### AT: Extinction Comes First (Bostrom)

#### Bostrom’s argument is that we should weigh future lives – that ethic leads to overpopulation, environmental destruction, and a lower standard of living, and justifies endless cloning

Singer 7 – Professor of Bioethics at Princeton University (Peter, Laureate Professor in the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics at the University of Melbourne, 8/25/07, “Peter Singer: Abortion, the dividing lines,” Herald Sun, http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/peter-singer-abortion-the-dividing-lines/story-e6frfifo-1111114264781)

Other opponents say the fetus has the potential to become a person, that is, a thinking, rational being, like ourselves, and the dog or chimpanzee do not have that potential. But why should mere potential give a being a right to life? The world already has more than six billion people. We are heading for more than nine billion by 2050. The more people there are, the greater the pressure on the Earth's environment and the greater the difficulty in giving them all even a minimally decent life. Do we really want every potential person to become an actual person? In fact, with modern medical technology, the argument from potential rapidly leads to absurdity. Scientists have shown, in many different species, including monkeys, that it is possible to clone an animal by taking the nucleus of an ordinary cell, and implanting it in an egg from which the nucleus has been removed. There is no biological reason to suppose that this would not work for human beings. This means that billions of our cells have the potential to become an actual person. Yet no one thinks that we have an obligation to "save" all these cells and turn them into people.