### 1NC - Framework

Util --- I’ll concede to practicality

#### High magnitude threats outweigh --- we have cognitive biases to underestimate the risks --- overcorrect in favor the NEG’s probability.

--- must preserve infinite lives and generations.

--- question of intergenerational equity.

--- existential threats are underestimated: global public good, intergenerational, unprecedented, scope neglect.

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>, Accessed 7/22/2017, Kent Denver-jKIM)

1.2. THE ETHICS OF EXISTENTIAL RISK In his book Reasons and Persons, Oxford philosopher Derek Parfit advanced an influential argument about the importance of avoiding extinction: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. ... The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second.65 In this argument, it seems that Parfit is assuming that the survivors of a nuclear war that kills 99% of the population would eventually be able to recover civilisation without long-term effect. As we have seen, this may not be a safe assumption – but for the purposes of this thought experiment, the point stands. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is that they would “destroy the future,” as another Oxford philosopher, Nick Bostrom, puts it.66 This future could potentially be extremely long and full of flourishing, and would therefore have extremely large value. In standard risk analysis, when working out how to respond to risk, we work out the expected value of risk reduction, by weighing the probability that an action will prevent an adverse event against the severity of the event. Because the value of preventing existential catastrophe is so vast, even a tiny probability of prevention has huge expected value.67 Of course, there is persisting reasonable disagreement about ethics and there are a number of ways one might resist this conclusion.68 Therefore, it would be unjustified to be overconfident in Parfit and Bostrom’s argument. In some areas, government policy does give significant weight to future generations. For example, in assessing the risks of nuclear waste storage, governments have considered timeframes of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even a million years.69 Justifications for this policy usually appeal to principles of intergenerational equity according to which future generations ought to get as much protection as current generations.70 Similarly, widely accepted norms of sustainable development require development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.71 However, when it comes to existential risk, it would seem that we fail to live up to principles of intergenerational equity. Existential catastrophe would not only give future generations less than the current generations; it would give them nothing. Indeed, reducing existential risk plausibly has a quite low cost for us in comparison with the huge expected value it has for future generations. In spite of this, relatively little is done to reduce existential risk. Unless we give up on norms of intergenerational equity, they give us a strong case for significantly increasing our efforts to reduce existential risks. 1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75
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#### Water scarcity is on the brink --- causes water wars that nuclear and functions as a threat multiplier

Jamail 19 [Dahr Jamail, a Truthout contributing writer, Board of Advisers member and former staff reporter, is the author of The End of Ice: Bearing Witness and Finding Meaning in the Path of Climate Disruption (The New Press, 2019), The Will to Resist: Soldiers Who Refuse to Fight in Iraq and Afghanistan (Haymarket Books, 2009), and Beyond the Green Zone: Dispatches From an Unembedded Journalist in Occupied Iraq (Haymarket Books, 2007). “The World Is on the Brink of Widespread Water Wars.” February 11, 2019. Truthout. https://truthout.org/articles/the-world-is-on-the-brink-of-widespread-water-wars/]

Mark’s words should be a call to attention, and a call to action. The plight of farmers in Australia illustrates a larger reality: As planetary temperatures continue to increase and rainfall patterns shift due to human-caused climate disruption, our ability to grow crops and have enough drinking water will become increasingly challenged, and the outlook is only going to worsen. The most recent United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report warned of increasingly intense droughts and mass water shortages around large swaths of the globe. But even more conservative organizations have been sounding the alarm. “Water insecurity could multiply the risk of conflict,” warns one of the World Bank’s reports on the issue. “Food price spikes caused by droughts can inflame latent conflicts and drive migration. Where economic growth is impacted by rainfall, episodes of droughts and floods have generated waves of migration and spikes in violence within countries.” In some places conflict is practically guaranteed. Meanwhile, a study published in the journal Global Environmental Change, looked at how “hydro-political issues” — including tensions and potential conflicts — could play out in countries expected to experience water shortages coupled with high populations and pre-existing geopolitical tensions. The study warned that these factors could combine to increase the likelihood of water-related tensions — potentially escalating into armed conflict in cross-boundary river basins in places around the world by 74.9 to 95 percent. This means that in some places conflict is practically guaranteed. These areas include regions situated around primary rivers in Asia and North Africa. Noted rivers include the Tigris and Euphrates, the Indus, the Nile, and the Ganges-Brahmaputra. Consider the fact that 11 countries share the Nile River basin: Egypt, Burundi, Kenya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Uganda, Rwanda, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania and the Democratic Republic of Congo. All told, more than 300 million people already live in these countries, — a number that is projected to double in the coming decades, while the amount of available water will continue to shrink due to climate change. For those in the US thinking these potential conflicts will only occur in distant lands — think again. The study also warned of a very high chance of these “hydro-political interactions” in portions of the southwestern US and northern Mexico, around the Colorado River. India and Pakistan Potential tensions are particularly worrisome in India and Pakistan, which are already rivals when it comes to water resources. For now, these two countries have an agreement, albeit a strained one, over the Indus River and the sharing of its water, by way of the 1960 Indus Water Treaty. However, water claims have been central to their ongoing, burning dispute over the Kashmir region, a flashpoint area there for more than 60 years and counting. The aforementioned treaty is now more strained than ever, as Pakistan accuses India of limiting its water supply and violating the treaty by placing dams over various rivers that flow from Kashmir into Pakistan. In fact, a 2018 report from the International Monetary Fund ranked Pakistan third among countries facing severe water shortages, This is largely due to the rapid melting of glaciers in the Himalaya that are the source of much of the water for the Indus. To provide an idea of how quickly water resources are diminishing in both countries, statistics from Pakistan’s Islamabad Chamber of Commerce and Industry from 2018 show that water availability (per capita in cubic meters per year) shrank from 5,260 in 1951, to 940 in 2015, and are projected to shrink to 860 by just 2025. In India, the crisis is hardly better. According to that country’s Ministry of Statistics (2016) and the Indian Ministry of Water Resources (2010), the per capita available water in cubic meters per year was 5,177 in 1951, and 1,474 in 2015, and is projected to shrink to 1,341 in 2025. Both of these countries are nuclear powers. Given the dire projections of water availability as climate change progresses, nightmare scenarios of water wars that could spark nuclear exchanges are now becoming possible. As if to underscore all of this, even the US military recently warned that climate change is a worldwide threat. The military’s Worldwide Threat Assessment report warned that climate change and other types of environmental degradation threatened global stability because they are “likely to fuel competition for resources, economic distress, and social discontent through 2019 and beyond.”

#### Asteroid mining singlehandedly solves scarcity

Kean 15 [Sam Kean is an American writer. He has written for The New York Times Magazine, Mental Floss, Slate, Psychology Today, and The New Scientist, and has published 6 books on scientific discoveries. “The End of Thirst.” December 2015. *The Atlantic.* https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/12/the-end-of-thirst/413176/]

If Earth does run dry, we might be able to save ourselves by mining water from asteroids and comets. Scientists have landed probes on these space rocks to study them. Future landers could mine them in deep space or possibly even drag them back toward Earth. Though the idea sounds far-fetched, space-mining companies already exist, and one of them, Planetary Resources, expects to start harvesting resources from asteroids in about a decade. According to Planetary Resources, a single 1,600-foot-wide asteroid could yield more platinum than has ever been mined in human history. But water could prove to be the real prize for space-mining companies. Some astronomers believe that the asteroid Ceres, which sits between Jupiter and Mars, may contain more freshwater (as ice) than all of Earth does. In addition to quenching people’s thirst, this water could be turned into fuel for interplanetary spaceships. In that case, an ample supply of water would be the key to a happy future not just down here on the ground, but up among the stars as well.

#### Sudden [regulations] are shocks that prove investors’ worst dreams true --- decks investment

Davidson and Stone 10 [Mr. Davidson is the founder and Managing Partner of Near Earth LLC. Previously, he was a Managing Director in the Telecomm Group at Credit Suisse First Boston. John Stone, Near Earth LLC, worked in the corporate finance unit of National Securities, and project engineer for Boeing. “Supporting Commercial Space Development.” November 2010. https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/files/SupportingCommercialSpaceDevelopmentPart1.pdf]

For investors, the ability for government policy to change dramatically, sometimes even within one Administration, is a clear, mostly uncontrollable and often catastrophic risk. Many investors have been burned in the past because of such policy changes and are highly reluctant or even refuse to invest in any company with material exposure to policy changes. For example, the “all payloads must go on shuttle” policy prior to the Challenger disaster essentially halted investment in the expendable launch industry, only to be reversed after the disaster. If the commercial space business in question cannot survive without continued government support, as an anchor tenant perhaps, then many investors will not take the risk that such support will continue to be there. To better understand this risk; let’s break it down to three key factors. The first derives from the fact that one Administration or Congress cannot bind another. This is, of course, the exact opposite of the contractual nature of most commerce. Once private sector parties agree, successors to such contracts cannot simply void them, even if they are willing to pay termination damages. Supporting Commercial Space Development Part 1 55 of 228 The second key factor is that policy and budget changes often happen on a yearly basis during the normal budget cycle, or they can be driven by the two year Congressional election cycle or every four years following a Presidential election. For an industry like commercial space with very long development periods and long payback periods for investors, this instability is completely inconsistent with the long term planning required for success and investor comfort. The third key factor is that policy and budget decisions are often perceived by investors to be driven more by political considerations such as jobs in a given district than by scientific or engineering merits or the long term economic and competitive sustainability of the industry. In an investor’s mind it is bad enough that a key risk factor to their business can change dramatically and over a short time frame, it is perhaps even worse that such decisions can be based on political versus purely economic considerations.
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Manufacturing DA

#### Commercial space manufacturing is booming and solves disease, but the plan kills it --- private launch and appropriation is key

Giulianotti et. al 21 [Marc A. Giulianotti1\*, Arun Sharma2,3, Rachel A. Clemens4 , Orquidea Garcia5 , D. Lancing Taylor6, Nicole L. Wagner7 , Kelly A. Shepard8 , Anjali Gupta4, Siobhan Malany9 , Alan J. Grodzinsky10, Mary Kearns‐Jonker11, Devin B. Mair12, Deok‐Ho Kim12,13, Michael S. Roberts1, Jeanne F. Loring14, Jianying Hu15, Lara E. Warren1 , Sven Eenmaa1, Joe Bozada16, Eric Paljug16, Mark Roth17, Donald P. Taylor18, Gary Rodrigue1, Patrick Cantini19, Amelia W. Smith1, William R. Wagner19,20\* 1 Center for the Advancement of Science in Space, Melbourne, FL, USA 2 Board of Governors Regenerative Medicine Institute, Cedars‐Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA 3 Smidt Heart Institute, Cedars‐Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4 Axiom Space, Inc., Houston, TX, USA 5 Johnson & Johnson 3D Printing Innovation & Customer Solutions, Johnson & Johnson Services, Inc., Irvine, CA , USA. 6 University of Pittsburgh Drug Discovery Institute and Department of Computational and Systems Biology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA 7 LambdaVision Inc., Farmington, CT, USA 8 California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, Oakland, California, USA 9 Department of Pharmacodynamics, College of Pharmacy, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL USA 10 Departments of Biological Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA 11 Department of Pathology and Human Anatomy, Loma Linda University School of Medicine, Loma Linda, CA, USA 12 Department of Biomedical Engineering, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA 13 Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA 14 Scripps Research Institute, San Diego, CA, USA 15 Center for Computational Health IBM Research, Yorktown Heights, NY, USA 16 Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA 17 Pittsburgh, PA, USA 18 The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA 19 McGowan Institute for Regenerative Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA 20 Departments of Surgery, Bioengineering, Chemical Engineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA. “Opportunities for Biomanufacturing in Low Earth Orbit: Current Status and Future Directions.” August 2, 2021. https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202108.0044/v1/download]

The use of LEO by governments and commercial enterprises is a complex ecosystem for providing opportunities and financing. In the last two decades, governments around the world, led by the U.S. and China, have heavily supported private space companies (2019 Report). These investments have focused on launch technologies, as high launch costs are perceived to be the greatest limiting factor to expanded space exploration and utilization (Werzt et al., 1996) and have led to recent reductions in the cost of transporting cargo to LEO by a factor of more than 20. Between 1970 and 2020, the average cost to launch a kilogram of payload into LEO on the space shuttle remained constant at about $54,500. Now, the cost per kilogram is $2,720 on a SpaceX Falcon 9 rocket (Figure 1) (Jones, H. W. et al., 2020). Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0044.v1 4 Figure 1: The cost of launching payloads to LEO has dropped considerably over the last 50 years. Note: Data is not to scale. Additionally, several private companies are now pursuing commercial space stations. Axiom Space, headquartered in Houston, is currently developing what promises to be the first‐ever privately operated space station, with the initial module scheduled to launch to the ISS in 2024. Axiom plans to dock multiple modules to the ISS that will eventually detach to become a standalone station. As the cost of transport to LEO has decreased—and is expected to decrease further—and plans for new platforms in LEO continue to advance (Dinkin S., 2019), opportunities in areas such as satellite deployment, biomedical research, in‐space manufacturing, and space tourism increase. Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 2 August 2021 doi:10.20944/preprints202108.0044.v1 5 As the past half century has witnessed the opening of space for exploration and commercial opportunities, in this same period, we have experienced exponential growth in our understanding of biology and physiology. This knowledge has been translated and commercialized for the benefit of human health and continues to accelerate as new technologies create additional tools to explore and cure. One aspect of this biomedical revolution is in the field of regenerative medicine, built upon advances in stem cell biology, biomaterials, and bioengineering. Remarkable advancements have been made in the design of MPS, also called tissue chips or organs‐on‐chips, and organoids that can mimic complex organ systems outside of the body for drug development or potential implantation to restore function. Stem cell isolation, characterization, and manipulation is advancing, with target applications broadly spread across tissues impacted by disease, trauma, and congenital conditions. Biomaterials and bioengineering advances have created new medical devices, targeted drug delivery platforms, biosensors and new imaging modalities, and the bioprinting of tissue constructs. To take advantage of these significant advances—more frequent and more affordable access to LEO and exponential progress in biomedical technology—the question is: How do these intersect, and what new opportunities arise as both advance? How can the unique LEO environment be leveraged to further advance biomanufacturing? Compelling answers to these questions will introduce economic drivers for investment in space‐based R&D that extend beyond the initial focus on pure discovery and into the expansion of commercial development in LEO. Over the past decade, the ISS National Lab has supported important space‐based research in the areas of tissue engineering and regenerative medicine that lays the groundwork for more complex studies and future investment. This critical research addressed fundamental questions such as: How does the LEO environment affect the organ function mimicked by tissue chips, and how do these changes relate to human disease? How does microgravity affect stem cell proliferation and differentiation? And how might 3D bioprinting benefit from the absence of gravity? Continued access to LEO through the ISS National Lab provides a unique opportunity for R&D that enables the jump from this initial work to the development of a sustainable market for biomanufacturing in space. The ISS is a powerful platform with a limited lifetime and thus limited time left for utilization; therefore, now is the time to leverage this invaluable orbiting laboratory to conduct R&D that demonstrates the value of biomanufacturing in space. This work will set the stage for increased private investment and the transition to larger and more numerous platforms in LEO that can support further discovery and development in the coming decades

#### Future pandemics are catastrophic.

Diamandis 21 [Eleftheriosi, biochemist specializing in clinical chemistry, Prof and Head of Clinical Biochemistry in the Dept of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology at the University of Toronto] “The Mother of All Battles: Viruses vs Humans. Can Humans Avoid Extinction in 50-100 Years?” Preprints, April 13, 2021, <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202104.0397/v1> TG

The recent SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, which is causing COVID 19 disease, has taught us unexpected lessons about the dangers of human extinction through highly contagious and lethal diseases. As the COVID 19 pandemic is now being controlled by various isolation measures, therapeutics and vaccines, it became clear that our current lifestyle and societal functions may not be sustainable in the long term. We now have to start thinking and planning on how to face the next dangerous pandemic, not just overcoming the one that is upon us now. Is there any evidence that even worse pandemics could strike us in the near future and threaten the existence of the human race? The answer is unequivocally yes. It is not necessary to get infected by viruses of bats, pangolins and other exotic animals that live in remote forests in order to be in danger. Creditable scientific evidence indicates that the human gut microbiota harbor billions of viruses which are capable of affecting the function of vital human organs such as the immune system, lung, brain, liver, kidney, heart etc. It is possible that the development of pathogenic variants in the gut can lead to contagious viruses which can cause pandemics, leading to destruction of vital organs, causing death or various debilitating diseases such as blindness, respiratory, liver, heart and kidney failures. These diseases could result in the complete shutdown of our civilization and probably the extinction of human race. In this essay, I will first provide a few independent pieces of scientific facts and then combine this information to come up with some (but certainly not all) hypothetical scenarios that could cause human race misery, even extinction. I hope that these scary scenarios will trigger preventative measures that could reverse or delay the projected adverse outcomes.