My value criterion is maximizing general welfare. Prefer this framework for the following reasons:  
  
1)Preventing suffering comes before all other rights and ethics because we can’t have other rights if we are dead or suffering; preventing suffering allows us to take actions like allowing for freedom. Because extinction comes first, this means that this framework comes first  
2) States maximize general welfare because they have to make a decision for a large group of citizens. This means that they have to pass policies based on the expected consequences for the majority of people.

#### GOODIN1 98 [Goodin, Robert, Professor of Philosophy, 1998, Utilitarianism as a public philosophy] LHP SV

Consider, first, the argument from necgooessity. **Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty,** and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private **individuals** will usually **have more complete information on**the peculiarities of**their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices** might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to what effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know **what will happen**most often**to most people as a result of their**various possible**choices**. But that is all. **That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use utilitarian calculus** – if they want to use it fat all – to choose general rules of conduct. **Knowing aggregates and averages, they** can proceed to **calculate the utility** payoffs from **[of]**adopting each alternative possible **general rule**.

3) Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – so, util comes first and my offense outweighs theirs under their own framework.

Thus, maximizing general welfare is a prerequisite to any other value criterion

#### CP text: The United States federal government should allow private appropriation and:

#### A] Fund a public-private partnership for deep space exploration

#### B] Triple NASA’s budget and earmark increased funding for cooperative deep space exploration

Galeon 17 [(Dom, writer for Futurism), “SpaceX Asks the U.S. To Fund a Public-Private Partnership for Deep Space Exploration,” July 14, 2017, <https://futurism.com/spacex-asks-the-u-s-to-fund-a-public-private-partnership-for-deep-space-exploration>] TDI

SpaceX Asks the U.S. To Fund a Public-Private Partnership for Deep Space Exploration The best chance of success could come from pooling our resources. / Off World/ Deep Space Exploration/ NASA/ Public Private Partnerships SpaceX/Flickr Image by SpaceX/Flickr WORKING TOGETHER Some 10 years back now, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) decided to work with private space companies to ferry people and cargo to the International Space Station (ISS). At the time, the space agency perhaps didn’t expect that it was heralding in a new era in space exploration. Both NASA and private agencies like SpaceX and Blue Origin have benefited from the collaboration. The former is able to save on costs, while the latter get to pursue their own individual programs, such as perfecting their reusable rocket technologies for commercial use. Without this partnership, these companies would not have been able to grow and develop at the same rate. Thus far, the joint missions have been limited to just orbital and near-orbit launches, like the Commercial Orbital Transportation Services (COTS) program, but SpaceX wants that to change. At a hearing of the U.S. Senate’s Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness on Thursday, SpaceX’s senior vice president for global business and government affairs Tim Hughes asked the U.S. government to open up deep space exploration for similar public-private partnerships. “The principles applied in past programs for low Earth orbit capability can and should be applied to deep space exploration,” he said, referencing the COTS program. ADVERTISEMENT A DEEP SPACE FUTURE In order for the U.S. and for humankind to establish a more permanent presence in space, Hughes asserts that the government should fund a COTS-like program for deep space. It won’t really be a matter of funding the competition, he argued, because the program could run parallel to NASA’s existing deep space exploration plans, such as the Space Launch System (SLS) and the Orion spacecraft. Living Off The Land: A Guide To Settling Mars [Infographic] Click to View Full Infographic “I think [these] can be readily supplemented with public-private partnerships to allow us to sustain a permanent presence in space,” said Hughes. NASA could impose “high level requirements” for this deep space partnership, just like it does with COTS, Hughes added. The partnership could prove particularly beneficial for NASA right now given the recent reports saying it doesn’t have the funding needed for its Mars mission. Of course, as with any change, push back is to be expected. For one, more established aerospace firms that already work with NASA — Lockheed Martin and Boeing, among others — might not be in favor of this idea. The important thing, however, is to realize that deep space exploration is an entirely different ballgame than missions in near-Earth orbit, and the best chance of success may come from pooling our resources.

#### The CP turns the aff and prevents stifling of innovation – k2 climate tech.

Van Burken 20 [(Rebecca, technology policy analyst at Reason Foundation) “Biden Can Utilize Space Companies and Public-Private Partnerships,” December 14, 2020 https://reason.org/commentary/biden-can-utilize-space-companies-and-public-private-partnerships/] TDI

Biden Can Utilize Space Companies and Public-Private Partnerships The commercial space industry is making NASA's operations more cost-effective and encouraging innovation. By Rebecca van Burken December 14, 2020 President-elect Joe Biden will predictably distance himself from many of the Trump administration’s policies and positions, but its openness to commercial space partnerships should not be among them. The expansion of public-private space partnerships that began during the Obama administration has continued during the Trump administration. These public-private partnerships have helped lead to many major space successes, including crewed-launches returning to American soil through SpaceX and the first-ever civilian passenger on a private suborbital spaceflight as part of Virgin Galactic’s 2019 VSS Unity SpaceShipTwo launch. These successes, and others, reflect positively on the U.S. space sector. However, they would not have happened without the entrepreneurial nature of commercial space. Unlike government engineers and scientists, commercial space operations are not constrained by government bureaucracy nor reliant on taxpayer funding. This allows commercial space companies to explore some seemingly far-fetched ideas, like 3D printing of small rockets, a concept being pioneered by the small start-up Relativity. Commercial space companies must also develop and maintain a competitive edge to survive in the market. Significant competition ultimately creates less-costly services that give NASA more bang for its buck when developing new technology. Competitive market pressures have created inspiring innovation exemplified by SpaceX’s reusable rocket technology and proposals for recycling and turning discarded orbiting tanks into space stations. Without the federal government’s continued openness to commercial space, innovation, and invention in the U.S. space industry could be stifled. Commercial space continues to show up when the government needs new services. Over the last few years, we have seen amazing new technologies developed to track environmental and climate concerns. This is, in part, because NASA has entered into deals with private companies like Planet that are able to analyze data collected by satellite imagery. Planet has stakes in defense satellite imagery but has expanded its portfolio to collect data for climate scientists and researchers to use. Its constellation of 120 satellites is at work photographing every portion of the world at least once a day, which provides constant and up-to-date environmental information. By maintaining deals like that with commercial satellite companies, NASA can avoid the costs of creating its own satellite constellation and other remote sensing technology. Additionally, NASA does not need to focus its energies on updating technologies to keep up with new software and technological capabilities. Companies that worry about competition in the market naturally reassess their services and the burden of doing this should be put on private industry, not on the government. Biden’s team should seek out the most effective private partners, hiring new talent in civil programs to use these systems. This would also free up funding for crewed space exploration. In addition to looking to develop new partnerships for space-related efforts, a Biden administration should reassess the government’s old partnerships. Prior to the election, Reuters reported that some Biden associates believe he may try to continue funding the International Space Station (ISS) beyond its planned termination in 2025. Reuters reported: …Biden, on the other hand, would likely call for a delayed moonshot and propose a funding extension for the International Space Station if he wins the White House, according to people familiar with the fledging Biden space agenda.Pushing back the moon mission could cast more doubt on the long-term fate of Boeing Co’s Space Launch System (SLS) rocket, just as Elon Musk’s SpaceX and Jeff Bezos’ Blue Origin scramble to bring rival rockets to market as soon as next year. Extending support for the space station for a decade would also be a major boost for Boeing, whose $225 million annual ISS operations contract is set to expire in 2024 and is at the depths of a financial crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the 737 MAX grounding after fatal crashes. This directly contradicts the Trump administration’s efforts to cease funding for the archaic space station by 2025. If Biden were to continue funding this aging facility via NASA it would drain funds that could be used for more important space activities, including manned missions. Commercial companies are primed and ready to take over the space station’s functions, and NASA should allow them to do so. If Biden has taxpayers and NASA continue to fund the ISS, it would most likely continue to contract with a company that famous for draining government money—Boeing. The partnerships with Boeing are the types of space policies the incoming Biden administration should be reviewing. It should ask Congress for a Government Accountability Office audit of Boeing’s work on the Space Launch System (SLS). The contract is for the development of a rocket with heavy-lift capacities that is designed to bring humans and cargo to the moon and back. Unfortunately, it has had numerous delays and cost overruns and is still not ready for a test flight, as Bloomberg reported in August: Boeing Co.’s Space Launch System, the largest rocket in NASA’s history, will carry a price tag of at least $9.1 billion — or 30% more than the previous estimate for a key element in the agency’s plan to return to the moon. Additionally, the costs for new ground infrastructure at Florida’s Kennedy Space Center to support the deep-space exploration program has jumped to $2.4 billion, Kathy Lueders, NASA’s associate administrator for human spaceflight, said in a blog post Wednesday. That’s also a 30% increase, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration said in an email Thursday. While we wait for Boeing to reuse obsolete space shuttle hardware on SLS, companies like Blue Origin and SpaceX are continually reusing entire launch boosters. Biden’s administration needs a real review of whether it would be more cost and time effective to work with companies like SpaceX or Blue Origin. SLS is estimated to cost NASA $1 billion or more for each launch, after having already consumed $18.3 billion since 2010. By contrast, SpaceX has had its self-funded heavy-lift rocket Starship in development since 2012 and has been doing successful prototype tests since 2019. Another space entity that will be a key issue for the Biden administration is the military agency, U.S. Space Force, created by President Trump. Reason magazine had detailed the numerous reasons a Space Force should not have been created. Now that it does exist, the Space Force should be viewed as an agency that does not need to spend taxpayers’ money to create its own technology for its missions. Instead, it should use the readily available market of commercial partners ready to contract services. Space News recently reported that Space Force is just now learning of the private sector’s capabilities: [Gen. John “Jay”] Raymond said in years past the only commercially viable services have been space launch and communications provided by geosynchronous satellites. But the Space Force is now becoming aware of other capabilities that are being offered commercially such as space tracking data, weather data and on-orbit satellite servicing. Raymond, chief of operations for Space Force, has previously committed to working closely with commercial satellite companies for space-related missions. Col. Michael “Hopper” Hopkins, commander of NASA’s SpaceX Crew-1 mission, was commissioned into the Space Force and began a new line of Space Force officers expected to launch to the ISS. To facilitate continued partnerships between Space Force and private enterprise, the Biden administration could back an initiative currently proposed to Congress that Space Force acquisitions be “speedy and agile.” Flexibility for Space Force would include pushing acquisition power to the lowest level of management and removing bureaucracy to make its programs more efficient. We are at a pivotal moment in the space industry’s history. The federal government has the opportunity to partner with space industry innovators like Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, and Richard Branson, and ensure there’s the opportunity for new space startups to emerge and add value to the market. The other path, a government and NASA-centric approach to space, would likely stifle technological developments and breakthroughs by private companies, cost taxpayers a lot more money, and cause the United States to fall behind other nations in a number of key areas.

#### Furthermore: Asteroid Mining is coming now, due to tech, and the private sector is perfect for this job. Countries are allowing it to happen in the status quo. It is necessary because it helps acquire water, rocket fuel, rare earth metals, and other valuables.

**Gilbert 21** alex gilbert, is a complex systems researcher and a PhD student in space resources at the Colorado School of Mines. "Mining in Space Is Coming." Milken Institute Review, April 26, 2021, [www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming](http://www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming). [Quality Control]

**Space exploration is back**. after decades of disappointment, a combination of better technology, falling costs and a rush of competitive energy from the private sector has put space travel **front and center**. indeed, many analysts (even some with their feet on the ground) believe that commercial developments in the space industry may be on the cusp of starting the largest resource rush in history: **mining on the Moon**, Mars and **asteroids**. While this may sound fantastical, some baby steps toward the goal have already been taken. Last year, NASA awarded contracts to four companies to extract small amounts of lunar regolith by 2024, effectively **beginning the era of commercial space mining**. Whether this proves to be the dawn of a gigantic adjunct to mining on earth — and more immediately, a key to unlocking cost-effective space travel — will turn on the answers to a host of questions ranging from what resources can be efficiently. As every fan of science fiction knows, the resources of the solar system appear **virtually unlimite**d compared to those on Earth. There are whole other planets, dozens of moons, thousands of massive asteroids and millions of small ones that doubtless contain humungous quantities of materials that are scarce and very valuable (back on Earth). Visionaries including Jeff Bezos imagine heavy industry moving to space and Earth becoming a residential area. However, as entrepreneurs look to harness the riches beyond the atmosphere, access to space resources remains tangled in the realities of economics and governance. Start with the fact that space belongs to no country, complicating traditional methods of resource allocation, property rights and trade. With limited demand for materials in space itself and the need for huge amounts of energy to return materials to Earth, creating a viable industry will turn on major advances in technology, finance and business models. That said, there’s no grass growing under potential pioneers’ feet. Potential economic, scientific and even security benefits underlie an emerging geopolitical competition to pursue space mining. The United States is rapidly emerging as a front-runner, in part due to its ambitious Artemis Program to lead a multinational consortium back to the Moon. But it is also a leader in **creating a legal infrastructure** for mineral exploitation. The United States has adopted the world’s first space resources law, recognizing the property rights of private companies and individuals to materials gathered in space. However, the United States is hardly alone. Luxembourg and the United Arab Emirates (you read those right) are racing to codify space-resources laws of their own, hoping to attract investment to their entrepot nations with business-friendly legal frameworks. China reportedly views space-resource development as a national priority, part of a strategy to challenge U.S. economic and security primacy in space. Meanwhile, Russia, Japan, India and the European Space Agency all harbor space-mining ambitions of their own. Governing these emerging interests is an outdated treaty framework from the Cold War. Sooner rather than later, we’ll need new agreements to facilitate private investment and ensure international cooperation. What’s Out There Back up for a moment. For the record, space is already being heavily exploited, because space resources include non-material assets such as orbital locations and abundant sunlight that enable satellites to provide services to Earth. Indeed, satellite-based telecommunications and global positioning systems have become indispensable infrastructure underpinning the modern economy. Mining space for materials, of course, is another matter. In the past several decades, planetary science has confirmed what has long been suspected: celestial bodies are potential sources for dozens of natural materials that, in the right time and place, are **incredibly valuable**. Of these, water may be the most attractive in the near-term, because — with assistance from solar energy or nuclear fission — H2O can be split into hydrogen and oxygen to make **rocket propellant**, facilitating in-space refueling. So-called “**rare earth” metals** are also **potential targets** of asteroid miners intending to service Earth markets. Consisting of 17 elements, including lanthanum, neodymium, and yttrium, these critical materials (most of which are today mined in China at great environmental cost) **are required for electronic**s. **And they loom as bottlenecks in making the transition from fossil fuels to renewables backed up by battery storage.**

#### However, in order for asteroid mining to take place, private entities need to be allowed to appropriate. The plan prevents that

**Meyers 15** Meyers, Ross. J.D. candidate at the University of Oregon Law School. "The doctrine of appropriation and asteroid mining: incentivizing the private exploration and development of outer space." Or. Rev. Int'l L. 17 (2015): 183. Italics in original. [Quality Control]

The **doctrine of appropriation** is a reasonable rule for adjudicating asteroid claims, and it could **easily be modified to apply to asteroid mining**. In the context of water rights, the doctrine of appropriation requires that the claimant be a landowner in order to claim the right to use a water source. It does not make sense, however, for the international community to grant complete ownership over asteroids toa single entity, so the landowner requirement of the rule should be removed. A similar modification would need to be made to the "beneficial use" language of the doctrine.

In the context of water rights, an appropriator obtains rights only to water that he or she can reasonably put to beneficial use. The metals contained in asteroids have a high level of marketability. For that reason, a mining entity could potentially put any amount of obtained metal to beneficial use, in the sense that the resources can be sold. This, however, would defeat the purpose of the rule, which is to limit such unreasonable claims. To ameliorate this problem, the doctrine of appropriation could be modified to define "beneficial use "constructively by providing that beneficial use is assumed for any resources that have been removed from the asteroid that the mining entity can reasonably hope to transport to market in a return journey. With the **astronomical cost** of undertaking a trip to such an asteroid, this modification would limit mining entities to only what they can carry back, thereby leaving the untapped resources available to other entities capable of making the same trip. Considering the size and profitability of metal deposits on asteroids, this modification to the doctrine of appropriation would **not be overly burdensome to corporate interests**. At the same time, it would **satisfy the economic imperative of promoting the rapid development of asteroid resources.**

There is no doubt that asteroids may be **extremely beneficial to mankind,** both as a **source of resources** and as a jumping-off point to **far off locations in space**. The human-race has progressed scientifically and technologically to the point that space travel is within commercial reach, and the need for new international laws governing the ownership of space has never been more apparent. The Outer Space Treaty of 1968made great strides in developing rational rules for space and many of its provisions should be maintained in their original form. However, by allowing ownership of asteroids under the doctrine of **appropriation**, the international community can **incentivize the exploration and development of space in a way that reflects the needs of society in general**, **without vesting an absolute monopoly in a single entity.** The doctrine of appropriation helped drive American westward expansion, and its application to space mining would help drive the human race in its expansion into the space, the final frontier.

#### Asteroid mining offsets terrestrial growth that ruins the environment and enables many more solar power satellites – both solve climate change

**Taylor 19** Chris Taylor is a veteran journalist. Previously senior news writer for Time.com a year later. In 2000, he was named San Francisco bureau chief for Time magazine. He has served as senior editor for Business 2.0, West Coast editor for Fortune Small Business and West Coast web editor for Fast Company. Chris is a graduate of Merton College, Oxford and the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. "How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires." Mashable, 2019, mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy. [Quality Control]

The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its **major problems**. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a **mountain of debt**. It has to keep growing or it will **implode**, so we might as well take the majority of the **industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.**

Secondly, there’s the **climate change fix**. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build **solar power satellites.** Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, **it’s always double high noon).**

The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like the one China is said to be working on could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or **over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence.**

“We're looking at a 20-year window to **completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,**” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is **millions of tons of construction materials** in orbit. **Asteroid mining can place it there.”**

The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments.

2100, the U.N. estimates. So if optimism is always a matter of perspective, the possibility of four degrees shapes mine.

#### Climate change causes extinction.

Specktor 19 [Brandon; writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years; "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, 6/4/19; <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html>] Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."