## 1

**Interp: debaters may not read theoretically justified frameworks. To clarify, they must only substantively justify their framework.**

**violation: they did – that’s 1ac 3**

**[a] Ground – topic lit under 1 framework isn’t split 50/50, so debaters need phil ground to compensate for uneven split – TJFs kill phil ground as it says only 1 framework is best for debatability and moots all constructive offense – outweighs on fairness bc it’s pre-round – unequal distribution of ground controls the internal link to all in round abuse**

**[b] phil ed – kills clash on philosophies bc all that matters is theoretical legitimacy—destroys clash and argument testing on moral theories, which is unique to debate. Phil clash outweigh on education because obviously we won’t pass specific policies, but learning philosophies teaches us how to live our quotidian life. Also the only thing unique to LD:)**

**Fairness is a voter – constitutive of the judge to decide the better debater and constrains decision making. Education is a voter – only portable impact. Drop the debater to deter future abuse**

Dtd – deters future abuse

Ci – reasonability causes race to bottom and collapse anyway

No rvis – baiting – incentivizes better theory debater to bait shells which justifies infinite aff abuse

## 2

#### Omnibus spending package passes the senate now – it’s tentative – sustained bipartisanship is key to getting it over the line

BRESNAHAN et al. 3/10 @5:17 AM [John Bresnahan – Co-Founder Punchbowl News, Anna Palmer - American political journalist based in Washington, Jake Sherman - American journalist and writer. He is the co-founder of Punchbowl News, Heather Caygle – Congress Reporter for Politico, Max Cohen – Reporter at Punchbowl News, Christian Hall – Reporter at Punchbowl News, “Punchbowl News AM: How Democratic leaders whiffed, but won”, 03-10-2022, https://punchbowl.news/?p=3806]//pranav

After 10 p.m. last night, the House passed a $1.5 trillion omnibus spending package that will keep federal agencies open until Sept. 30. The measure now goes onto the Senate, which is expected to pass it as well, although there may be some opposition from conservative Republicans.

The House has also approved a short-term funding bill that gives the Senate until March 15 to complete work on the omnibus. The Senate will take this up today.

The omnibus package includes more than $13 billion in military and humanitarian funding for Ukraine, which has been invaded by tens of thousands of Russian troops. U.S. aid will go to Eastern European nations dealing with more than 2 million Ukrainians who have fled the bloody Russian onslaught, as well as NATO allies now facing a renewed security threat.

#### Moves to make media more objective collapse bipartisanship – Republicans hate the plan

Brown & Solender ’21 [Abram Brown - senior editor at Forbes, Andrew Solender - senior news reporter covering politics, “Social Media Reform Appears Stalled In Congress—Even As Zuckerberg And Dorsey Prepare To Testify About It”, 03-25-2021, Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/abrambrown/2021/03/25/section-230-social-media-facebook-twitter-zuckerberg-dorsey-congress/?sh=177ff87750fe]//pranav

After the mob swept through the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6, congressional Democrats seemed poised to seize the moment and push through a set of long-sought reforms with bipartisan support: alterations to Section 230, the bedrock federal legislation that shields tech companies from liability for what’s posted on their sites and undergirds much of the online economy. The riot had been born, planned and fed by the internet—President Trump himself contributing to the online melee—and lawmakers saw an opportunity to finally hold platforms more accountable for what’s said on social media. But momentum on Section 230 has ebbed in the new Congress, even as three major tech CEOs—Mark Zuckerberg, Jack Dorsey and Sundar Pichai—are scheduled to testify Thursday before a House subcommittee taking a look at the issue. In fact, it’s unclear whether anything will be done about it until after the midterm elections, say both Democratic and Republican leaders who have been champions of Section 230 reform, despite the existence of several legislative proposals for change. “Right now, there’s not a bill out there I could support,” says Ron Wyden, a Democrat from Oregon who co-wrote Section 230 a quarter century ago and has advocated for modifying it. Across the aisle, frequent social media critic Sen. Josh Hawley throws up his hands at the concept. During the current Congress, “there won’t be anything meaningful” done with Section 230, the Missouri Republican says. When Wyden helped get Section 230 passed in 1996, it established an important principle that would allow web companies to flourish: They wouldn’t be held liable for what’s posted on their sites, a particularly important protection for companies reliant on user content like Dorsey’s Twitter, Zuckerberg’s Facebook and Pichai’s Alphabet, the parent company of Google and YouTube. It’s allowed them to grow into multi-multi-billion-dollar businesses—and in the cases of Facebook and Alphabet, two of the largest in the world, which together are worth a collective $2.1 trillion. But there’s been a growing movement over the past few years to alter Section 230—or possibly repeal it entirely. Democrats such as Sen. Richard Blumenthal have promoted the idea of modifying Section 230 to place more burden on the companies to self-regulate and take down offensive or harmful content. Republicans have postulated regulatory change as well, for an entirely different reason. They think platforms like Facebook and Twitter already over-filter content, unfairly weeding out conservative voices. Nearly a dozen bills have been introduced over the past two years aimed at adjusting the legislation. President Trump personally took up the mission, most noisily at the end of his term when he vetoed a bill containing the $740 billion defense budget partly because it didn’t include the Section 230 repeal he requested. (Congress overrode the president, prompting, ironically, one of his final tweets: “Our Republican Senate just missed the opportunity to get rid of Section 230, which gives unlimited power to Big Tech companies. Pathetic!!!”) President Biden, meanwhile, told The New York Times in January 2020 the legislation “should be revoked immediately.” He hasn’t had anything else to say on the subject publicly, suggesting his position may be drifting back toward his party’s less strident stance. (A White House spokesperson didn’t respond to a request for comment.) As political pressure has mounted, tech companies have increasingly conceded the need to better regulate themselves. Social media has also found itself in Congress’ crosshairs—placed there during hearings like Thursday’s before the House energy and commerce subcommittee on communications and technology—forcing Zuckerberg and Dorsey to move away from initial reluctance to police their sites. “A decade ago, social media was nascent. As more people joined, the conversations became more robust and the importance of social media—and the scrutiny of it—became far greater,” says Colin Crollin, Twitter’s former public policy chief. In the past year, Facebook and Twitter have added fact-check labels and hubs of well-vetted information around important topics like voting and Covid-19 and, most notably, expelled Trump after his comments on their platforms helped incite the Jan. 6 violence. Zuckerberg and Dorsey now seem resigned to their fate and have signaled an increasing acceptance of the inevitability of reform during past congressional testimony and other public statements. Despite the hearing, Washington appears to be stalled out on the issue. Unsurprisingly, Republicans place the blame on their liberal counterparts, complaining that Democrats won’t join forces to fight and risk cozy relationships with the technorati. “I don’t expect Congressional Democrats to be willing to stand up to Big Tech,” says Sen. Ted Cruz, of Texas, who has made monologues on this subject a staple. Just as unsurprisingly, Democrats say much the same about Republican peers, characterizing them as unwilling to work productively on the matter. “There’s not a lot of good faith,” says Brian Schatz, the Democratic Senator from Hawaii who, along with Sen. John Thune (R-S.D.), has authored the PACT Act, which would give the government more legal tools to regulate social media companies and require platforms to make their content moderation practices more accessible to users. But there’s more going on here than typical partisan bickering. Most fundamentally, changes to internet regulation appear to be nowhere on the top list of priorities for the Biden White House or the Democrat-led Congress. Each has staked out the pandemic and the economy as the most pressing agenda items. And mucking around with federal regulations that affect the fortunes of some of the country’s biggest political donors may not hold the appeal it seemed to even two months ago, as both Democrats and Republicans vie for control in next year’s midterm election of House and Senate chambers the Democrats currently hold by the narrowest of margins. “Democrats are recovering from four years of Trump, and they have two goals: to heal America and to win races up and down the ballot while retaining control of the House and Senate,” says Cooper Teboe, a Democratic fundraising strategist in Silicon Valley. “While there are legitimate concerns with social media and how it intersects with democracy, I don't think a single voter is going to the polls with this single issue in mind.” Even if Congress and Biden had fewer pressing priorities, Democrats and Republicans don’t agree on what the problem is, making it more difficult to find bipartisan consensus. “Many on the political right want platforms to stop taking down so much user content, many on the political left want platforms to take down more user content. And while both of those goals could be promoted by certain changes to Section 230, there is no one change that will serve both of those goals,” says Daphne Keller, a director at Stanford’s Cyber Policy Center.

#### Bill is key to solve a laundry list of existential crises – environment, readiness, Ukraine

Popli 3/9 [Nik, Journalist for TIME, “The House Just Passed a Massive Spending Bill. Here’s What's In It”, 03-09-2022, TIME, https://time.com/6156432/spending-bill-ukraine-whats-in/]//pranav

The House passed a $1.5 trillion spending package Wednesday night that sends further military and humanitarian assistance to Ukraine and funds the federal government through the end of September. The spending bill increases funding for the military and nearly every non-defense agency, with federal domestic spending set to reach $715 billion and defense funding $782 billion for the remainder of this fiscal year. The House passed the spending measure in two separate votes, with the portion containing defense spending passing by a vote of 361-69, and the non-defense portion passing by a vote of 260-171. The bill was slated for passage Wednesday morning, but stalled after multiple Democrats refused to allow Congress to offset $15.6 billion in new COVID-19 aid with previously approved but unspent relief funds. To get the bill over the finish line, Democratic House leaders removed the COVID-19 aid provision—which sought to replenish federal health programs that provide tests, treatments, and vaccines—and now instead hope to pass a separate bill on COVID-19 relief funding next week. The omnibus bill now heads to the Senate, where lawmakers in the upper chamber may continue negotiating elements of the bill before it heads to President Joe Biden’s desk. Senate Minority Whip John Thune, a Republican from South Dakota, said Tuesday that he expects a “fairly robust” and “bipartisan vote” from his colleagues, in large part due to the urgency of getting assistance to Ukraine, signaling it may be possible for the bill to clear the Senate quickly. Here are some of the current bill’s most significant provisions. $13.6 billion for aid to Ukraine The package delivers nearly $14 billion in emergency funding to help address the emerging humanitarian crisis in Ukraine and shore up the country’s defense against Russia, including $4 billion for humanitarian aid, $3.5 billion for sending new military equipment and $3 billion for deploying U.S. troops to the region. The largest segment of humanitarian aid—$2.65 billion to the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)—goes toward providing emergency food assistance, health care and urgent support for vulnerable populations and communities in Ukraine. USAID will also fund an additional $120 million in initiatives to provide support for activists, journalists and independent media to help promote public messaging and accountability for Russian human rights violations. $1.4 billion to the State Department will fund migration and refugee assistance to provide support for refugee outflows from Ukraine. More than 2 million Ukrainians have fled their country in the 13 days since Russia began its invasion, according to a tracker from the U.N. refugee agency. $1.76 billion will go towards helping Ukraine respond to macroeconomic and governmental needs such as protecting its electrical grid from disruption. The legislation also allows Biden to transfer an additional $3 billion in excess defense equipment to Ukraine and other regional U.S. allies if needed. The Biden Administration originally called on lawmakers to approve $10 billion in aid to Ukraine, but bipartisan efforts and staunch support from the House led that figure to grow in the face of a worsening Russian onslaught and pleas from Ukraine’s President Volodymyr Zelensky for more equipment. $1.45 billion for southern border response Republicans won a few concessions in the bill—notably increased military spending—but they also secured more than $23 billion for two key federal agencies that oversee immigration: Customs Enforcement (ICE) and Border Protection (CBP). $1.45 billion will go towards managing the volume of migrants arriving at the southern border, including $1.06 billion to CBP for processing facilities, migrant medical care, and transportation. $30 million will fund new body-worn cameras and video recording equipment for Border Patrol stations, and $72.4 million will be invested in new aircraft and aircraft sensors. U.S. border officials processed migrants at the southwest border 153,941 times in January, according to CBP data provided to a federal court in Texas, marking a 14% decrease from the previous month. $4 billion for rural development programs After 2021’s bipartisan infrastructure bill provided a $65 billion investment in rural infrastructure to increase broadband access, the latest spending measure invests an additional $4 billion for rural development programs. Of that amount, $550 million will go towards the expansion of broadband service and $450 million for the ReConnect program, which provides loans and grants to cover the cost of broadband construction and improvement. The White House estimates that more than 30 million Americans live in areas that lack broadband infrastructure to provide minimally acceptable speeds. Additional spending will be invested in basic utility infrastructure, including $1.45 billion for rural water and waste program loans and over $653 million in grants to provide safe drinking water and sanitary waste disposal systems. $24.6 billion for student financial assistance Biden called for sweeping higher education reforms during his State of the Union address on March 1, including a $2,000 Pell Grant expansion and additional HBCU and community college funding. The spending bill partly accomplishes these goals, increasing the maximum Pell Grant by $400—the largest increase in the maximum award in more than a decade—and authorizing $363 million in HBCU funding. In total, the bill provides $24.6 billion for federal student aid programs, an increase of $35 million from the previous year. Climate change investments The bill provides record funding for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy at $3.2 billion, $338 million more than the previous year—but less than what House Democrats had proposed. The funding will support the production of clean and affordable energy sources. An additional $78.3 million will fund the Department of Agriculture’s efforts to address the impacts of climate change in farming and rural communities, including research on clean energy technologies and greenhouse gas reductions. NASA’s Science Mission Directorate will also receive $7.6 billion—an increase of $313.4 million compared to last year—to enable better scientific research on a variety of topics, including Earth’s changing climate.

**Warming causes extinction & turns every impact – no adaptation & each degree is worse**

**Krosofsky ’21** [Andrew, Green Matters Journalist, “How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction”, Green Matters, 03-11-2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction]//pranav

Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species,** humankind included. In fact, **the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet**. **Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won’t be able to handle long-term**. Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. **As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, **these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions**. The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, **unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak.** **The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming.** Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification**. **This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef**, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth’s plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. We won’t try and sugarcoat things, humanity’s own prospects aren’t looking that great either. According to The Conversation, **our species has just under a decade left to get our CO₂ emissions under control. If we don’t cut those emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to potentially catastrophic levels. It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense.** The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, **but it will mean less food, less water, and increased hardship across the world — especially in low-income areas and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires**.

## 3

#### Affirmatives must tell negatives what the aff is at least 30 minutes before –

#### Testing – they make it impossible to adequately test the aff without adequate pre-round prep – favors newness over engagement – disclosure solves their offense – you can break new affs, you just have to disclose the plan text personally or disclose it on the wiki before round

#### I asked – screenshot in doc.

#### Negative ground – they make negative ground concessionary to the goodwill of the aff and results in extremist generics that heavily skew ground in favor of the aff

1. It’s the same hoops indigenous scholarship has to go through in academia to get on an equal playing field which proves it’s an independent link to the k.

## Case

### Underview

1ar theory stuff –

Reject 1ar theory – a) late breaking b) dta on 1ar theory solves

No infinite abuse – onyly 7 minutes – literally no reasonability justification in the 1ac – just asserted to give it to them which is nonsensical

Presumption/permissibility

1] negate unless 2nr goes for alt advocacy

2] assume things are false

30 speaks – speaks are arbitrary and 30 speaks is the only nonarbitrary way to signal good will other than the ballot

Text: The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best proves the desirability of the resolution by comparing the world of the affirmative to the world of the negative. To clarify, it’s comparative worlds.

Prefer:

[1] Ground – Truth testing forecloses core neg ground like counterplans and K alts bc they don’t prove the resolution false but say something else is better which kills fairness and puts affs permanently ahead.

[2] Hijack – Truth testing collapses – we can only determine the truth or falsity of something by comparing the world in which it’s true to a world in which it’s false

[3] Advocacy Skills – Comparative worlds forces advocating for real world advocacies which increases policy education. Tons of messed up things we can’t fix without advocating for something - comes first – only terminal impact in debate.

[4] Weighability – Can’t compare between multiple NIBs and aprioris – means only comparative worlds allows ways for the judge to make a decision.

### Framework

Standard is minimizing existential risk – extinction o/w

#### Even the most conservative estimates prove reducing existential risk outweighs all other impacts, regardless of probability – actively prioritize our calculus since you are cognitively biased against it – outweighs under their offense- cx proves that death is bad

Whittlestone 17 – (Jess Whittlestone, PhD in Behavioural Science and has worked as a policy consultant for government, specialising in security and foreign policy. She also has experience as a freelance journalist for a number of online magazines, including Quartz, Vox, and Aeon. Before her PhD, she studied Maths and Philosophy at Oxford, and played a key role in developing 80,000 Hours' coaching process and research. Currently, Jess is a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the Leverhulme Centre for the Future of Intelligence at Cambridge, “The Long-Term Future”, Effective Altruism, 11-16-17, Available Online at <https://www.effectivealtruism.org/articles/cause-profile-long-run-future/>, accessed 12-4-18, HKR-AM)

The number of people alive today pales in comparison to the number who could exist in the future. It may therefore be extremely important to ensure that human civilization flourishes far into the future, enjoying fulfilling lives free of suffering.

There are a number of ways we might work to ensure a positive future for humanity. We could work to better understand and prevent extinction risks - catastrophic events that have the potential to destroy all life on this planet.[1] We may want to focus on the broader category of existential risks- events that could dramatically and irreversibly curtail humanity’s potential.[2] Or we might focus on increasing the chance that the lives of our descendants are positive in other ways: for example, improving democracy or the ability of institutions to make good decisions.

Attempts to shape the long-term future seem highly neglected relative to the problems we face today. There are fewer incentives to address longer-term problems, and they can also be harder for us to take seriously.

It is, of course, hard to be certain about the impact of our actions on the very long-term future. However, it does seem that there are things we can do - and given the vast scale we are talking about, these actions could therefore have an enormous impact in expectation.

This profile sets out why you might want to focus your altruistic efforts on the long-term future - and why you might not. You may be particularly inclined to focus on this if you think we face serious existential threats in the next century, and if you’re comfortable accepting a reasonable amount of uncertainty about the impact you are having, especially in the short-term.

The case for the long-term future as a target of altruism

The case for focusing on the long-term future can be summarised as follows:

The long-term future has enormous potential for good or evil: our descendants could live for billions or trillions of years, and have very high-quality lives;

It seems likely there are things we can do today that will affect the long-term future in non-negligible ways;

Possible ways of shaping the long-term future are currently highly neglected by individuals and society;

Given points 1 to 3 above, actions aimed at shaping the long-term future seem to have extremely high expected value, higher than any actions aiming for more near-term benefits.

Below we discuss each part of this argument in more detail.

The long-term future has enormous potential

Civilisation could continue for a billion years, until the Earth becomes uninhabitable.[3] It’s hard to say how likely this is, but it certainly seems plausible - and putting less than, say, a 1% chance on this possibility seems overconfident.[4] You may disagree that 1% is a reasonable lower bound here, but changing the figure by an order of magnitude or two would still yield an extremely impressive result. And even if civilisation only survives for another million years, that still amounts to another ~50,000 generations of people, i.e. trillions of future lives.[5]

If our descendants survive for long enough, then they are likely to advance in ways we cannot currently imagine - even someone living a few hundred years ago could not possibly have imagined the technological advances we’ve made today. It is possible they might even develop technology enabling them to reach and colonise planets outside our solar system, and survive well beyond a billion years.[6]

Let’s say that if we survive until the end of the Earth’s lifespan, there is a 1% chance of space colonisation. This would make the overall probability of survival beyond Earth 1 in 10,000 (1% chance of surviving to a billion years, multiplied by a 1% chance of surviving further given that). This sounds incredibly low, but suppose that space colonisation could allow our descendants to survive up to 100 trillion years[7]. This suggests we could have up to 1/10,000 x 100 trillion years = 10 billion expected years of civilisation ahead of us.

If we expect life in the future to be, on average, about as good as the present, then this would make the whole of the future about 100 million times more important than everything that has happened in the last 100 years. In fact, it seems like there could be more people in the future with better lives than those living today: economic, social, and technological progress could enable us to cure diseases, lift people out of poverty, and better solve other problems. It also seems possible that people in the future will be more altruistic than people alive today[8] - which also makes it more likely that they will be motivated to create a happy and valuable world.

However, it’s precisely because of this enormous potential that it’s so important to ensure that things go as well as possible. The loss of potential would be enormous if we end up on a negative trajectory. It could result in a great deal of suffering or the end of life.[9] And just as the potential to solve many of the world’s problems is growing, threats seem to be growing too. In particular, advanced technologies and increasing interconnectedness pose great risks.[10]

There are things we can do today that could affect the long-term future

There are a number of things we could work on today that seem likely to influence the long-term future:

Reducing extinction risks: We could reduce the risk of catastrophic climate change by putting in place laws and regulations to cut carbon emissions. We could reduce the risks from new technologies by investing in research to ensure their safety. Alternatively, we could work to improve global cooperation so that we are better able to deal with unforeseen risks that might arise.

Changing the values of a civilisation: Values tend to be stable in societies,[11] so attempts to shift values, whilst difficult, could have long-lasting effects. Some forms of value change, like increasing altruism, seem robustly good, and may be a way of realizing the very best possible futures. However, spreading poorly considered values could be harmful.

Reducing suffering risks: Historically, technological advances have enabled great welfare improvements (e.g. through modern agriculture and medicine), but also some of the greatest sources of present-day suffering (e.g. factory farming). To prevent the worst risks from new technologies, we could improve global cooperation and work on specific problems like preventing worst-case outcomes from artificial intelligence.

“Speeding up” development: Boosting technological innovation or scientific progress could have a lasting “speed up” effect on the entire future, making all future benefits happen slightly earlier than they otherwise would have. Curing a disease just a few years earlier could save millions of lives, for example. (That said, it’s not clear whether speeding up development is good or bad for existential risk - developing new technologies faster might help us to mitigate certain threats, but pose new risks of their own.)

Ripple effects of our ordinary actions: Improvements in health not only benefit individuals directly but allow them to be more economically successful, meaning that society and other individuals have to invest less in supporting them. In aggregate, this could easily have substantial knock-on effects on the productivity of society, which could affect the future.

Other ways we might create positive trajectory changes: These include improving education, science, and political systems.

Paul Christiano also points out that even if opportunities to shape the long-term future with any degree of certainty do not exist today, they may well exist in the future. Investing in our own current capacity could have an indirect but large impact by improving our ability to take such opportunities when they do arise. Similarly, we can do research today to learn more about how we might be able to impact the long-term future.

The long-term future is neglected, especially relative to its importance

Attempts to shape the long-term future are neglected by individuals, organisations and governments.

One reason is that there is little incentive to focus on far-off, uncertain issues compared to more certain, immediate ones. As 80,000 Hours put it, “Future generations matter, but they can’t vote, they can’t buy things, they can’t stand up for their interests.”

Problems faced by future generations are also more uncertain and more abstract, making it harder for us to care about them. There is a well-established phenomenon called temporal discounting, which means that we tend to give less weight to outcomes that are far in the future. This may explain our tendency to neglect long-term risks and problems. For example, it’s a large part of why we seem to have such difficulty tackling climate change.

Generally, there are diminishing returns to additional work in an area. This means that the neglectedness of the long-term future makes it more likely to be high impact.

Efforts to shape the long-term future could be extremely high in expected value

Even if the chance of our actions influencing the long-term trajectory of humanity is relatively low, there are extremely large potential benefits, which mean that these actions could still have a very high expected value. For example, decreasing the probability of human extinction by just one in a million could result in an additional 1,000 to 10,000 expected years of civilisation (using earlier assumptions).[12]

Compare this to actions we could take to improve the lives of people alive today, without looking at longer-run effects. A dramatic victory such as curing the most common and deadly diseases, or ending all war, might only make the current time period (~100 years) about twice as good as otherwise.[13] Though this seems like an enormous success, given the calculations above, decreasing the probability of human extinction would be 10 or 100 times better in expectation.

We might want to adjust this naive estimate downwards slightly, however, given uncertainty about some of the assumptions that go into it - we could be wrong about the probability of humanity surviving far into the future, or about the value of the future (if we think that future flourishing might have diminishing value, for example.) However, even if we think these estimates should be adjusted downwards substantially, we might very conservatively imagine that reducing the likelihood of existential risk by one in a million only equates to 100 expected years of civilization. This still suggests that the value of working to reduce existential risk is comparable to the value of the biggest victories we could imagine in the current time period - and so well worth taking seriously.

#### Complacency goes neg – academics and the wider public actively discount the probability AND magnitude of existential risks – only giving them extra attention in debate solves – that means our impact outweighs even in we lose the rest of framing

Javorsky 18 [Emilia Javorsky is a Boston-based physician-scientist focused on the invention, development and commercialization of new medical therapies. She also leads an Artificial Intelligence in Medicine initiative with The Future Society at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. Why Human Extinction Needs a Marketing Department. January 15, 2018. https://www.xconomy.com/boston/2018/01/15/why-human-extinction-needs-a-marketing-department/]

Experts at Oxford University and elsewhere have estimated that the risk of a global human extinction event this century—or at least of an event that wipes out 10 percent or more of the world’s population— is around 1 in 10. The most probable culprits sending us the way of the dinosaur are mostly anthropogenic risks, meaning those created by humans. These include climate change, nuclear disaster, and more emerging risks such as artificial intelligence gone wrong (by accident or nefarious intent) and bioterrorism. A recent search of the scientific literature through ScienceDirect for “human extinction” returned a demoralizing 157 results, compared to the 1,627 for “dung beetle.” I don’t know about you, but this concerns me. Why is there so little research and action on existential risks (risks capable of rendering humanity extinct)?

A big part of the problem is a lack of awareness about the real threats we face and what can be done about them. When asked to estimate the chance of an extinction event in the next 50 years, U.S. adults in surveys reported chances ranging from 1 in 10 million to 1 in 100, certainly not 10 percent. The awareness and engagement issues extend to the academic community as well, where a key bottleneck is a lack of talented people studying existential risks. Developing viable risk mitigation strategies will require widespread civic engagement and concerted research efforts. Consequently, there is an urgent need to improve the communication of the magnitude and importance of existential risks. The first step is getting an audience to pay attention to this issue.

### LBL

[1] Weighability – pain and pleasure can be aggregated but a violation of freedom is unquantifiable without material utilitarian impacts. That freezes action – affirming or negating can’t happen under Kant if either causes a violation of freedom, so it can’t serve as a guide to action

[2] Culpability – wills are unverifiable – I can kill someone and lie and say my will was not that, but util gives material impacts you’re culpable for. Culpability outweighs – binds us to actions since ethics is a guide to action

[3] Begs the question of freedom – conceptions of what is freedom and domination require experience, such as evaluating the ethicality of hate speech as violence or freedom

[4] Hijack – we reflect on past violations of freedom to act morally in the future ie I reflect ont eh experience of stealing to change in the future, which is based off experience.

[7] Shmagency objection – begs the question of why it matters that I want to be an agent – there’s no external impact so it doesn’t matter

[8] ought-ought gap – no link between practical reason existing and maxims needing to be universalizable

[9] Experience hijacks reason – we only understand maxims because of our experiences with the maxim i.e. 2+2=4 is only true if I learned it, also indicts universalization since its impossible because we have different experiences

The Performativity arg -

[1] Fallacy of origin – just because you need freedom to read args doesn’t mean we should maximize it – oxygen is required to read my args but we don’t maximize oxygen

[2] Conflates reason with practical reason – just because we think about action doesn’t mean I have to respect ability to act

[3] Turn -we use experience debate. We only give rebuttal redos of speeches that we had a bad experience with

The consequentialism indicts –

Overview -

[1] Empirically Denied – politicians and people can still pass policies with consequential logic – we can still have calc

[2] Grant me a really low threshold for answering these args they are blippy and not warranted.

The Induction arg -

[1] Probability solves – even if we can’t predict everything exactly, we can have a general idea

[3] Absurd – if I drop a pencil, I can tell it’ll fall, causal changes can still exist

The Infinite Calc arg-

[1] We don’t have to calculate about how long to calc for – solves, just calculate for as long as it takes to solve the issue

The infinite consequences arg -

[1] No, terminal impacts exist: we can choose to stop looking after some terminal impact like extinction.

The intentions argument -

[1] No intent-foresight distinction — if we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action