## Condo

### Framework Interpretations

Counter-interp---affs must justify their religious tradition prior to fiated implementation.

#### Framework---the ballot is a referendum on the plan’s desirability

### Predictability---1NR

#### ‘Resolved’ means

b: to reduce by analysis

That’s Webster’s ’22 [Merriam Webster; 2022, updated annually; English Language Dictionary; Merriam Webster’s, “resolved,” https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolved]

#### ‘Should’ requires a defense of the 1AC’s theory.

Lambertson ’9 [Floyd Wesley; August 18; Professor of Speech at the University of Northern Iowa; Quarterly Journal of Speech, “The meaning of the word ‘should’ in a question of policy,” vol. 28]

"In a question of policy—or any other question—the word 'should' means 'that the policy advocated is necessary and desirable; that 'this house' commit itself to that policy, principle, or theory. But also, as a matter of common sense, it implies to some extent the 'could' and the 'would.' What is the sense of discussing at length the 'should' of a principle if it is not feasible, practicable, or attainable? In other words it is necessary for the affirmative to justify the policy or theory (the 'should') and also to some extent to set out— at least suggest—the technique of establishing it." Lew Sarett, Northwestern University.

### Consequentialism---1NC

#### Use virtue ethics.

Fierke ’22 [Karin; 2022; Professor in the School of International Relations at the University of St Andrews; Snapshots from Home: Mind, Action and Strategy in an Uncertain World, “Mind/No-Mind,” Ch. 2]

The ethical paradox is expressed in a puzzle from the Zen Buddhist Dogen. The puzzle revolves around the need to choose between culling a population of deer that have grown too large or letting them live, knowing that they would harm the ecology of a small Scottish island which was being devastated by the overpopulation of deer. What is the ethical answer to the need for action in a context where loss of life will be the outcome of any decision? James (2004) argues that the Zen Buddhist could be justified in choosing to cull the deer if she did so out of compassion for the deer or out of concern to preserve the island’s ecosystem. Balance is the key issue here. There are plenty of examples of death and harm in nature and, in this respect, death, the culmination of thermodynamic decay, is a part of life. There is, however, a difference between death as a part of the natural balance that restores itself and death from violence for instrumental ends and profit.

Modern ethics in the West has been primarily concerned with providing rules or first principles that set out how we ought to act. Acts can then be measured against the rule to determine the degree of correspondence. Such practices will not be effective in a context of radical uncertainty. If the defining feature of modern ethics has been a concern with what is right, Zen Buddhism, according to James (2004), represents a form of virtue ethics, which has a counterpart among the ancient Greeks. Virtue ethics is concerned less with good outcomes than with what constitutes a good life, or in the case of Buddhism, an enlightened life. An enlightened life might include qualities of acting mindfully, with compassion and integrity. Paradoxically, the self that seeks the good life is empty of essence, impermanent and, in the context of this snapshot, engaged in violence and war. A Buddhist virtue ethics provides practical wisdom about acting differently that flows from seeing the world differently, free of distorting attachments. Detaching from one’s separateness and assumed intrinsic identity comes with a potential to be more selfless and compassionate. The path can’t be encapsulated in a set of rules but is instead developed through skill and practice, and not least through calming the mind and developing the power of concentration.

#### Endorsing kuśala creates profound value as an act of personal meditation regardless of consequences---infinite value is impossible to consequentially evaluate and cultivating relationality is precious.

Hershock ’21 [Peter; 2021; director of the Asian Studies Development Program at the East-West Center; Buddhism and Intelligent Technology: Toward a More Humane Future, “Buddhism: A Philosophical Repertoire,” p. 38-41]

To embody wisdom and enact moral clarity requires attentive mastery. We will later discuss the roles played by focus- and flexibility-oriented meditation practices in realizing Buddhist ideals of personal presence. Here, anticipating critical engagement with the dynamics of the attention economy, it is enough to stress that attention training is integral to the processes of physical, emotional, and intellectual dehabituation that are needed to be freely responsive. The Pali and Sanskrit term for attention, manasikāra, simply means awareness that is concentrated or resolutely focused. This implies that one can be attentive with different degrees of concentration or focus. We can devote half our attention to cooking and half to conversing. But in addition to how much attention we are paying to our situation, Buddhism makes a distinction qualitatively between being attentive in ways that bind us to or that free us from conflict, trouble, and suffering.

It is possible, even without training, to be keenly attentive to our present circumstances. Young children avidly awaiting the ice-cream cone being prepared for them and adolescents in the throes of video game ecstasy are both clearly capable of highly concentrated attention. What is not so clear is whether they are freely attentive or compulsively so. Without training, our attention is readily and involuntarily attracted or distracted. In particular, we are especially susceptible to unwisely having our attention captured by the superficial, craving-inducing aspects of things (ayoniśomanasikāra). This, as we will see, is crucial to the workings of the new attention economy being realized through intelligent technology. Yet, with training, our attention can also be wisely concentrated—directed freely and intentionally in ways that are both sensitive to the interdependent origins of things and consistent with truing relational patterns (yoniśomanasikāra).

To the extent that Buddhist ethics consists in the goalless, nirvana-oriented practice of integrally cultivating wisdom, moral clarity, and attentive mastery, it is hard to place readily or without remainder into one of the standard categories of ethics grounded on definitive and generalized judgments regarding personal character (virtue ethics), duties (deontological ethics), or the consequences of actions (utilitarianism). Given Buddhism’s ethical insistence on pairing wisdom with compassion, a closer fit might be care ethics, with its emphasis on situationally apt attentive responsiveness. But Buddhist compassion is not reducible to the natural inclinations to care about and for others that are invoked by care ethics, much less to the abstractly mandated responses to suffering that are typically framed with reference to personal virtues or duties, or derived through a consequentialist calculus of harms and happiness. Rather, Buddhist compassion is exemplified in the ongoing intentional practice of dissolving the karmic causes and conditions of shared conflict, trouble, and suffering—a necessarily improvisational labor of shared predicament resolution in steadfast pursuit of increasingly liberating relational outcomes and opportunities.

What makes Buddhist ethics so difficult to place (and, potentially, so relevant today) is the fact that it offers only an open-ended training program—cultivating wisdom, moral clarity, and attentive mastery—and a set of “cardinal points” for discriminating qualitatively among relational outcomes and opportunities. Especially in early Buddhist contexts, the term used for the “true north” of liberating presence on the Buddhist “moral compass” was kuśala. Often translated as skillful or wholesome or good, kuśala actually functions as a superlative. Rather than connoting something that is good as opposed to mediocre or bad, it connotes virtuosity.

The ethical significance of aiming at kuśala outcomes and opportunities is neatly illustrated in an early Buddhist text, the Sakkapañha Sutta (DN 21). Like most early Buddhist suttas or recounted teachings of the Buddha, the Sakkapañha Sutta is structured as a dialogue. In this case, the Buddha is asked to explain how it can be that human beings generally want to live in harmony and without strife, and seem to have the resources for doing so, they almost always fail and end up embroiled in anger, hatred, and conflict. At first, the Buddha offers his standard psychological account of conflict and social strife as typically being rooted in jealousy and greed, which are in turn dependent on having fixed likes and dislikes, and these on being caught by craving forms of desires and tendencies to dwell on things. But this entire edifice of conditions, he finally explains, ultimately rests on conceptual proliferation (Pali: papañca; Skt: prapañca): compulsively dividing up what is present into ever more finely wrought units and relations among them, producing ever more tightly woven nets of fixed associations and judgments that at once support and entrap the craving- and conflict-defined self. To bring an end to conflict, interpersonal discord, and the suffering they entail, one must uproot prapañca.

When the Buddha is asked how we can stop engaging in conceptual proliferation and enact our intentions to live in peace and harmony, he significantly directs attention away from “inner” psychological conditions to “outer” personal and social consequences. To cut through prapañca, he says, we should continually evaluate our conduct (mental, verbal, and physical) in terms of whether it is bringing about kuśala or akuśala outcomes and opportunities, continuing on courses of actions only if they both decrease akuśala eventualities and increase those that are kuśala. Given that kuśala is a superlative, this means that resolving conflicts and freeing ourselves from trouble and suffering is not simply a matter of refraining from doing bad things and instead doing or being either harmlessly mediocre or what is considered good by current standards. These are all akuśala. Freeing ourselves from conflict, trouble, and suffering requires going beyond current conceptions of good and evil, realizing virtuosically shared presence with and for others. The course correction required is resolutely qualitative.

The aim of Buddhist ethics is to foster the cultivation of wisdom, moral clarity, and attentive mastery, establishing and then continuously enhancing commitments to and capacities for thinking, speaking, and acting as needed to realize superlative or virtuosic (kuśala) relational dynamics. The purpose of ethical deliberation is not to discover or devise absolute or universal standards of conduct. Just as virtuosic musical performances set new standards of musicianship, kuśala ethical conduct sets ever new standards of ethical excellence. A karmic ethics of compassionate virtuosity is an ethics of doing better at what we are already doing best, evaluating value systems and the ways that they are embodied personally and institutionally to realize ways of life that are progressively conducive to relating freely.

#### Consistent applications of virtue ethics make us compassionate.

Long ’21 [William; 2021; Professor of Political Science at Georgia State University; A Buddhist Approach to International Relations, “A Buddhist Alternative,” Ch. 6]

In addition to revolutionary changes in the physical sciences, the life sciences too have made remarkable new discoveries that challenge our thinking about human nature as irreversibly self-interested and expand the possibilities for considering our cooperative potential and corresponding social arrangements. Until relatively recently, the prevailing view in neuroscience was that the brain contained all its neurons at birth, and the number and circuitry of these neurons were set within the first few years of life. Scientists believed that the only lifelong brain changes were minor alterations in synaptic (interneuronal) connections and accelerating cell death with aging. Social scientists in the Western tradition assumed that this relatively fixed brain was, by nature, first and always primarily self-interested and self-serving.

In the 1990s, however, neuroscientists discovered that the brain continues to generate new neurons throughout life (neurogenesis) and that new and existing neurons undergo structural and functional changes in their circuitry in response to their environments, by training and experience (neuroplasticity). Contrary to what was once believed, the brain is highly dynamic (Eriksson et al. 1998). When referring to changes in the brain, it is important to distinguish between gross morphology and cellular structure and function. The overall structure and pattern of brain development is under genetic control and does not change markedly. But our 35,000 genes are not up to the job of prescribing the wiring for the brain’s 100 trillion or more synapses. These connections are shaped by our ongoing experiences. It is at this cellular level that the brain is remarkably plastic. Neuroplasticity refers to altering connections in the brain, the strengthening, withering, or rerouting of synaptic connections.

Neuroplasticity is more than mere learning or storing a memory. The brain is far more flexible than that. It can make wholesale topographical reorganizations throughout life (Elbert et al. 1995). For example, experiments demonstrate that some brain areas that were thought to be “hardwired” for one function can in response to injury and adaptive effort, take on a totally different function, what scientists call cross-modal functional plasticity. Altering connections in the brain in a way that strengthens the efficacy of a neuronal circuit over the long term is the essence of neuroplasticity.

How does the brain accomplish these adaptive feats? Various new technologies are giving us a glimpse of this process. These new technologies are illuminating the neural correlates for specific adaptations wrought through repeated experiences. These technologies can also show us the brain areas and patterns of electrochemical activation associated with a mental process. In discovering and observing the link between brain circuitry and mental states, some scientists are also suggesting that the causal connection between brain and mind works in both directions (Lutz et al. 2004). Specifically, they offer intriguing new evidence to suggest that the processes of brain wiring and rewiring may be shaped by mental (nonphysical) events. This work reveals that it is not just experience that molds the brain. Rather, changes in brain circuitry are generated only when behavior is specifically attended to. Attention (mindfulness), is required for use-dependent brain changes. In fact, imagined physical movements, if repeated with concentration, can produce the same synaptic changes as actual repetitive body movements (Schwartz and Begley 2002; Slotnick 2004). Similarly, mental imagery correlates with the activation of the same brain areas as those associated with the actual perception of the imagined object. In short, mental force appears to express itself through the brain, but it is not reducible to the brain.

Some neuroscientists began looking at the brain activity (“brain state”) and cognitive and neural characteristics (“brain traits”) of meditators to better understand the immediate and long-term effects of focused awareness. These studies produced preliminary evidence for the possibility that mental training may alter brain activity, shape the physical brain, and affect human behavior. Early work by Richard Davidson, Antoine Lutz, and others found that sustained thoughts activated certain neuronal pathways in the brain associated with the regulation of positive affect (like compassion), reduced negative thoughts and feelings such as anxiety and depression, and subdued self-referential thoughts (See Davidson et al. 2003; Pollard 2003; Lutz et al. 2004). These early studies lent support to the notion that a willful refocusing of mental awareness could bring about important changes in brain activity and structure (Brefczynski-Lewis et al. 2007; Lazar et al. 2005).

These initial investigations have led to hundreds of recent studies on the impact of various forms of mindfulness and meditation on brain functioning and morphology. Two “metastudies” (studies of studies) reviewed these experiments looking for methodological reliable and comparable results. One of these metastudies concluded “that meditation appears to be reliably associated with altered anatomical structure in several brain regions” (Fox et al. 2014 at p. 69). The brains of meditators were altered in eight brain regions including areas related to meta awareness (our ability to watch our own minds), body awareness, memory consolidation and reconsolidation, self and emotional regulation, and infra and interhemispheric communication (Fox et al. 2014; see also Afonso et al. 2020). The second metastudy concluded that meditation produces positive effects on cognitive and emotional processes (Sedlmeier et al. 2012). Several individual studies raise intriguing possibilities. For example, one study found that meditators, unlike control subjects, had reduced activity in “self-referential processing,” i.e., mind wandering, which appears to be our default mechanism and is often correlated with unhappiness (Brewer et al. 2011). Another study found that meditation increased compassionate responses to suffering, even in the face of social pressures to avoid so doing (Condon et al. 2013).

As noted, these changes in brain function and form do not occur without sustained and repeated effort, however. Absent focused attention, the brain will produce predictable patterns of brain activity, that is, our default mode of thinking. Through choice and willful attention, however, it appears that an alternative synaptic path may be activated and perpetuated. The idea that immaterial forces such as intention and attention could shape the brain’s function and form runs counter to classical materialist science. Working in the materialist tradition, most scientists, including almost all neuroscientists, have assumed that mental processes are inefficacious byproducts of purely physical brain processes. To the extent that one can recognize the mind at all, brain to mind is a one-way street. All our thoughts and actions are reducible to impersonal, microscopic, physical processes. Nothing that is nonphysical, such as the mind, consciousness, or will, can even exist in the sense of being a measurable, real entity much less shape physical outcomes.

This classical approach has been unable to explain how brain activity gives rise to consciousness (subjectively felt mental states), however, and what role consciousness might play in the brain’s workings. Why, if exclusively local physical processes in the brain control us, do we possess a stream of conscious thoughts capable of understanding large-scale phenomena? After 350 years of classical material science and more than half a century of neuroscience, materialist approaches have done a good job of linking structure and function in the brain, but have made no progress in explaining consciousness, something we all experience most all the time. In the materialist paradigm, accounting for consciousness is the “hard problem,” and because consciousness cannot be effectively explained by reference to material forces, for most scientists in the classical material tradition, consciousness either is not a legitimate area of inquiry or, if it is, they have promised, since the eighteenth century, that a materialist answer to the hard problem of consciousness is only a matter of time (Araujo 2012).

The idea that the process of brain wiring and rewiring is shaped by immaterial mental events may confound classical materialist science (which either denies mind or separates mind from matter), but it is not inconsistent with quantum science (which sees mind and matter as inextricably entwined). Recall that in the quantum world, the subject determines which of many possible realities becomes actualized through its intention and attention. Quantum theory reunites consciousness with the causal structure of nature, joining subjective experience and objective outcomes. Thus, quantum theory creates a “causal opening for the mind,” a point of entry by which mind could alter the functioning and shape the physical structure of the brain.

Is there evidence for the existence of a “quantum brain” or “quantum consciousness?” At this point we do not know, and it remains to be seen where, if anywhere, there exists a demonstrable locus for quantum effects in the brain. Because the environment for sustained quantum effects to operate in the brain has not been sufficiently established, traditional neuroscience argues that brain functions can, indeed must, be understood as the interactions of neurons operating under classical physical principles. Still, we know that quantum physics operates sub-atomically everywhere, and we know that mechanical explanations of neuronal function cannot account for the processing speed of the human brain. Furthermore, there is evidence that sustained thought alters brain states and traits; we just do not know how or precisely where this occurs. Quantum theory raises the following question to material neuroscience: How can the mind and consciousness be reduced to the function of atoms within the brain if we know that ultimately these atoms have no fixed or non-probabilistic existence outside of subjective mental events? If atoms derive their properties from interaction with consciousness [in quantum], how can consciousness depend only on those same atoms? (Schwartz and Begley 2002).

In truth, at this moment, both materialism and quantum approaches toward mind are meta-physical assertions awaiting more evidence, an epistemic exercise. Science should be about epistemic pursuits, not metaphysical closure, so let us keep an open mind. Asserting that a nonmaterial force (thought) can shape a material object such as the brain, as quantum theory does, is no more speculative than asserting a material basis for nonmaterial consciousness, which is the prevailing materialist neuroscience view. With the advent of quantum theory, the nature of matter has become as problematic as the nature of mind.

Implications of New Scientific Discoveries for Social Theory

I only report on this ongoing scientific debate to consider its possible implications for the discussion at hand. As noted, some social scientists wonder “Are Buddhist ideas harmonious with science?” The answer, I suggest, is “yes,” they are remarkably consistent with the latest findings in the physical and biological sciences, not “otherworldly.”

Coming back to the focus of this discussion (and firmer footing for the author), the quantum explanations for brain plasticity and a causal role for mind carry potentially important behavioral and moral consequences for social thought and action coming from the world of science (Wendt 2015). If true, they would imply that, although we are endowed with a given brain morphology and basic circuitry, not all aspects of our responses are passively determined by neurobiological mechanisms. Instead, our volitional choices moment to moment to attend to one bit of environmental stimulation over another and to form, through our intention and attention (the driving force of karma, for Buddhists), one thought pattern rather than another, can sculpt our brain and make us who we are.

#### PROXIMITY---karmic consequences outweigh.

Fierke ’22 [Karin; 2022; Professor in the School of International Relations at the University of St Andrews; Snapshots from Home: Mind, Action and Strategy in an Uncertain World, “Navigating a Participatory Universe,” Ch. 5, p. 185-186]

A further interpretation of the fruits of action ties them more closely to the concept of karma. The meaning of karma varies across traditions. The Buddha, for instance, held a common Indian perspective regarding the existence of natural law (dharma), a physics which was at work in the unfolding of worldly events (Adam, 2006: 6). Karma is an activation that reverberates through time. The opening to the Dhammapada captures the idea of a regularity that is law-like and moral, while also highlighting the importance of mind and intention: ‘Our life is shaped by our mind; we become what we think. Suffering follows an evil thought as the wheels of a cart follow the oxen that draw it’ (Easwaren, 2007b: 105).

In Buddhism, impure states/action are considered unwholesome or unskilful (akusala). Unskilful actions are rooted in the ‘three poisons’ (greed, hatred and ignorance), which stand in the way of our seeing reality as it is. Ignorance is considered to be the fundamental human problem. As such, liberating awareness or wisdom arises when delusion is removed. Illusion refers not merely to an absence of knowledge but rather to the presence of views that provide an illusory awareness of how things are. The most fundamental of these is the illusion of an independent and permanent self. The emotions of greed and hatred arise from this false idea of self. Removing the illusion means also removing self-centred craving and antagonism towards others (Adam, 2006: 7). Actions arising from the three poisons are unskilful because they lead to future suffering, for the agent and for others.

Actions are not impure because they give rise to negative outcomes, as in the logic of consequences, but rather the reverse (Harvey, 2000: 49). The karmic fruit or result is a function of the intention, and in the case of an unwholesome intention, one marked by the presence of the three poisons. As in the passage from the Dhammapada, the mental activity of intention is inseparable from mind. But mind relates to something larger than the individual, that is, to the objective moral law (dharma) that is at work in the universe. The effort to align one’s personal moral conduct (sila) with the working of the universe is considered essential for following the path to awakening, which involves training to be nonviolent in thought, word and deed (Adam, 2006: 7). Someone who has purified the mind and attained liberation embodies moral law effortlessly (Harvey, 2000: 44). An intention that expresses hatred relies on the delusion of self. Higher spiritual realization, by contrast, rests on nonviolence as a natural and spontaneous expression. This highest ‘truth’ is beyond words, whereas nonviolent action is a part of life and living. The two, that is, truth and nonviolence, come together in Gandhi’s strategy of satyagraha (truthforce).

## Buddhism

### Tanhā DA---1/2NC

#### Universal impermanence makes suffering inevitable, turning case and corroding value to life. Thus, radical acceptance of the status quo is a more virtuous choice than participating in the 1AC’s fantasy of control.

Meiklejohn ’19 [Brad; 2019; Alaska State Director for The Conservation Fund; Rewilding, “A Buddhist View of Conservation,” https://rewilding.org/a-buddhist-view-of-conservation/]

We suffer when we expect the world to be different from the way it is. “It shouldn’t be this way” is the perennial lament of conservationists. Here in the western world we are trained to be discerning, and we deploy our discernment to pick out all the things that are wrong in the world. And when we start looking, we start finding: climate chaos, species extinction, and the familiar list of worldly woes. It has long been this way, as the Roman historian Tirulean observed in 150 AD:

All parts of the earth are built over, trampled, full of commerce. Farms and fields drive back the forests. Even rocks are cultivated. Swamps are drained. Today’s towns outnumber yesterday’s houses. Everywhere on earth are residences, peoples, governments and human growth so clogs the world it can barely support us. And as our needs increase we struggle with each other for them and nature fails us.

When we hold an idealized view of the how the world should be, our happiness and satisfaction rest on an unattainable perfect future state. “If only we could stop the Pebble mine…if only we could save the Arctic Refuge…if only so-and-so were not president.” But “if only…” is a future that never arrives. Even when our wishes come true, we find something else to despair over, some other “if only” to pin our hopes on. Our default mode of finding faults has a corrosive effect on all aspects of our life.

Yet the world is the way it is. The world will always be imperfect. The world is not here to make us happy nor will it ever be the way we want it to be. How could it be otherwise? There are nearly 8 billion people who want the world to be a certain way, and only one world.

When we don’t accept things as they are, we suffer. This suffering comes in various forms for conservationists: frustration, outrage, anger, disappointment, despair, resentment, and stress are common among us. To be clear, we create this suffering. It is our choice to be frustrated, angry, or resentful, yet these states of mind do nothing to improve the situation and render us less effective. “The world is not coming at you, it is coming from you” as the Vietnamese Buddhist Thich Nhat Hanh says. What we think and feel is what we project. “With our thoughts we create the world,” said the Buddha.

The Buddhist way is not a path of resignation, however. It is a path of radical acceptance of things as they are. “It’s like this now” is a helpful refrain that short-circuits anger, frustration and despair. Acceptance can easily lead to indifference, though, unless it is harnessed to a higher purpose, such as the Bodhisatva aspiration “Beings are numberless. I vow to save them all.” The magnitude of this ambition, in full view of reality, takes the pressure off an impossible task. We do the work because it is the right thing to do, not to finish the job. Our path is endless. There is nothing to achieve and nowhere to go.

We cannot control the results of our efforts. The only thing we can truly control is our intention. When our intentions are wholesome, our work will produce wholesome results. If our actions are tinged with greed, hatred or delusion, we will reap the consequences. Dishonesty and deceit will undermine our own work. We can rest in the knowledge that those who pillage the environment will reap their karma, and we will inherit our own.

As conservationists we spend a lot of time communicating. I have often heard it said that we are conversationalists more than conservationists. But how are we communicating? Many conservationists come across as shrill, pedantic and righteous — not particularly attractive traits. What is the intention of our communication? Are we aiming to win, to convince, to belittle, to impress, to gain attention or are we merely stating what we know to be true? We must clearly set our intention before we communicate.

The Buddha placed particular importance on right speech, which for our purposes encompasses all forms of communication, including texts, tweets, phone calls, emails, grant applications, memos and letters. The Buddha defined right speech as speech that is true, timely, beneficial, endearing and agreeable. He placed special emphasis on truthfulness: “For the person who lies, there is no evil he might not do.” The German philosopher Nietzche said: “It’s not that you lied that bothers me. It’s that now I can never trust you.” Is all of our speech impeccably true, or do we exaggerate or shade the truth to bolster our side of the story? Is our speech harsh or divisive, or is our speech pleasing and intended to bring others together? Gossip, idle chatter, useless talk and speculation, all forms of wrong speech, were encompassed by the onomatopoetic term “sampapalapa” in the Pali language of the Buddha’s time.

Conservationists often divide the world into “us” and “them.” “They” are the problem and “we” have the solution. “If only they weren’t so greedy…so selfish…so ignorant…so lazy.” But there is no them, just us. We are all 99.99% the same. We all have the same impulses, emotions, and desires. We all want what is best for us and we all have our own answers to what is best for us. The Buddha identified the delusion of a separate self as a root problem, and today we are witnessing an epidemic of self that manifests in widespread anxiety, depression, drug addiction, and suicide. Our actions as conservationists should be selfless not selfish. By acting from compassion and generosity we transcend the polarization of “us” and “them.”

David Brower, a legend in conservation said, “All our victories are temporary and all of our defeats are permanent.” We know that conservation work requires (to borrow from another conservation legend, Brock Evans) relentless pressure, relentlessly applied, as we often fight the same battles over and over. The Buddha observed that impermanence is one of the three immutable characteristics of life. Change is constant; nothing lasts. “It is a bold thing for a human being who lives on the earth but a few score years at the most to presume upon the Eternal and covet perpetuity for any of his undertakings,” said wilderness warrior Howard Zahnhiser. We cannot ever achieve a permanent state of perfection or protection, and even the most devastating defeats give rise to future opportunities.

Conservation is a relay race, not a sprint, with the baton of obligation passed from one generation to the next. We cannot save all there is to save in our lifetimes. Trying to do too much too fast and too often brings on the dis-ease of “busy-ness.” Ask a fellow conservationist how they are and, more often than not, you get back the response: “Busy.” Busy has become the modern badge of self-worth, as if by proclaiming our busy-ness we fend off the nagging worry that we are not doing enough.

I would prescribe three things for modern conservationists: gratitude, immersion in nature, and meditation. Like a border collie that needs a job, we can give our discerning minds the task of finding what is right with the world, rather than all that is wrong. A daily gratitude practice of, say, making a list of five things you are grateful for, will bring benefits to your work and your life.

“Save it because you love it,” says western Dharma teacher Jack Kornfield. But you have to know it before you love it. I am always dismayed by how little time modern conservationists spend in wild nature. Every person working in conservation should take at least one 10-day trip into wild nature each year. And get paid to do it. Shorter trips just don’t cut it because it takes several days just to disconnect from the buzz of the modern world and reconnect with the slower, deeper rhythms of nature.

Deep time in the wildness will ground you in reality and will defuse the hecticity that renders most of us too distracted to be effective. Meditation provides the same grounding, and is a portable refuge that will make you more patient, more caring, more present, less angry, less stressed and less prone to burnout. If that is not enough, the Buddha also assured that mediation would improve your complexion, help you sleep better and draw rare, shy animals near! Don’t just take my word, or the Buddha’s. See for yourself.

### Presumption---2NC

#### OBSERVER EFFECT---quantum physics confirms it overdetermines predictions.

Fierke ’22 [Karin; 2022; Professor in the School of International Relations at the University of St Andrews; Snapshots from Home: Mind, Action and Strategy in an Uncertain World, “Navigating a Participatory Universe,” Ch. 5]

The measurement of quantum phenomena is more complex. The world is not static but in motion. What is measured is thus less what ‘is’ than what ‘might be’, given multiple potentials. There is no single angle from which the world or any other object can be measured in its completeness. The measurement takes place from within the motion, which means that the apparatus and the observer move together, shaping the angle of observation, what is measured and what is seen. The apparatus, the observer and the observed phenomenon change alongside one another. The measuring apparatus enacts a ‘cut’ which is an ‘intra-action’ from which separation and difference emerge (Barad, 2007: 140).1 Gandhi, like the scientist, considered himself to be engaged in an experiment (Adam, 2006). Gandhi and the other actants in his experiment are inseparable from the measurement itself. In this respect, action is an enactment and activation of a measurement that is bound up in the constitution of a world.

The second point regards the nature of the reality to be measured. The ‘reality’ in question is not only in motion but may not even exist until an observation is made! As John Wheeler famously stated: ‘No phenomenon is a phenomenon until it is an observed phenomenon.’ There is a debate within quantum physics regarding the extent to which particles and waves constitute a reality at all or are merely a function of the physicist’s mathematic equations. As Ball (2018: 99) states: ‘There is a shared desire to regard Schrodinger’s wave function as a physical object itself after forgetting, or refusing to accept, that it is merely a mathematical tool that we use for the description of the physical object.’ Quantum theory reveals the illusion at the heart of classical physics, that is, the assumption that reality is composed of fixed particle states and that we can somehow get beyond the tool of description to the object itself (Ball, 2018: 100). The experience of the observer is instead bound up in the production of knowledge of phenomena.

The third point regards the significance of motion and the illusion of substance for how structure is understood. The problem of structure begins with a tendency, even among quantum physicists, to cling to an illusion of substance. The illusion has found expression in a common error. The error rests on an assumption that reality represents a stable state that may be ‘disturbed’ through a clumsy process of measurement (Ball, 2018: 68). Change, in this error, represents a deviation from a background composed of pre-existing properties, and arises from a blunder by the measurer. Quantum measurement reverses the relationship expressed by the error; properties emerge from the measurement itself as potentials collapse into form.

In the classical view, change is an aberration from the stable properties of an independently existing reality, which, as structure, determines and limits what is possible. By contrast, quantum measurement involves a wave function collapse from which physical properties emerge from indeterminism and change. The former emphasizes matter and form, and structures are understood to be real. The latter is concerned with potentials and the emergence of form from formlessness. The appearance of structure rests on an illusion of permanence, and is thus both real and non-real. The classical model seeks truth in an independently existing reality. The quantum apparatus measures a process of becoming and the generation of knowledge that is holographic. The measurement problem relates not to the disturbance of an a priori system arising from a blunder; rather the system has no particular properties or character until a measurement is made. Different measurements will produce different realities that aren’t necessarily compatible.

Measuring human intra-actions

The juxtaposition of scientist and strategist is not to suggest that quantum science provides an analogy or metaphor for thinking about strategy in the world. Bohr’s (2010) parallel suggests that science and strategy may be two different manifestations of action that produces the world. Political strategy is a domain which, as Bohr suggests, might be elucidated through the parallel. Both the scientist and the strategist are bound up in the phenomena to be measured. The one draws on a mathematical language to model microscopic intra-actions. The other relies on everyday language to navigate the macroscopic world. Within a quantum state, systems have no properties until they are measured, and different measurements will produce different realities. As Wendt (2015: 217) states, ‘In language what brings about a concept’s collapse from potential meanings into an actual one is a speech act, which may be seen as a measurement that puts it into a context, with both other words and particular listeners’. His argument about language extends to social structures, which, he claims, ‘are, physically, superpositions of shared mental states – social wave functions’ (Wendt, 2015: 258). In contrast to a materialist view of structure, these structures are potentialities, which like the wave function are unobservable until they collapse into a particular form. These structures are people and their practices, and thus express consciousness as well as materiality. As shared mental states they are ontologically emergent from the entanglements of the agents who constitute them.

#### That neutralizes value AND renders their impacts non-unique.

Barandes ’24 [Jacob; March 12; Department of Physics @ Harvard University; Princeton University Press; The Weirdness of the World, “Almost Everything You Do Causes Almost Everything (under Certain Not Wholly Implausible Assumptions); or, Infinite Puppetry,” Ch. 7]

5. Almost Everything You Do Causes Almost Every Type of Non-unique Future Event

Thus, it is fairly plausible, and probably the most straightforward interpretation of current physical theory, to suppose the following:

(1) The universe is infinite.

(2) This infinitude continues temporally after heat death.

(3) Post–heat death, galaxies like our own will occasionally fluctuate into existence by freak chance, with some finite and not ever-decreasing probability.

(4) Ordinary actions of ours, like raising our hands, will cause an infinite series of traveling particles to ripple through this post-heat-death universe, interfering from time to time with the systems that fluctuate into existence, including those sibling galaxies.

If all of this is true, then any event that has a finite chance of occurring as a result of being perturbed by one of these successor particles will in fact eventually occur as a result of having been perturbed by one of these successor particles. The probability might be mind-bogglingly small! But we have infinitude to play with.

Consider a googol: 10100. That’s well over a trillion times as many particles as are estimated to exist in the observable portion of the universe. What a tiny number! A googolplex puts a googol to shame. Instead of 10 raised merely to 100, it’s ten raised to the googol: 1010100. But this is also a minuscule number. We laugh at its smallness. How about a “power tower” of googolplexes—a googolplex to the googolplexth to the googolplexth to the googolplexth . . . a googolplex times, or 1010100 ↑↑ 1010100, as it is sometimes notated.23 Let’s call this number a Vast. If the events discussed here happen once in a Vast years, that’s still eyeblink-frequent compared with infinitude— or  rather, of course, even more relatively frequent than that, if we’re truly comparing with infinitude, which we are. These are the kinds of magnitudes we have in mind, not mere lifetime-of-the-galaxy magnitudes.

A successor particle from your hand raising just now will eventually hit a system it will perturb in such a way that a person will live who would otherwise have died. At some point, a galaxy will fluctuate into existence containing an Earth-like planet populated with humanlike people, containing a radio telescope that the successor particle strikes, causing a bit of information to appear on a sensitive device. This bit of information happens to be just enough to push the device over a threshold needed to trigger an alert to a waiting scientist, who now pauses to study the device rather than send the email she was composing. Because she didn’t send that email, a certain fateful hiking trip is postponed and the scientist does not fall to her death, which she would have done but for your particle. However improbable all of this is, one improbability stacked on another stacked on another, there is no reason to think that any of this is strictly zero (or strictly infinitesimal) probability. Its chance of occurring within some finite period of time is, presumably, one over some extremely large finite number. Thus, given the assumptions above, it will occur, eventually. You saved her! Let’s pause for a celebratory toast.

Of course, there is another scientist you killed. There are wars you started and peaces you precipitated. There are great acts of heroism you enabled, children you brought into existence, plagues you caused, great works of poetry that would never have been written but for your intervention, and so on. It would be bizarre to think you deserve any credit or blame for this. You didn’t cause them in the sense of intending them or being what residents of those worlds would regard as among the primary causes worth describing in their history books. However, in another sense you did cause them. None of these events would have happened to the people they did in fact happen to, had it not been for the raising of your arm. And there is an unbroken chain of physical processes from the moment of your arm’s going up to those various future events. Your arm raising isn’t a proximal cause but rather a “distal” cause—very distal indeed—but a cause nonetheless.24

If the goodness or badness of your actions is measured by their positive or negative effects, as in standard consequentialist ethics, then under the current set of cosmological assumptions the utility of every action you do will be ꝏ + −ꝏ. This risks making a hash of ethical and decision-theoretic approaches to long-term expected utility that have no temporal or causal horizon.25