1NC

I negate: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. I value justice, because the resolution concerns the justness of a state action. The criterion is maximizing well being, prefer because:

[1] Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. People consistently regard pleasure and pain as good reasons for action. **Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo "An Argument for Hedonism" Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] GI

I think several things should be said in response to Moore's challenge to hedonists. First, I do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain why we should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable. Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, there is something peculiar about the list of **additional intrinsic values** that counts in hedonism's favor: the listed values have a strong **tend**ency **to be** well **explained as things that** help **promote pleasure and avert pain.** To go through Frankena's list, **life** and **consciousness** are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; **activity**, health, and strength **bring about pleasure;** and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as "pleasures and satisfactions." The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and "proportion in objects contemplated," and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena's list, such as understanding, wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly. Morally good dispositions and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, contribute a happy society, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after. To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values. Indeed, pluralists' suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism's: "Hedonists," he writes "do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend."24 Ross writes that "[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors."25 Roger Crisp observes that "those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy."26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that*7if the suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values are potentially explainable by appeal to just pleasure and pain (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), then—by appeal to Occam's razor—we have at least a pro tanto reason to resist the introduction of any further intrinsic values and disvalues. **It is ontologically** more **costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case all values admit** of **explanation by** reference to **a single intrinsic value and** a single intrinsic **disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts.** The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists. The challenge can be phrased as the following question: If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they te nd to point toward pleasure and away from pain?27

[2] Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority. **Bostrom 12** [(Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford) "Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority." Global Policy, 2012] TDI

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

Prefer-

1~ Bindingness— I could put my hand on a hot stove and I'd automatically pull it back before a signal is sent to my brain— Anything else fails to be morally binding because one could always ask "why not?"

2~Degrees of wrongness – only consequentialism can explain why breaking a promise to take someone to the hospital is worse than breaking a promise to play video games – absolutist frameworks fail because you can't weigh between violations of framework

That outweighs:

3~ Extinction first under any framework

A~ Future lives — trillions of future lives are lost. They are just as valuable as current ones – anything else says some lives are worth less than others which is genocidal rhetoric

B~ Reversibility — extinction forecloses future improvement; prefer — if we're unsure about which interpretation of the world is true, we should preserve it to figure things out.

Text – States should

[1] implement cooperative active debris removal measures aimed at mitigating debris from mega-constellations.

[2] adopt a system of market share liability in regard to the creation of debris in outer space by private entities in accordance with Munoz-Patchen 18

[3] dismantle their antisatellite weapon systems and stop all development of space weapons

1st plank solves for Mega-constellation Impacts.

Hardy 20, Brian Patrick. Long-term effects of satellite megaconstellations on the debris environment in low earth orbit. Diss. 2020. (Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)//Elmer

The results of this thesis demonstrate that satellite megaconstellations have the potential to leave a significant mark on the LEO debris environment, even centuries after they cease operations. **Various test cases for the Starlink megaconstellation were analyzed in a new, medium-fidelity simulation for orbital debris evolution, and a variety of PMD and ADR rates for Starlink were considered**. It was shown that if Starlink adheres only to the minimum regulatory requirement of 90% PMD for large constellations, then LEO debris levels will grow almost twice as fast as the baseline scenario with no megaconstellations. Improving Starlink's PMD rate to 95% would lead to only 19% more debris, while **99% PMD** is the **preferred option** that **prevents** any **significant debris contributions** at all. Importantly, Starlink's choice of PMD strategy will affect its own collision risk very little over the short term, but the impact will be noticeable on multi-century timescales by the overall LEO environment. Finally, **in scenarios with 90% and 95% PMD**, **active debris removal of non-operating Starlink satellites yields significant**, if

limited, **benefits**. The 90% PMD scenario combined with an ADR rate of 5 Starlink satellites per year, for example, is able to reduce debris levels to those seen for the 95% PMD scenario. This result suggests that active debris removal could be a **viable mitigation strategy for megaconstellations with sub-optimal PMD rates.**

2nd plank incentivizes sustainable use of space

Munoz-Patchen 18 [Chelsea Munoz-Patchen, Chelsea Muñoz-Patchen is an associate in the Houston office of Latham & Watkins. While attending University of Chicago Law School, Ms. Muñoz-Patchen was an articles editor for The Chicago Journal of International Law. Her research on regulating space debris was published in 2018. Ms. Muñoz-Patchen served as a research assistant for Professors Daniel Abebe and Jonathan Masur, focusing on intellectual property and constitutional law in the US and Ethiopia. Prior to law school, Ms. Muñoz-Patchen earned her BA and BS in Geography from Arizona State University. As a graduate student, she studied political ecology and people's relationship to urban nature, and taught Introduction to Physical Geography labs. 7-1-2018, Semanticscholar, "Regulating the Space Commons: Treating Space Debris as Abandoned Property in Violation of the Outer Space Treaty | Semantic Scholar", https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Regulating-the-Space-Commons%3A-Treating-Space-Debris-Munoz-Patchen/607eff0141f48332a69ae8c5a3301d871057a4fa accessed 12/21/21] Adam

- **solves global commons**

Market-share liability has been **suggested as a way to deal with the difficulty of identifying the individual ownership of objects and it could be put to use in the obligation to clean up debris**.154 Market-share liability **would allow for the apportionment of responsibility based on the respective contribution to the risk, and would not require the identification of individual pieces of space debris.**155 Market-share liability **has already been successfully applied where multiple parties contribute to a dangerous situation, but where it is virtually impossible to tie a particular party to the harm caused**.156 Market-share liability was created in 1980 in the case Sindell v. Abbott Labororatories. 157 In Sindell, the Supreme **Court of California devised the concept in response to a case in which pharmaceuticals that were marketed to pregnant women caused cancer in their children at least a decade later**.158 Since **the latent period was so long, the women naturally could not remember the specific pill manufacturer** out of two hundred such manufacturers.159 The **court found that each defendant's market share could be determined fairly accurately, and therefore used market share as a basis for the apportionment of liability**.160 While market-share liability has not been broadly adopted, this is likely because cases with fungible products and a serious causation problem are rare.161 **Academics have taken this idea and sought to apply it to space debris, which has similar fungibility and causation issues**, but their applications have been limited to a tort-like context.162 One author suggested that **whenever a collision occurs due to an unidentifiable piece of debris and a functional space object, liability and compensation should be apportioned** "**among spacefaring nations equal to the percentages of the total debris population for which the particular nation is responsible."** 163 This **mechanism frees the victim from having to prove causation by a specific nation, when that would be virtually impossible**.164 There will be difficulties calculating the percentage with precision in such a system, but **there is fairly accurate information from the U.N. including registry, sampling, mathematical models, and other records of known collisions and the resultant debris**.165 Without strong buy-in, it may be challenging to get this rarely used domestic tort theory to apply in international

space law, especially with the potential for disputes over the proper apportionment of market share.166 The **states primarily responsible for existing debris are the U.S., Russia, and China – powerful countries unlikely to be pleased with this newfound expense**. That said, though these **nations would be paying the highest cost, this would be proportional to their respective contributions to the problem**. Indeed, these **nations may welcome this remedy, because their space activity is threatened by the proliferation of space debris** and they **likely value continuing their extensive and advanced use of space**. This **solution solves the free rider problem and would compensate any nation or company that cleans up space** such that any nation (**like the U.S., Russia, or China) fearing the collapse of its space program and unwilling to bear all the cleanup costs itself would see this as an attractive solution**. It is even possible that **liable states like the U.S. and Russia will be eager to aid in debris identification, so as to add to other states' liability**.167 This regulatory remedy would resolve the current tragedy of the commons. By **assigning responsibility for the cost of cleanup, nations or companies would be incentivized to begin cleanup operations**, because **they would know that others will not freeride on their costly efforts**. Instead, **they will have guaranteed compensation from those responsible. Obtaining the funds is crucial,** particularly since the **high cost of deploying existing technology to destroy space debris has been a hindrance thus far.**168 Using **market-share liability is also a useful way to compensate victims of debris collisions and to incentivize spacefaring nations to avoid creating new debris in the future.**169 However, this does not do enough to remedy the persistent existence of space debris, which is threatening the very continuation of space activity. The Outer Space Treaty creates an obligation on states to carry out space activities "for the 'benefit and interests of all countries,' and that outer space shall never be subject to national appropriation." 170 To uphold their obligations under this treaty, nations should not be creating debris, because it interferes with the ability of others to conduct their space activities, or perhaps keeps them from space altogether. **Due to this legal violation, and the negative externality created by property abandonment, states should be required to pay for the disposal of debris in proportion to the amount they create**. While the **creation of debris may be unavoidable, there are existing practices that can greatly minimize the proliferation of debris**, and any **debris that is nonetheless created can be dealt with through market-share liability payments.** This collection of market-share disposal payments would not simply be a tax on operations or tort compensation for harmful acts. Instead, once liability is apportioned, (and this could be done on an ongoing or periodic basis to reflect new developments), **nations or companies undertaking actions to clean up space would be compensated for their costs by the nations responsible according to their percentage of responsibility.** The U.N. Office for Outer Space Affairs **(UNOOSA) could allocate the percentage of liability, drawing on its role in promoting international cooperation and the peaceful use of outer space, as well as preparing reports and studies**.171 **If any disputes were to arise from nonpayment, familiar procedures could be employed**—perhaps by **drawing from other notable space treaties that provide "established procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations."** 172 In many of the space treaties and conventions, including the Liability Convention, **disputes and claims can be brought to the SecretaryGeneral of the U.N.**173 These bodies could be utilized here to **assure fairness in allocating liability and handling routine compensation disputes.** This new regulatory regime can thus **be grounded in the existing space treaty regime and administered by existing authorities.** It would **resolve the incentive problems that exist in the international commons of space through regulation that allocates the cost of debris cleanup to those who have created and continue to create it.** The **regime can also adapt as the outer space marketplace and the actors who comprise it shift over time, and as the registry of space objects,**

incidents, and tracking capabilities improves. This regulatory regime also **ultimately would allocate cleanup funds to parties who would like to continue to operate in space, removing the disincentive to carry the cost in the face of potential freeriding.**

3rd plank solves space war – states won't posses capability to escalate

Innovation

Space Commercialization drives Tech Innovation in the Status Quo – it provides a unique impetus.

Hampson 17 Joshua Hampson 1-25-2017 "The Future of Space Commercialization" https://republicans-science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf (Security Studies Fellow at the Niskanen Center)//Elmer

The size of the **space economy** is **far larger** than many may think. In 2015 alone, the global market amounted to $323 billion. **Commercial** infrastructure and **systems accounted for 76 percent** of that 9 total, with satellite television the largest subsection at $95 billion. The global space launch market's 10 11 share of that total came in at $6 billion dollars. It can be hard to disaggregate how space benefits 12 particular national economies, but in 2009 (the last available report), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) estimated that commercial space transportation and enabled industries generated $208.3 billion in economic activity in the United States alone. Space is not just about 13 satellite television and global transportation; while not commercial, GPS satellites also underpin personal navigation, such as smartphone GPS use, and timing data used for Internet coordination.14 Without that data, there could be problems for a range of Internet and cloud-based services.15 There is also room for growth. The FAA has noted that while the commercial launch sector has not grown dramatically in the last decade, there are indications that there is latent demand. This 16 demand may catalyze an increase in launches and growth of the wider space economy in the next decade. The Satellite Industry Association's 2015 report highlighted that their section of the space economy outgrew both the American and global economies. The FAA anticipates that growth to 17 continue, with expectations that small payload launch will be a particular industry driver.18 In the future, **emerging space industries** may contribute even more the American economy. Space tourism and resource recovery—e.g., mining on planets, moons , and asteroids—in particular may become large parts of that industry. Of course, their viability rests on a range of factors, including costs, future regulation, international problems, and assumptions about technological development. However, there is increasing optimism in these areas of economic production. But the space economy is not just about what happens in orbit, or how that alters life on the ground. The growth of this economy can also **contribute to new innovations across all walks of life.** Technological Innovation Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but it is reasonable to expect that **a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation**. In terms of technology, **the difficult environment** of outer space helps **incentivize progress along the margins**. Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why **small, affordable satellites** are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. **That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities. Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects. Lightweight 21 nanotubes, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation. The need for certainty about the**

resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector. Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development. Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point can provide new perspectives to old industries. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.

Appropriation is key to sustained investment in the space economy- Brehm ‘15

https://uwlaw-omeka.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/original/85c099453455f8163454cd946f8762427c1a910f.pdf

Wayne White's treaty proposal creates a strong foundation for international discussion of the increasingly important issue of private property acquisition in outer space. White's well-crafted treaty proposal seeks to advance private exploration of outer space within the regulatory framework of the Outer Space Treaty and existing international space law. By creating a system in which private entities can establish real property rights in their space objects and a surrounding safety zone, the proposal incentivizes private investment of large sums into space exploration programs. Provisions which authorize the right to exclude, the right to be free from interference, the exclusive right to appropriate resources within an established safety zone, and the right to sell real property further encourage private space exploration and create strong associated incentives. 7 Private space exploration and resource extraction entities allocate substantial investments in furtherance of their space programs.0 8 Allowing such entities to mine valuable platinum group resources, as well as water and hydrogen in celestial bodies that can be used to propel deeper space exploration, not only provides a robust safety net for current space exploration entities,and but also creates a system that encourages new entities to enter into the field of private space exploration. Increased space exploration across the board would have nearly unlimited benefits in terms of societal, economical, and technological advancement.0 9 …Ultimately, a combination of an international agreement that establishes a responsible system of private property acquisition in outer space and domestic legislation that recognizes such private property rights provides a meaningful framework to encourage and facilitate the future of space exploration. Such a system would give way to further space exploration and vast economic, technological, and societal improvements. Ultimately, establishing a system of private property rights in outer space through international agreement and domestic legislation would lead to a world in which the final frontier is no longer restricted to the use and exploration of only the most technologically advanced nations. Essentially, such a system would allow for free space exploration and use by all. V. CO

Space innovation is key to solving climate change.

Greg Autry, Professor of Space Leadership at Thunderbird School of Global Management, writes in 2019:

Greg **Autry 19** (Greg Autry, Clinical Professor of Space Leadership, Policy and Business at Thunderbird School of Global Management, Tech startup founder, Researcher on entrepreneurship, commercial space and economics. Former NASA Presidential Appointee. Writer & regular Forbes contributor, 2021 Space Advocate of the Year.) Space Research Can Save the Planet—Again 7-20-2019 Foreign Policy https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/07/20/space-research-can-save-the-planet-again-climate-change-environment/ //DebateDrills TJ

Indeed, understanding the evolution of other planets' climates is essential for modeling possible outcomes on Earth. NASA probes revealed how, roughly 4 billion years ago, a runaway greenhouse gas syndrome turned Venus into a hot, hellish, and uninhabitable planet of acid rain. Orbiters, landers, and rovers continue to unravel the processes that transformed a once warm and wet Mars into a frigid, dry dust ball—and scientists even to conceive of future scenarios that might terraform it back into a livable planet. Discovering other worlds' history and imagining their future offers important visions for climate change mitigation strategies on Earth, such as mining helium from the moon itself for future clean energy.

Spinoff technologies from **space research, from GPS to semiconductor solar cells**, are already helping to reduce emissions; the efficiency gains of GPS-guided navigation shrink fuel expenditures on sea, land, and air by between 15 and 21 percent—a greater reduction than better engines or fuel changes have so far provided. Modern solar photovoltaic power also owes its existence to space. The first real customer for solar energy was the U.S. space program; applications such as the giant solar wings that power the International Space Station have continually driven improvements in solar cell performance, and NASA first demonstrated the value of the sun for powering communities on Earth by using solar in its own facilities.

Promisingly, space-based solar power stations could overcome the inconvenient truth that wind and solar will never get us anywhere near zero emissions because their output is inherently intermittent and there is, so far, no environmentally acceptable way to store their power at a global scale, even for one night. **Orbital solar power stations**, on the other hand, would **continually face the sun**, beaming clean power back through targeted radiation to Earth day or night, regardless of weather. They would also be free from clouds and atmospheric interference and therefore operate with many times the efficiency of current solar technology. Moving solar power generation away from Earth—already possible but held back by the current steep costs of lifting the materials into space—would preserve land and cultural resources from the blight of huge panel farms and **save landfills from the growing problem** of discarded old solar panels.

Sustainable energy advocates in the U.S. military and the Chinese government are actively pursuing space-based solar power, but just making solar cells damages the environment due to the **caustic chemicals employed**. Space technology offers the possibility of freeing the Earth's fragile biosphere and culturally important sites from the **otherwise unavoidable damage** caused by manufacturing and mining.

The U.S. start-up Made in Space is currently taking the first steps toward manufacturing in orbit. The company's fiber-optic cable, produced by machinery on the International Space Station, is orders of magnitude more efficient than anything made on Earth, where the heavy gravity creates tiny flaws in the material. Made in Space and others are eventually planning to build large structures, such as solar power stations, in space. As these technologies develop, **they will augment each other, bringing costs down dramatically; space manufacturing, for instance, slashes the cost of solar installations in space**.

Strong Innovation solves Extinction -- Multiple Scenarios

Matthews 18 Dylan Matthews 10-26-2018 "How to help people millions of years from now" https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good (Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University)//Re-cut by Elmer

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. **The 7.6 billion people now living**, after all, **amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future**. It's reasonable to suggest that those **quadrillions of future people have**, accordingly, **hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do**. That's the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead's 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, "On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future." It's a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It's not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned "long-termism" into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? **The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction**, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity's continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. **But** in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that **while that's certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity** (which he calls "**targeted**" **approaches** to the far future) **have to complement "broad" approaches, where instead of trying to predict what's going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future**, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. **In other words, caring about the far future doesn't mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now**. For example: **We're going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress**. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn't get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the **odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs** we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. **So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to** improve school systems — here and now — to **harness** the group economist Raj Chetty calls "lost Einsteins" (**potential innovators** who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: **improve incentives and norms in academic work** to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X "If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute," Beckstead writes. "An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards." Look at those examples again: It's just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party's platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren't that special, or at least maybe we don't have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. **If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol' do-goodery,**