin to develop ways of overcoming these. This was, admittedly, non-specific and somewhat vague, but the central thrust of his proposal was clear: ‘In our age of global survival concerns, it should be the primary responsibility of scholars to engage in survival issues’.72 Herz considered IR an essential disciplinary contributor to this endeavour, one that should be promiscuous across the social and natural sciences. It should not be afraid to think the worst, if the worst is at all possible, and to establish the various requirements – social, economic, political – of ‘a livable world’.73 How this long-term project would translate into global policy is not specified but, consistent with his previous work, Herz identified the need for shifts in attitudes to and awareness of global problems and solutions. Only then would it be possible for ‘a turn round that demands leadership to persuade millions to change lifestyles and make the sacrifices needed for survival’.

74 Productive pessimism and temporality

In 1976, shortly before he began compiling the ideas that would become Survival Research, Herz wrote:

For the first time, we are compelled to take the futuristic view if we want to make sure that there will be future generations at all. Acceleration of developments in the decisive areas (demographic, ecological, strategic) has become so strong that even the egotism of après nous le déluge might not work because the déluge may well overtake ourselves, the living.

Of significance here is not the appeal to futurism per se, although this is important, but the suggestion this is ‘the first time’ futurism is necessary to ensuring human survival. This is Herz the realist declaring a break with conventional realism: Herz is not bound to a cyclical vision of political or historical time in which events and processes reoccur over and again. His identification of nuclear weapons as an ‘absolute novum’ in international politics demonstrates this belief in the non-cyclical nature of humankind’s unfolding temporality.76 As Sylvest observes of Herz’s attitude to the nuclear revolution, ‘the horizons of meaning it produced installed a temporal break with the past, and simultaneously carried a promise for the future’.

This ‘promise for the future’ was not, however, a simple liberal view of a better future consonant with human progress. His autobiography is clear that his experiences of Nazism and the Holocaust destroyed all remnants of any original belief in ‘inevitable progress’.78 His frustration at scientism, technocratic deception, and the brutal rationality of twentieth-century killing, all but demanded a rejection of the liberal dream and the inevitability of its consummation. If the ‘new age’ ushered in by nuclear weapons, he wrote, is characterized by anything, it is by its ‘indefiniteness of the age and the uncertainties of the future’; it was impossible under these conditions to draw firm conclusions about the future course of international politics.79 Instead, he recognised the contingency, precarity and fragility of international politics, and the ghastly tensions inherent to the structural core of international politics, the security dilemma.

80 Herz was uneasy with both cyclical and linear-progressive ways of perceiving historical time. The former ‘closed’ temporalities are endemic to versions of realist IR, the latter to post-Enlightenment narratives feeding liberal-utopian visions of international relations and those of Marxism.81 In their own ways, each marginalizes and diminishes the contingency of the social world in and through time, and the agency of political actors in effecting change. Simultaneously, each shapes the futures that may be imagined and brought into being. Herz recognised this danger. Whilst drawing attention to his own gloomy disposition, he warns that without care and attention, ‘the assumption may determine the event’.82 As a pessimist, Herz was alert to the hazard of succumbing to negativity, cynicism or resignation. E.H. Carr recognised this also, in the difference between the ‘deterministic pessimism’ of ‘pure’ realism and those realists ‘who have made their mark on history’; the latter may be pessimists but they still believe ‘human affairs can be directed and modified by human action and human thought’.83 Herz would share this anti-deterministic perspective with Carr. Moreover, the possibility of agency is a product of a temporality ‘neither temporally closed nor deterministic, neither cyclical nor linear-progressive; it is rooted in contingency’.

#### Apocalyptic images good

Jessica Hurley 17, Assistant Professor in the Humanities at the University of Chicago, “Impossible Futures: Fictions of Risk in the Longue Durée”, Duke University Press, <https://read.dukeupress.edu/american-literature/article/89/4/761/132823/Impossible-Futures-Fictions-of-Risk-in-the-Longue>

* Squo power structures (i.e. what the K criticizes) paint themselves as stable/inevitable to project their power and maintain dominance
* Questioning that stability thru extinction narratives questions squo world orders bc it calls into ques the idea of squo world stability which allows us to envision alternative worlds/future i.e. one where it fails and causes extinction
* Justifies extinction focus and preventing extinction in the name of changing those squo structures

If contemporary ecocriticism has a shared premise about environmental risk it is that genre is the key to both perceiving and, possibly, correcting ecological crisis. Frederick Buell’s 2003 From Apocalypse to Way of Life: Environmental Crisis in the American Century has established one of the most central oppositions of this paradigm. As his title suggests, Buell tells the story of a discourse that began in the apocalyptic mode in the 1960s and 70s, when discussions of “the immanent end of nature” most commonly took the form of “prophecy, revelation, climax, and extermination” before turning away from apocalypse when the prophesied ends failed to arrive (112, 78). Buell offers his suggestion for the appropriate literary mode for life lived within a crisis that is both unceasing and inescapable: new voices, “if wise enough….will abandon apocalypse for a sadder realism that looks closely at social and environmental changes in process and recognizes crisis as a place where people dwell” (202-3). In a world of threat, Buell demands a realism that might help us see risks more clearly and aid our survival.¶ Buell’s argument has become a broadly held view in contemporary risk theory and ecocriticism, overlapping fields in the social sciences and humanities that address the foundational question of second modernity: “how do you live when you are at such risk?” (Woodward 2009, 205).1 Such an assertion, however, assumes both that realism is a neutral descriptive practice and that apocalypse is not something that is happening now in places that we might not see, or cannot hear. This essay argues for the continuing importance of apocalyptic narrative forms in representations of environmental risk to disrupt conservative realisms that maintain the statusquo. Taking the ecological disaster of nuclear waste as my case study, I examine two fictional treatments of nuclear waste dumps that create different temporal structures within which the colonial history of the United States plays out. The first, a set of Department of Energy documents that use statistical modeling and fictional description to predict a set of realistic futures for the site of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico (1991), creates a present that is fully knowable and a future that is fully predictable. Such an approach, I suggest, perpetuates the state logics of implausibility that have long undergirded settler colonialism in the United States. In contrast, Leslie Marmon Silko’s contemporaneous novel Almanac of the Dead (1991) uses its apocalyptic form to deconstruct the claims to verisimilitude that undergird state realism, transforming nuclear waste into a prophecy of the end of the United States rather than a means for imagining its continuation. In Almanac of the Dead, the presence of nuclear waste introjects a deep-time perspective into contemporary America, transforming the present into a speculative space where environmental catastrophe produces not only unevenly distributed damage but also revolutionary forms of social justice that insist on a truth that probability modeling cannot contain: that the future will be unimaginably different from the present, while the present, too, might yet be utterly different from the real that we think we know.¶ Nuclear waste is rarely treated in ecocriticism or risk theory, for several reasons: it is too manmade to be ecological; its catastrophes are ongoing, intentionally produced situations rather than sudden disasters; and it does not support the narrative that subtends ecocritical accounts of risk perception in which the nuclear threat gives rise to an awareness of other kinds of threat before reaching the end of its relevance at the end of the Cold War.2 In what follows, I argue that the failure of nuclear waste to fit into the critical frames created by ecocriticism and risk theory to date offers an opportunity to expand those frames and overcome some of their limitations, especially the impulse towards a paranoid, totalizing realism that Peter van Wyck (2005) has described as central to ecocriticism in the risk society. Nuclear waste has durational forms that dwarf the human. It therefore dwells less in the economy of risk as it is currently conceptualized and more in the blown-out realm of deep time. Inhabiting the temporal scale that has recently been christened the Anthropocene, the geological era defined by the impact of human activities on the world’s geology and climate, nuclear waste unsettles any attempt at realist description, unveiling the limits of human imagination at every turn.3 By analyzing risk society through a heuristic of nuclear waste, this essay offers a critique of nuclear colonialism and environmental racism. At the same time, it shows how the apocalyptic mode in deep time allows narratives of environmental harm and danger to move beyond the paranoid logic of risk. In the world of deep time, all that might come to pass will come to pass, sooner or later. The endless maybes of risk become certainties. The impossibilities of our own deaths and the deaths of everything else will come. But so too will other impossibilities: talking macaws and alien visitors; the end of the colonial occupation of North America, perhaps, or a sudden human determination to let the world live. The end of capitalism may yet become more thinkable than the end of the world. Just wait long enough. Stranger things will happen.¶

#### Tying narratives to material political issues resolves the harms of the aff

Chang 93 [1993, 장 Robert S. Chang is a Professor of Law and an Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development, He also serves on the advisory board of Berkeley’s Asian American Law Journal. “Toward an Asian American Legal Scholarship: Critical Race Theory, Post-Structuralism, and Narrative Space”, 81 Cal. L. Rev. 1241 p. 1255-1258 //BWSWJ]

Systemic disfranchisement-whether at the level of faculty meetings or national elections-discourages many Asian Americans from participating in the political process. This is reflected in the low voter registration statistics which show Asian Americans to be "grossly underrepresented in terms of their voting power in relation to their numbers in the population. 29 2 This political silence has been attributed to "cultural differences, the difficulty of combining Asian Pacific American subgroups into a cohesive 'minority' group because of their diverse nationalities and generations, and their lack of interest in politics. '293 These reasons, however, are largely myths created to prevent the enfranchisement of Asian Americans. 294 The low voter registration figures can be attributed to several specific barriers that prevent Asian Americans from participating in a meaningful manner. The greatest historical barrier to Asian American participation in the political process was the fact that Asian Americans could not become naturalized295 and could therefore not vote since only citizens had that right. Some states even prohibited American-born Asians from voting.296 This historical exclusion has an inertia that carries into the present. Yet the dominant culture, and in particular, the legislature and judiciary, do not understand because they are largely unaware of this pattern of formally excluding Asian Americans. In fact, according to the Civil Rights Report, formal barriers to political participation still exist: 1) apportionment policies that dilute the voting strength of Asian American voting blocks; 2) the unavailability of Asian-language ballots and other election materials; 3) problems with the implementation of the Census of Population; and 4) anti-Asian sentiments among non-Asian voters and the media and the consequent dearth of Asian American political candidates (which may also be partly caused by political parties that ignore the Asian American population and do not actively seek or promote Asian candidates).297 I address the first two barriers examined by the Civil Rights Commission.298 Two current apportionment policies dilute Asian American voting strength: (1) the splitting of the Asian American population in an area into several voting districts,29 9 and (2) the establishment of at-large election systems in areas of high Asian American population. 3° Attempts to redress Asian American vote dilution are hindered by a United States Supreme Court decision which requires that a minority group "be able to demonstrate that it is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district. 30 1 One problem with this requirement is that it excludes Asian Americans, many of whom are geographically dispersed, at times involuntarily, through the will of the government.30 2 Another formal mechanism that prevents greater voter participation among Asian Americans is the use of English-only ballots. Congress, recognizing the problems with English-only ballots, amended the Voting Rights Act in 1975 and again in 1982 to provide language assistance to "language minorities."303 However, these measures did not take into account the distinct problems facing Asian Americans. Congress, in establishing that a language minority must constitute at least five percent of the voting age population, did not consider the diversity of languages and cultures among Asian Americans. Thus, even if the Asian American population in a given political subdivision were greater than the requisite five percent, no single Asian American language minority constituted a large enough group to benefit from the Act's provisions.3a As a result, no Asian American groups were able to claim the status of a "language minority" under that amendment. This did not change until the voices of Asian Americans spoke our distinct problems into existence. Because Asian Americans were unable to constitute language minorities for the purposes of the 1982 Voting Rights Act, members of the community began to voice concerns and to protest the 1982 Act. Many participated in Roundtable Conferences on Civil Rights sponsored by the United States Commission on Civil Rights.30 ' Their efforts led to the 1992 amendment to the Voting Rights Act,30 6 which led to the enfranchisement of many Asian Americans.30 7 Achieving enfranchisement is only the first step toward meaningful political participation and social change. The next step is to elect legislators and appoint public officials who will address and respond to the unique needs of Asian Americans. In legislative halls, executive agencies, and judicial chambers, the law is made and implemented, but Asian Americans, perhaps more so than other disempowered groups, have not yet been able to enter these domains in a significant way. Nevertheless, the voting rights example shows how legal reform can be brought about when Asian Americans participate in the political process and give voice to our oppression and our needs.

#### Biological death is the ultimate evil – it obliterates metaphysics and ontology

Paterson 3 - Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, SAGE

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alternative of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather**,** death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclu sion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state thatany intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility**.**
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