I negate the resolution, “Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.”

Definitions:

Private - controlled or owned by individual people or companies, rather than by the government

Source: Macmillan Dictionary

Appropriation - the act of setting apart or taking for one's own use

Source: Collins English Dictionary

The value for the round is clearly justice as whether or not the appropriation of outer space by private entities is or is not just is the question posed by the resolution. So only a value of justice will answer the question of the resolution. We should look to the text of the resolution whenever possible as doing so empowers us to actually resolve the debate. So unless my opponent upholds justice you can already prefer my case on topical relevance and focus.

**To uphold justice, society must abide by Nozick’s entitlement theory.**

V: Justice

C: Nozicks Difference Principles

Lamont & Favor ‘17, Lamont, Julian (Lecturer in Philosophy The University of Queensland) and Christi Favor (Lecturer at

The Queensland University of Technology's Center for Ethics), "Distributive Justice", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/justice-distributive/>.

Most contemporary versions of the principles discussed so far allow some role for the market as a means of achieving the desired distributive pattern—the Difference Principle uses it as a means of helping the least advantaged; utilitarian principles commonly use it as a means of achieving the distributive pattern maximizing utility; desert-based principles rely on it to distribute goods according to desert, etc. In contrast, advocates of libertarian distributive principles rarely see the market as a means to some desired pattern, since the principle(s) they advocate do not ostensibly propose a ‘pattern’ at all, but instead describe the sorts of acquisitions or exchanges which are just in their own right. The market will be just, not as a means to some pattern, but insofar as the exchanges permitted in the market **just outcomes are those arrived at by the separate just actions of individuals; a particular distributive pattern is not required for justice. Robert Nozick advanced thi**s version of libertarianism (Nozick 1974), and is its best known contemporary advocate. Nozick proposes a 3-part “**Entitlement Theory**”. If the world were wholly just, the following definition would exhaustively cover the subject of justice in holdings: A person who acquires a holding in **accordance with the principle of justice in acquisition is entitled to that holding. A person who acquires a holding in accordance with the principle of justice in transfer, from**

**someone else entitled to the holding, is entitled to the holding. No one is entitled to a holding except by (repeated) applications of (a) and (b). The complete principle of distributive justice**

**would say simply that a distribution is just if everyone is entitled to the holdings they possess under the distribution** (Nozick, p.151). The statement of the Entitlement Theory includes reference to the principles of justice in acquisition and transfer. (For details of these principles see Nozick, pp.149–182.) The principle of justice in transfer is the least controversial and is designed to specify fair contracts while ruling out stealing, fraud, etc. The principle of justice in acquisition is more complicated and more controversial. The principle is meant to govern the gaining of exclusive property rights over the material world. For the justification of these rights, Nozick takes his inspiration from John Locke’s idea that everyone ‘owns’ themselves and, by mixing one’s labors with the world, self-ownership can generate ownership of some part of the material world. However, of Locke’s mixing metaphor, Nozick legitimately asks: ‘…why isn’t mixing what I own with what I don’t own a way of losing what I own rather than a way of gaining what I don’t? If I own a can of tomato juice and spill it in the sea so its molecules... mingle evenly through out the sea, do I thereby come to own the sea, or have I foolishly dissipated my tomato juice?’ (Nozick 1974, p.174) **Nozick concludes that what is significant about mixing our labor with the material world is that in doing so, we tend to increase the value of it, so that self-ownership can lead to ownership of the external world in such cases**

So to be just, we must adhere to the criterion of Nozick’s Difference Principle. Prefer this criterion for it is intuitive as if a person does nothing wrong, they are entitled to their property and so is consistent with the broadest conceptions of due. The police cannot take property without due cause and a warrant, or it would simply be robbery. So my criterion comes before any other. I contend the appropriation of outer space by private entities is consistent with Nozick’s Difference Principle

# Contention 1

**A free market can do everything more efficiently than NASA**

**Garmong ’05**, Robert Garmong (Ph.D. in philosophy, was a writer for the Ayn Rand Institute from 2003 to 2004), “**Privatize Space Exploration,” Capitalism Magazine, July 22, 2005,** <https://www.capitalismmagazine.com/2005/07/privatize-space-exploration/>

As NASA scrambles to make the July 31 window for the troubled launch of space shuttle Discovery, we should recall the first privately funded manned spacecraft, SpaceShipOne, which over a year ago shattered more than the boundary of outer space: it destroyed forever the myth that space exploration can only be done by the government. Two years ago, a Bush Administration panel on space exploration recommended that NASA increase the role of private contractors in the push to permanently settle the moon and eventually explore Mars. Unfortunately, it appears unlikely that NASA will consider the true free-market solution for America’s expensive space program: complete privatization.

**There is a contradiction at the heart of the space program**: space exploration, as the grandest of man’s technological advancements, requires the kind of bold innovation possible only to minds left free to pursue the best of their creative thinking and judgment. Yet, **by funding the space program** through taxation, we **necessarily place it at the mercy of bureaucratic whim. The results are written all over the past twenty years of NASA’s history: the space program is a political animal, marked by shifting, inconsistent, and ill-defined goals. The space shuttle was built** and **maintained to please clashing special interest groups, not to do a clearly defined job for which there was an economic** and technical **need**. The shuttle was to launch satellites for the Department of Defense and private contractors–which could be done more cheaply by lightweight, disposable rockets. It was to carry scientific experiments–which could be done more efficiently by unmanned vehicles. But one “need” came before all technical issues: NASA’s political need for showy manned vehicles. **The result**, as great a technical achievement as it is**, was an over-sized, over-complicated, over-budget, overly dangerous vehicle that does everything poorly and nothing well**. Indeed, the space shuttle program was supposed to be phased out years ago, but the search for its replacement has been halted, largely because space contractors enjoy collecting on the overpriced shuttle without the expense and bother of researching cheaper alternatives. **A private industry could have fired them–but not so in a government project, with home-district congressmen to lobby on their behalf**. This means that treating space as a global commons means unjust policies where people are taxed violating their property rights to support a wasteful, inefficient space program they may not even support and so is unjust.

Impact: This means that treating space as a global commons means unjust policies where people are taxed violating their property rights to support a wasteful, inefficient space program they may not even support and so is unjust.

# Contention 2

**Extending first in time, first in right to outer space is the only way to ensure successful space exploration.**

**Garmong 2 ’05**, Robert Garmong (Ph.D. in philosophy, was a writer for the Ayn Rand Institute from 2003 to 2004), “**Privatize Space Exploration,” Capitalism Magazine, July 22, 2005,** <https://www.capitalismmagazine.com/2005/07/privatize-space-exploration/>

**Nor would it be difficult to spur the private exploration of space–it’s been happening, quietly, for years. The free market works to produce whatever there is demand for**, just as it now does with traditional aircraft. Commercial satellite launches are now routine, and could easily be fully privatized. The X Prize, which SpaceShipOne won, offered incentives for private groups to break out of the Earth’s atmosphere. But all this private exploration is hobbled by the crucial absence of a system of property rights in space. Imagine the incentive to a profit-minded business if, for instance, it were granted the right to any stellar body it reached and exploited. We often hear that the most ambitious projects can only be undertaken by government, but in fact the opposite is true. **The more ambitious a project is, the more it demands to be broken into achievable, profit-making steps–and freed from the unavoidable politicizing of government-controlled science. If space development is to be transformed from an expensive national bauble whose central purpose is to assert national pride to a practical industry, it will only be by unleashing the creative force of free and rational minds. The creative minds that allowed SpaceShipOne to soar to triumph have made the first private steps toward the stars. Before them are enormous technical difficulties, the solution of which will require even more heroic determination than that which tamed the seas and the continents. To solve them, America must unleash its best minds, as only the free market can do.**

Impact: This means rather than being unjust, the appropriation of outer space by private entities is the only way for us to successfully rapidly move into space by allowing billionaires to risk their own funds and not everyone else’s and so the appropriation of outer space by private entities is just.