**People own their own bodies and as a result have rights to use their bodies.**

**Feser,** Edward. "Robert Nozick." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, iep.utm.edu/nozick/. Accessed 12 June 2021. ICW NW

Nozick takes his position to follow from a basic moral principle associated with Immanuel Kant and enshrined in Kant’s second formulation of his famous Categorical Imperative: “Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only.” The idea here is that **a human being, as a rational agent endowed with self-awareness, free will, and the possibility of formulating a plan of life, has an inherent dignity and cannot** properly **be treated as a mere *thing*, or *used* against his will** as an instrument or resource in the way an inanimate object might be. In line with this, Nozick also describes individual human beings as *self-owners* (though it isn’t clear whether he regards this as a restatement of Kant’s principle, a consequence of it, or an entirely independent idea). The thesis of self-ownership, a notion that goes back in political philosophy at least to John Locke, is just the claim that **individuals own themselves – their bodies, talents and abilities, labor, and by extension the** fruits or **products of their exercise of their talents, abilities and labor.** They have all the prerogatives with respect to themselves that a slaveholder claims with respect to his slaves. But the thesis of self-ownership would in fact rule out slavery as illegitimate, since each individual, as a self-owner, cannot properly be owned by anyone else. (Indeed, many libertarians would argue that unless one accepts the thesis of self-ownership, one has no way of explaining *why* slavery is evil. After all, it cannot be merely because slaveholders often treat their slaves badly, since a kind-hearted slaveholder would still be a slaveholder, and thus morally blameworthy, for that. The reason slavery is immoral must be because it involves a kind of stealing – the stealing of a person from himself.) But **if individuals are inviolable ends-in-themselves** (as Kant describes them) **and self-owners, it follows**, Nozick says, **that they have certain *rights*, in particular** (and here again following Locke) **rights to their lives, liberty, and the fruits of their labor. To own something,** after all, just **is to have a right to it,** or, more accurately, to possess the bundle of rights – **rights to possess something, to dispose of it, to determine what may be done with it,** etc. – that constitute ownership; and **thus to own oneself is to have such rights to the various elements that make up one’s self. These rights function, Nozick says, as *side-constraints* on the actions of others; they set limits on how others may, morally speaking, treat a person.** So, for example, **since you** own yourself, and thus **have a right to yourself, others are constrained morally not to kill or maim you** (since this would involve destroying or damaging your property), or to kidnap you or forcibly remove one of your bodily organs for transplantation in someone else (since this would involve stealing your property). They are also constrained not to force you against your will to work for another’s purposes, even if those purposes are good ones. For **if you own yourself, it follows that you have a right to determine whether and how you will use your self-owned body and its powers,** e.g. either to work or to refrain from working.

**Thus, the state ought not interfere with people since that would violate their rights.**

**Feser 2,** Edward. "Robert Nozick." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, iep.utm.edu/nozick/. Accessed 12 June 2021.

So far this all might seem fairly uncontroversial. But what follows from it, in Nozick’s view, is the surprising and radical conclusion that ***taxation*,** of the redistributive sort in which modern states engage in order to fund the various programs of the bureaucratic welfare state, **is morally illegitimate. It amounts to a kind of *forced labor*, for the state so structures the tax system that any time you labor at all, a certain amount of your labor time – the amount that produces the wealth taken away from you forcibly via taxation – is time you involuntarily work, in effect, for the state.** Indeed, such taxation amounts to partial *slavery*, for in giving every citizen an entitlement to certain benefits (welfare, social security, or whatever), the state in effect gives them an entitlement, a *right*, to a part of the proceeds of your labor, which produces the taxes that fund the benefits; every citizen, that is, becomes in such a system *a partial owner of you* (since they have a partial property right in part of you, i.e. in your labor). But **this is** flatly **inconsistent with the principle of self-ownership.**

The various programs of the modern liberal welfare state are thus immoral, not only because they are inefficient and incompetently administered, but because they make slaves of the citizens of such a state. Indeed, **the only sort of state that can be morally justified is** what Nozick calls **a *minimal state***or “night-watchman” state, **a government which protects individuals**, via police and military forces, **from force, fraud, and theft, and administers courts of law, but does nothing else.** In particular, **such a state cannot regulate what citizens eat, drink, or smoke** (**since this would interfere with their right to use their self-owned bodies as they see fit), cannot control what they publish or read** (since this would interfere with their right to use the property they’ve acquired with their self-owned labor – e.g. printing presses and paper – as they wish), cannot administer mandatory social insurance schemes or public education (since this would interfere with citizens’ rights to use the fruits of their labor as they desire, in that some citizens might decide that they would rather put their money into private education and private retirement plans), and cannot regulate economic life in general via minimum wage and rent control laws and the like (since such actions are not only economically suspect – tending to produce bad unintended consequences like unemployment and housing shortages – but violate citizens’ rights to charge whatever they want to for the use of their own property).

**Thus, the standard is consistency with libertarianism. This is the idea that the only moral state is one that protects people’s rights but is *never* morally justified in coercing its citizens. Prefer:**

**1. Culpability: If people didn’t freely will an action they can’t be said to be responsible for it because they couldn’t have done otherwise. I.e. if I’m forced to slap a person, no one would say I’m culpable because I had no choice in the matter. This means ethics can’t exist without freedom because we wouldn’t be able to assign agents culpability.**

**2. Freedom is a prerequisite to the use of other frameworks, because if we can’t choose our actions we can’t make them consistent with the aff framework. This means I hijack the aff framework because even if they win it's true, we have to have freedom to pursue it in the first place.**

**Contention)**

**Private businesses have a right to pursue space exploration and it is coercive for the government to interfere with that.**

**Under libertarianism, government interference in economic endeavors like the privatization of space are coercive.**

"Libertarianism." ***Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy***, 5 Sept. 20**02**, plato.stanford.edu/entries/libertarianism/. Accessed 16 Dec. 2021.

Libertarian positions are most controversial in the realm of distributive justice. In this context, **libertarians** typically **endorse** something like **a free-market economy: an economic order based on private property and voluntary market relationships** among agents. Libertarians usually see the kind of large-scale, coercive wealth redistribution in which contemporary welfare states engage as involving unjustified coercion. The same is true of many forms of economic regulation, including licensing laws. **Just as people have strong rights to individual freedom in their personal and social affairs,** libertarians argue, **they also have strong rights to freedom in their economic affairs. Thus, rights of freedom of contract and exchange, freedom of occupation, and private property are taken very seriously.**

**This impacts back to my framework because interference with private appropriation of space is unjustified, thus one has a right to appropriate outer space, i.e. the appropriation of outer space is *justified*.**

**Contention 2)**

**Libertarianism would allow the ownership of space by private companies.**

**Broker,** Tyler. "Space Law Can Only Be Libertarian Minded." *Above the Law*, 14 Jan. 20**20**, abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/. Accessed 16 Dec. 2021.

The impact on human daily life from a transition to the virtually unlimited resource reality of space cannot be overstated. However, when it comes to the law, a minimalist, dare I say libertarian, approach appears as the only applicable system. In the words of [NASA](https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=840632333037679), “2020 promises to be a big year for space exploration.” Yet, as Rand Simberg [points out](https://reason.com/2020/01/12/socialists-in-space-2/) in Reason magazine, **it is** actually **private American investment that is currently moving space exploration to “a pace unseen since the 1960s.”** According to Simberg, due to this increase in private investment **“We are now on the verge of getting affordable private access to orbit for large masses of payload and people.”** The impact of that type of affordable travel into space might sound sensational to some, but in reality [the benefits](https://abovethelaw.com/2019/10/automation-ubi-and-the-future-of-human-labor/) that space can offer are far greater than any benefit currently attributed to any major policy proposal being discussed at the national level. The sheer amount of [resources available](https://cneos.jpl.nasa.gov/about/nea_resource.html) within our [current reach/capabilities](https://www.asteroidmission.org/) simply speaks for itself. However, although those new realities will, as Simberg says, “bring to the fore a lot of ideological issues that up to now were just theoretical,” I believe it will also eliminate many economic and legal distinctions we currently utilize today. For example, **the sheer number of resources we can already obtain in space means that in the rapidly near future, the distinction between a nonpublic good or a public good will be rendered meaningless.** In other words**, because the resources available within our solar system exist in such quantities, all goods will become nonrivalrous in their consumption and nonexcludable in their distribution. This would mean government engagement in the public provision of a nonpublic good,** even at the trivial level, or [what Kevin Williamson defines as socialism](https://www.nationalreview.com/2011/01/socialism-back-kevin-d-williamson/), is rendered meaningless or impossible. In fact, **in space, I fail to see how any government could even *try* to legally compel collectivism** in the way Simberg fears. Similar to many economic distinctions, however, it appears that many laws, both the good and the bad, will also be rendered meaningless as soon as we begin to utilize the resources within our solar system. For example, **if every human being is given access to the resources that allows them to replicate anything anyone else has, or replace anything “taken” from them instantly, what would be the point of theft laws? If you had virtually infinite space in which you can build what we would now call luxurious livable quarters, all without exploiting human labor or fragile Earth ecosystems when you do it, what sense would most property, employment, or commercial law make?** Again, this is not a pipe dream, no matter how much our population grows for the next several millennia, the amount of resources within our solar system can sustain such an existence for every human being. Rather than panicking about the future, we should try embracing it, or at least meaningfully preparing for it. Currently, the [Outer Space Treaty](http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/introouterspacetreaty.html), or as some call it [“the Magna Carta of Space,”](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2019/08/31/space-final-legal-frontier/) is silent on the issue of whether private individuals or corporate entities can own territory in space. Regardless of whether governments allow it, however, private citizens are currently obtaining the ability to travel there, and if human history is any indicator, private homesteading will follow, flag or no flag. We Americans know this is how a Wild West starts, where most regulation becomes the impractical pipe dream. But again, this would be a Wild West where the exploitation of human labor and fragile Earth ecosystem makes no economic sense, where every single human can be granted access to resources that even the wealthiest among us now would envy, and where innovation and imagination become the only things we would recognize as currency. **Only a libertarian-type system, that guarantees basic individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness could be valued** and therefore human fidelity to a set of laws made possible, in such an existence.

**This impacts back to my framework because private corporations are justified in appropriating space.**
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