**Overview**

#### Interpretation – The negative must concede the affirmative framework or contention level offense.

#### It’s preemptive, you violate by reading turns or defense to my offense and reading an alternative framework.

#### Prefer –

#### 1. Strat skew – A) It’s impossible for the 1AR to win both layers of framing and offense when you can frame me out and read a bunch of turns to the aff making the round impossible in 4min – especially since the 2n can collapse on either the framework or the contention for 6 minutes B) Neg reactivity advantage, aff disclosure, and 1n time allocation means they can craft a perfect 1nc – conceding one layer of substance solves since it gives me weighing recourse and strategic 1ar maneuvers without having to brute force both.

#### 2. Depth of Clash – We pick and choose whether to debate offense or framework and when, which means we have more discussion of each one every round. Depth o/w since reading 1 page of 100 different books is useless and superficial. Breadth is solved across multiple rounds when people choose a different layer in each.

**And, 1AR theory is legitimate since the negative could do literally anything without the ability to call out the abuse. Aff theory is Drop the debater because four minutes isn’t enough to read a shell and still have time to cover substance sufficiently. No RVI because the 2nr would get six minutes to collapse to turns on a shell I only spent 30 seconds on. Aff theory first – A) Proportionality – The 1ar has to dedicate a significantly larger portion of it’s time reading theory and the 2n can spend much longer answering it B) Size of impact – neg abuse is always structurally worse since the 1ar only has 4 minutes to compensate whereas the NC has 13 to adapt.**

### Framework

**I value morality. The Meta-Ethic is Non-Naturalism.**

**1. The Naturalistic Fallacy: It is impossible to reduce goodness to an observable property, since the two are fundamentally separate. For example, if we believe an action that produces pleasure is good, it does not logically follow that pleasure and goodness are the same property, since the fact they describe the same thing does not make them the same thing.**

**2. The Open Question argument: Suppose goodness was synonymous with a observable property like “X”. It is impossible to answer to question “is X good” since either A) X is the exact same thing as good, in which case our answer is the meaningless tautology “good is good” or B) X is not the same as good in which case non-naturalism is true.**

**3. Only a priori knowledge is epistemically reliable. Descartes 41,**

René, 1641. Discourse On Method ; and, Meditations on First Philosophy, NPR

Yet from everything I have just listed, how do I know that there is not something else which does not allow even the slightest occasion for doubt**?** Is there not a God, or whatever I may call him, who puts into me the thoughts I am now having? But why do I think this, since I myself may perhaps be the author of these thoughts**?** In that case am not I, at least, something? But I have just said that I have no senses and no body. This is the sticking point: what follows from this? Am I not so bound up with a body and with senses that I cannot exist without them? But I have convinced myself that there is absolutely nothing in the world, no sky, no earth, no minds, no bodies. Does it now follow that I too do not exist? No: if I convinced myself of something then I certainly existed. But there is a deceiver of supreme power and cunning who is deliberately and constantly deceiving me**.** In that case I too undoubtedly exist**,** if he is deceiving me; and let him deceive me as much as he can, he will never bring it about that I am nothing so long as I think that I am something**. So** after considering everything very thoroughly**,** I must finally conclude that this proposition, I am, I exist, is necessarily true whenever it is put forward by me or conceived in my mind. ButI do not yet have a sufficient understanding of what this ‘I’ is, that now necessarily exists. So I must be on my guard against carelessly taking something else to be this ‘I’, and so making a mistake in the very item of knowledge that I maintain is the most certain and evident of all. I will therefore go back and meditate on what I originally believed myself to be, before I embarked on this present train of thought. I will then subtract anything capable of being weakened, even minimally, by the arguments now introduced, so that what is left at the end may be exactly and only what is certain and unshakeable.

**There are three ways to categorize the substance of these non-natural properties: Internally, Externally, or from our Constitutive nature as beings. Internalism and Externalism fail – only constitutivism can be solve their deficiencies. Kastafanas 14,** Kastafanas, Paul. "Constitutivism About Practical Reasons". *Philarchive.Org*, 2014, [**https://philarchive.org/archive/KATCAP**](https://philarchive.org/archive/KATCAP). // Scopa Consider a perfectly homely normative claim, such as “you have to go to the movies.” If we ask what would render this claim true, the answer seems clear: a fact about the agent’s motives. If the claim is true for Allen but false for Betty, this is due to the fact that Allen desires to see the film and Betty does not. It is natural to think that in just this way, reasons will be tied to facts about agent’s motives. But what about **claims such as “you have reason not to murder”**? That claim seems different. It **purports to be universal, applying to all agents**. Moreover, **it does not** seem to **depend on the agent’s motives**. Suppose Allen has many motives in favor of murdering his uncle (getting revenge for past slights, collecting an inheritance, etc.), and no motives that count against it (he’s a sociopath with no compunction about harming others, and he thinks he’s clever enough to contrive a plan that leaves him with no risk of getting caught). In this simplified case, all of Allen’s motives count in favor of murdering his uncle; none count against it. Nonetheless, most of us want to say that he has reason not to murder. So we face contrary pressures: in certain cases, the claim that reasons are grounded in motives looks exceedingly plausible, indeed obvious; in others, the same claim looks like it generates unacceptable consequences. And so we get a familiar, well-worn philosophical debate: **internalists defend the claim that all normative claims are generated in facts about the agent’s motives, whereas externalists deny this**. More precisely: (Internalism) Agent A has reason to φ iff A has, or would have after procedurally rational deliberation, a desire or aim whose fulfillment would be promoted by φ-ing. (Externalism) It can be true both that (i) agent A has reason to φ, and (ii) A does not have, and would not have after procedurally rational deliberation, a desire or aim whose fulfillment would be promoted by φ-ing. **Each of these theories faces certain difficulties. Internalism has trouble with apparently universal normative claims, such as “you should not murder.”** Externalism is tailor-made to capture universal normative claims. Nonetheless, it faces several challenges, including the much-discussed problems of practicality and queerness. First, consider practicality. **Moral claims are supposed to be capable of moving us**. Recognizing that φ-ing is wrong is supposed to be capable of motivating the agent not to φ. **But we might wonder how a claim that bears no relation to any of our motives could have this motivational grip**. As Bernard Williams puts it, “**the whole point of external reasons statements is that they can be true independently of an agent’s motivations. But nothing can explain an agent’s (intentional) actions except something that motivates him so to act**” (1981, 107). William’s suggestion is that if the fact that murder is wrong is to exert a motivational influence upon the person’s action, then the agent must have some motive that is suitably connected to not murdering. And this pushes us back in the direction of internalism. Second, consider Mackie’s argument from queerness. Motives are familiar things, so it seems easy enough to imagine that claims about reasons are claims about relations between actions and motives. Internalism therefore has little difficulty with Mackie’s argument. But what would the relata in an external reasons statement be? Are we to imagine that a claim about reasons is a claim about a relation between an action and some independently existing value? This would be odd: as Mackie puts it, “if there were objective values then they would be entities or relations of a very strange sort, utterly different than anything else in the universe” (1977, 38). For if such values existed, then it would be possible for a certain state of affairs to have “a demand for such-and-such an action somehow built into it” (1977, 40). And this, Mackie concludes, would be a decidedly queer property. In sum: **both externalism and internalism have attractive features, yet incur substantial costs**. Traditional **internalism grounds normative claims in familiar features of our psychologies, yet for that very reason has trouble generating universal normative claims. Externalism generates universal normative claims with ease, yet encounters the problems of practicality and queerness**. So we have a pair of unappealing options, and the debate continues. Constitutivism attempts to resolve this dilemma. To put it in an old-fashioned way, **constitutivism sublates internalism and externalism, seeing each position as containing a grain of truth**, but also as partial and one-sided. **The constitutivist agrees with the internalist that the truth of a normative claim depends on the agent’s aims**, in the sense that the agent must possess a certain aim in order for the normative claim to be true. **However, the constitutivist traces the authority of norms to an aim that has a special status—an aim that is constitutive of being an agent. This constitutive aim is not optional**; if you lack the aim, you are not an agent at all. So, while the constitutivist agrees with the internalist that reasons derive from the agent’s aims, the constitutivist holds that there is at least one aim that is intrinsic to being an agent. Accordingly, the constitutivist gets one of the conclusions that the externalist wanted: there are universal reasons for acting.13 Put differently, there are reasons for action that arise merely from the fact that one is an agent. Specifically, these are the reasons grounded in the constitutive aim. **So constitutivism can be viewed as an attempt to resolve the dispute between externalists and internalists** about practical reason, by showing that there are reasons that arise from non-optional aims.14 In so doing, **it generates universal reasons while sidestepping the problems of practicality and queerness**.

**That requires practical reason as the basis for ethics:**

**[1] Regress – Ethical theories must have a basis. We can always ask why we should follow the basis of a theory, so they aren’t morally binding because they don’t have a starting point. Practical reason solves – When we ask why we should follow reason, we demand a reason, which concedes to the authority of reason itself, so it’s the only thing we can follow**

**[2] Inescapability – Every agent intrinsically values practical reason when they go about setting and pursuing an end under a moral theory, as it presupposes that the end they are committing is an intrinsic good. That necessitates practical reason as a necessary means to follow through on any given end.**

**That justifies a universal moral law –**

**1. Absent universal ethics morality becomes arbitrary since it can be meaninglessly applied in different ways without reason. Non-arbitrariness is a side constraint – only non-arbitrary principles can hold agent culpable for their actions since otherwise we could make up ethical rules for different situations to punish people.**

**2. A priori principles like reason apply to everyone since they are independent of human experience. That means to allow one to violate a rule without another would be a contradiction. Contradictions are a side constraint – it’s an inescapable condition that undermines all arguments since something can’t be both true and false simultaneously**

**3. Every agent is equally morally relevant, which requires equal treatment and equal standards for ethics.**

**Therefore, In order to respect each agent as a practical reasoner, we require a universal set of moral laws for what counts as a violation of the principles of rational reflection. That’s the categorical imperative – it has 4 formulations. Pecorino 02,** pecorino, philip. "Categorical Imperative". *Qcc.Cuny.Edu*, 2002, [**https://www.qcc.cuny.edu/socialsciences/ppecorino/medical\_ethics\_text/Chapter\_2\_Ethical\_Traditions/Categorical\_Imperative.htm**](https://www.qcc.cuny.edu/socialsciences/ppecorino/medical_ethics_text/Chapter_2_Ethical_Traditions/Categorical_Imperative.htm). For Kant **the basis for a Theory of the Good lies in the intention** or the will. Those acts are morally praiseworthy that are done out of a sense of duty rather than for the consequences that are expected, particularly the consequences to self. The only thing GOOD about the act is the WILL, the GOOD WILL. That will is to do our DUTY. What is our duty? It is our duty to act in such a manner that we would want everyone else to act in a similar manner in similar circumstances towards all other people. Kant **expressed this as the Categorical Imperative**. Act according to the maxim that you would wish all other rational people to follow, as if it were a universal law. For Kant the GOOD involves the Principle of Universalizability! Kant argues that there can be four formulations of this principle: **The Formula of the Law of Nature: "Act as if the maxim of your action were to become through your will a universal law of nature."The Formula of the End Itself: "Act in such a way that you always treat humanity**, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, **never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end."The Formula of Autonomy: "So act that your will can regard itself at the same time as making universal law through its maxims."The Formula of the Kingdom of Ends: "So act as if you were through your maxims a law-making member of a kingdom of ends."**

**However, we require an enforcement mechanism for these principles since rights claims can’t exist in the state of nature. What follows is the omnilateral will. Varden** **10, Helga. "A Kantian Conception of Free Speech." Freedom of Expression in a Diverse World, 2010 // AHS RG The first important distinction between Kant and much contemporary liberal thought issues from Kant’s argument that it is not in principle possible for individuals to realize right in the state of nature. Kant explicitly rejects the common assumption in liberal theories of his time as well as today that virtuous private individuals can interact in ways reconcilable both with one another’s right to freedom and their corresponding innate and acquired private rights. All the details of this argument are beyond the scope of this paper. It suffices to say that ideal problems of assurance and indeterminacy regarding the specification, application and enforcement of the principles of private right to actual interactions lead Kant to conclude that rightful interaction is in principle impossible in the state of nature.5 Kant argues that only a public authority can solve these problems in a way reconcilable with everyone’s right to freedom. This is why we find Kant starting his discussion of public right with this claim: however well disposed and right-loving men might be, it still lies a priori in the rational idea of such a condition (one that is not rightful) that before a public lawful condition is established individual human beings… can never be secure against violence from one another, since each has her own right to do what seems right and good to her and not be dependent upon another’s opinion about this (6: 312).6 There are no rightful obligations in the state of nature, since in this condition might (‘violence’, or arbitrary judgments and ‘opinion’ about ‘what seems right and good’) rather than right (freedom under law) ultimately governs interactions. According to Kant, therefore, only the establishment of a public authority can enable interaction in ways reconcilable with each person’s innate right to freedom. Moreover, only a public authority can ensure interaction consistent with what Kant argues are our innate rights (to bodily integrity and honor) and our acquired rights (to private property, contract and status relations). The reason is that only the public authority can solve the problems of assurance and indeterminacy without violating anyone’s right to freedom. The public authority can solve these problems because it represents the will of all and yet the will of no one in particular. Because the public authority is representative in this way – by being “united a priori” or by being an “omnilateral” will (6: 263) – it can regulate on behalf of everyone rather than on behalf of anyone in particular. For these reasons, civil society is seen as the only means through which our interactions can become subject to universal laws that restrict everyone’s freedom reciprocally rather than as subject to anyone’s arbitrary choices.**

**Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative as enacted through the omnilateral will.**

**Prefer –**

**1. Motivation – The categorical imperative is intrinsically motivational since it respects the nature of agency, which is the mechanism by which we can set and pursue any end – absent the motivation to pursue ends you would no longer be an agent, which means to be an agent necessitates being motivated to act.**

#### 2. Intents first –

#### 1. To account for all foreseen impacts would prevent action because individuals would become morally culpable for all actions and states of affairs not just those that factor into the will

**2. Otherwise ethical theories hold agents responsible for consequences external to their will which removes any reason to be moral because agents cannot control what they are being punished for**

**3. Aggregation is impossible since there’s no way to quantify different amounts of pain and pleasure – how can 2 headaches equal a migraine**

**4. Induction fails – it’s incoherent to justify the past to justify the future because there’s no logical certainty that what has happened before will happen again**

**5. Since it requires evaluating end-states we can’t know whether the action was good until after it was taken which means the judge cannot determine whether the aff is good**

**6. Consequences empirically impossible to predict. Menand 05, Louis Menand (the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of English at Harvard University) “Everybody’s An Expert” The New Yorker 2005** [**http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2005/12/05/everybodys-an-expert//**](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2005/12/05/everybodys-an-expert//) **FSU SS “Expert Political Judgment” is not a work of media criticism. Tetlock is a psychologist—he teaches at Berkeley—and his conclusions are based on a long-term study that he began twenty years ago. He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. By the end of the study, in 2003, the experts had made 82,361 forecasts. Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate. Tetlock got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, [e.g.] economic growth), or less of something (repression, [e.g.] recession). And he measured his experts on two dimensions: how good they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and how accurate they were at predicting specific outcomes. The results were unimpressive. On the first scale, the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability to all three outcomes—if they had given each possible future a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world, in other words, are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices.**

**Contention**

**contend that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.**

**1. Universalizability - a) Space exploration entails that everyone leaves Earth which means that no one would be around to create the means to leave earth b) Assumes all agents have access to the resources to fund a space trip – they definitely don’t which means exploration is non-universalizable**

Benjamin **Segobaetso**, “Ethical Implications of the Colonization, Privatization and Commercialization of Outer Space”, May **2018**, https://ruor.uottawa.ca/bitstream/10393/38318/1/Benjamin\_Segobaetso\_2018.pdf // swickleee

It can be argued through Kantian ethics that our record here on Earth paints a picture of neoliberal and capitalist policies with tendencies to favour the highest bidder at the exclusion of the under privileged and puts profit first at the expense of the environment. For Kantians, there are two questions that we must ask ourselves whenever we decide to act: (i) Can I rationally will that everyone act as I propose to act? If the answer is no, then we must not perform the action. (ii) Does my action respect the goals of human beings? Again, if the answer is no, then we must not perform the action. Kantian ethicists would argue that extending to space neoliberal and capitalist policies is immoral because these systems create economic disparities and life threatening environmental injustices; therefore, they are set up in a way that we could 16 not rationally will everyone to act the way they act either here on Earth or in space. Also, Kantian ethicists would ask whether the action of extending neoliberal and capitalist policies to space would respect the goals of extra-terrestrial intelligent life if any rather than merely using them for humans’ own purposes? If the answer is no, then the participating agent must not perform the action. Kant wrote on the possible existence of extra-terrestrial intelligent species in the final pages of the last book that he published, Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View [Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht] (1978). In this publication, Kant hinted that the highest concept of the Alien species may be that of a terrestrial rational being [eines irdischen vernünftigen ]; however, he argued that it will be difficult to describe its characteristics because there is no knowledge available of a non-terrestrial rational being [nicht irdischen Wesen] which could be used as a reference in regards to its properties and ultimately classify that terrestrial being as rational. This dilemma will continue until extraterrestrial intelligent life is discovered because comparing two species of rational beings has to be on the basis of experience, but that experience has not been possible yet (Kant, 237-238).

**2. Means to an end – Corporations justification for appropriation is the possibility of human extinction which explicitly leverages the conditions of life for profit – that uses life as a means to an end since it’s the mechanism by which corporations establish their justification for the monopolization of space**

**3. Kingdom of Ends – a] Public good – Outer space is a public good that every self-legislating agent needs equal access to; land in space contains necessary elements for survival which means no agent in the kingdom of ends would agree to allow ownership over those goods b] Deliberation – Private entities are incapable of making omnilateral decisions as privatization entails that they withhold information which limits deliberation over making maxims.**

Chiara **Cordelli** 20**16**, University of Chicago, Political Science & the College [cordelli@uchicago.edu](mailto:cordelli@uchicago.edu) <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/What-is-Wrong-With-Privatization_UCB.pdf>

**The intrinsic wrong of privatization, I will suggest, rather consists in the creation of an institutional arrangement that, by its very constitution, denies those who are subject to it equal freedom**. I understand freedom as an interpersonal relationship of reciprocal independence. To be free is not to be subordinated to another person’s unilateral will. By building on an analytical reconstruction of **Kant’s Doctrine of Right, I will argue that current forms of privatization reproduce** (to a different degree) within a civil condition the very same defects that Kant attributes to **the state of nature**, or to a pre-civil condition, thereby making a rightful condition of reciprocal independence impossible. Importantly, this is so even if private actors are publicly authorized through contract and subject to regulations, and even if they are committed to reason in accordance with the public good. The reason for this, as I will explain, derives from the fact that **private agents are constitutionally incapable of acting omnilaterally, even if their actions are omnilaterally authorized by government through some delegation mechanism**, e.g. a voluntary contract. Omnilateralness, I will suggest, must be understood as a function of 1) rightful judgment and 2) unity. By rightful judgment I mean the capacity to reason publicly and to make universal rules that are valid for everyone, according to a juridical ideal of right, as necessary to solve the problem of the unilateral imposition of private wills on others. By unity I mean the capacity to make rules and decisions that change the normative situation of others, as a part of a unified system of decision-making. The condition of unity is crucial, as I shall later explain, insofar as there might be multiple interpretations compatible with rightful judgment, which would still problematically leave the definition of people’s rightful entitlements indeterminate. Further, the practical realization of the juridical idea of an omnilateral will, I will contend, requires embeddedness within a shared collective practice of decision-making. In practice, rightful judgment can only obtain when certain shared background frameworks that structure practical reasoning and confer unity to that reasoning are in place. The rules of public administration and the authority structure of bureaucracy should be understood as playing this essential function of giving empirical and practical reality to the omnilateral will, as far as the execution of rules and the concrete definition of entitlements are concerned. Together, these two requirements are necessary, (whether they are also sufficient is a different question), to make an action the omnilateral action of a state, which has the moral power to change the normative situation of citizens, by fixing the content of their rights and duties in accordance with the equal freedom of all. The phenomenon of privatization thus raises the fundamental questions of why we need political institutions to begin with, and what makes an action an action of the state. **Insofar as private agents make decisions that fundamentally alter the normative situation (the rights and duties) of citizens, and insofar as, by definition, private agents are not public officials embedded in that shared collective practice, their decisions, even if well intentioned and authorized through contract, cannot count as omnilateral acts of the state.** They rather and necessarily remain unilateral acts of men. Hence, I will conclude, for the very same reasons that **we have, following Kant, a duty to exit the state of nature** so as to solve the twofold problems of the unilateral imposition of will on others and the indeterminacy of rights, we also have a duty to limit privatization and to support, on normative grounds, a case for the re-bureaucratization of certain functions. Therefore, my paper provides foundational reasons to agree with Richard Rorty’s nonfoundational defense of bureaucracy as stated in the opening epigraph, since only agents who are appropriately embedded within a bureaucratic structure, properly understood, are, in many cases, capable of acting omnilaterally. The “bosses” I am here concerned with are not primarily those who 5 can unilaterally impose Sptheir will on us in their capacity as private employers, but rather any private actor who acts unilaterally while in the garb of the state.

**4. Intrinsic value – The fundamental requirement for one to posses intrinsic value is to be self organizing.**

Anna Frammartino **Wilks**, “Kantian Foundations for a Cosmocentric Ethic”, The ethics of Space Exploration pp 181-194, July 23, **2016**, <https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-3-319-39827-3_13> // swickleee

When considering the various kinds of existing beings that we know of, **there seems to be a powerful tendency to view living beings as constituting a distinct category**. There is just something about living beings that strikes us as unique—though what exactly it is quite eludes us (Cleland 2012). It was the acknowledgment of this fact that inspired the initiative among late eighteenth century scientists to establish the sub-discipline of “biology” as a scientific inquiry specifically devoted to the investigation of living things (Van den Berg 2014). Kant’s characterization of a living thing was a catalyst in moving this initiative forward, serving as the foundational principle for the life sciences in this early phase, and it is still operative in current biological theory (Deacon and Cashman 2013). What was the distinguishing feature of living things that Kant fastened on**? According to Kant , the fundamental feature of living things that take the form of organisms is that they are self-organizing** (CPJ 5: 372). An organism is not only an organized being, as in the case of a machine; it is a self-organizing being. We conceive of an organism as if it were not controlled by something external to itself, but rather something internal. Thus **an organism appears, in this sense, to be a system rather than an aggregate, and a somewhat autonomous agent**. As such, an organism is conceived as if it were a natural purpose, since it manifests reciprocal causality, i.e., its parts exist for the sake of the whole, and the whole exists for the sake of its parts (CPJ 5: 371).12 **The organism** does not **exist** solely to serve some extrinsic purpose (CPJ 5: 374). It **seems, rather, to contain an intrinsic purpose in accordance with which it directs all its activities. All other fundamental features of organisms, e.g., self-maintenance, growth, homeostasis, metabolism, reproduction, evolution through adaptation, etc., depend upon the organism’s capacity for self-organization.** The only way we can make sense of the organism’s activity is to consider it as if it contained a purposive drive within itself. Thus Kant characterizes an organism as a natural purpose (Naturzweck).13 It is this feature of organisms, Kant maintains, that renders a completely mechanical explanation of them impossible, since an organism is always underdetermined by the laws of physics.14 In effect “**self-organization implies intrinsic purposiveness**” (Thompson 2010, 140). My view is that **the purposiveness exemplified by living organisms is a rudimentary form of a moral constraint**. Hannah Ginsborg intimates this view in her claim that Kant’s notion of end or purpose here is bound up with the notion of normativity. She maintains that to view an organism as having an end or purpose is essentially “to regard it as conforming to, and a fortiori as governed by, normative rules or constraints” (2006, 464). Kant explains that in our judgment of organisms we compare “the concept of a product of nature as it is with one of what it ought to be” (First Introduction 20: 240). I maintain that this “natural normativity,” as Ginsborg calls it, may be construed as a prototype of moral constraint that generates a primitive form of moral agency. This is the feature that distinguishes organisms as unique types of beings,15 and which in some highly developed organisms gives rise to fully autonomous moral agents. To be sure, since Kant’s time the notion of “self-organization” has acquired a much broader meaning, which opened the door to its application to numerous other contexts and fields besides living organisms and biology (Keller 2008). Those applications of the term, however, fail to capture the particular feature of “self-organization” that warrants its association with the domain of ethics, and specifically, for determining the basis of intrinsic value. Kant’s characterization of organisms provides us with a paradigm case of self-organization for assessing intrinsic value (CJP 5: 374–6).16 Merely existing beings do not possess this property. Thus, on my view, MacNiven’s attribution of intrinsic value to systems of merely existing beings—which I call an ontocentric ethic—would be unfounded. The abiotic features of ecosystems also do not possess this property.17 **It is only by virtue of the organic beings in an ecosystem that the ecosystem itself may be said to involve self-organization**. I conclude, therefore, that **all living beings, understood as organisms in the Kantian sense, may be viewed as possessing intrinsic value by virtue of their capacity for self-organization.** However, the fact that all living beings possess intrinsic value does not necessarily imply that they all possess equal intrinsic value, as Taylor’s biocentric ethic presupposes.18 Some maintain that intrinsic value is an all or nothing thing; it does not admit of degrees.19 I contend that intrinsic value does admit of degrees, and that assessing the degree of intrinsic value possessed by living beings is precisely what is required to resolve some of the most important questions pertaining to the ethics of space exploration, in particular, the question of how the value of microbial extraterrestrial life is to be weighed against the value of human life, along with human desires and activities.20 I direct my attention to the issue of assessing intrinsic value in the section that follows.

**And, space is self legislating – argument from creation – we are subject to the laws of the universe but the universe creates its own laws. There is nothing beyond space that regulates it, thus It regulates itself through the nature of its creation.**

**5. Reject property rights/ libertarianism turns, they r incoherent – a) space has no physical manifestation as space is by definition the absence of matter which means it cannot be measured, bordered, or divided, thus it cannot be owned**