#### The value is justice as per the resolution, defined as giving each their due.

#### Justice must begin from our ability to reason. When you take an action, you can always ask why you should take the action. When a reason for the action is formulated, however, you can ask again why we should consider this reason. These justifications continue on into infinity because you can always keep asking “why.” The only way to solve this problem and get to the root of morality is to base ethics in reason itself, because asking for a reason to use reason concedes that it is important. Another justification is that the ability to reason to take action is what defines a moral agent. For example, a rock may roll down a hill, but because it lacks to ability to reason to make that decision, we would not say that morality applies to it.

#### That means that all actions must be universalizable, making the value criterion of the debate consistency with universal maxims. Just like how 2 + 2 = 4 is universally true for all reasoners, morality must be universally true as well. Taking an action means you imply that others should be able to take the action because morality must apply the same way to both of you. That means certain actions are restricted. For example, theft is non-universalizable because it depends on the existence of property; however, if everyone were to steal, objects would be passed around with no consideration of their owners, destroying any conception of property in the first place.

#### For clarification, morality is derived from whether it would logically contradict itself, not from adding up the consequences of certain actions. Adding 2 circles doesn’t make anything more circular than it was before, just like how 2 actions aren’t more universalizable than 1. Therefore, consequence-based arguments that do not pertain to the universalizability of actions, such as policy disadvantages, do not matter if I win the framework debate.

#### Prefer my framework additionally:

#### [1] The mere act of arguing against my framework proves it true because debating presupposes everyone has the ability to use practical reason and autonomy to make arguments.

**[2] Only my framework applies to the value of justice.**

**Miller 17** David Miller, Professor of Political Theory and Senior Research Fellow at the University of Oxford, "Justice," 26 June 2017, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed 26 December 2021, pg. 1, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice/#UtilJust> ~ST~

The third aspect of justice to which Justinian’s definition draws our attention is **the connection between justice and the impartial and consistent application of rules – that is what the ‘constant and perpetual will’ part of the definition conveys. Justice is the opposite of arbitrariness. It requires that where two cases are relevantly alike, they should be treated in the same way (We discuss below the special case of justice and lotteries). Following a rule that specifies what is due to a person who has features X, Y, Z whenever such a person is encountered ensures this.** And although the rule need not be unchangeable – perpetual in the literal sense – it must be relatively stable. This explains why justice is exemplified in the rule of law, where laws are understood as general rules impartially applied over time. Outside of the law itself, individuals and institutions that want to behave justly must mimic the law in certain ways (for instance, gathering reliable information about individual claimants, allowing for appeals against decisions).

IF THERE’S ANY SORT OF UNCERTAINTY IS TO ALLOW US TO BE ALIVE TO HAVE THESE DEBATES

## Offense

#### [1] Self-ownership is the ability to interact with external objects. Appropriation allows you to exercise your own freedom on other things.

**Feser 05** Edward Feser, Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION," 1 January 2005, Cambridge University Press, accessed 12 1 2022, Pg. 71-73, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1> phs st recut

There is. An alternative, soft-line approach could acknowledge that the initial acquirer who abuses a monopoly over a water hole (or any similar crucial resource) does commit an injustice against those who are disad- vantaged, but such an approach could still hold that the acquirer never- theless has not committed an injustice in acquisition —his acquisition was, as I have said, neither just nor unjust. Nor does he fail to own what he has acquired; he still cannot be said to have stolen the water from anyone. Rather, his injustice is an unjust use of what he owns, on a par with the unjust use I make of my self-owned fist when I wield it, unprovoked, to bop you on your self-owned nose. In what sense does the water-hole owner use his water unjustly, though? He doesn’t try to drown anyone in it, after all— indeed, the whole problem is that he won’t let anybody near it! Eric Mack gives us the answer we need in what he has put forward as **the “self-ownership proviso” (SOP).28 This is a proviso not (as the Lock- ean proviso is) on the initial acquisition of property, but rather on how one can use his property in a way that respects others’ self-ownership rights. It is motivated by consideration of the fact that the talents, abilities, capac- ities, energies, etc., that a person rightfully possesses as a self-owner are inherently “world-interactive”; that is, it is of their very essence that they are directed toward the extra-personal environment.29 Your capacity to use your hand, for instance, is just a capacity to grasp and manipulate external objects; thus, what you own in owning your hand is something essentially grasping and manipulating.30 Now if someone were to cut off your hand or invasively keep you from using it (by tying your arm against your body or holding it behind your back), ~~he~~ [they] would obviously be violating your self-ownership rights. But there are, Mack suggests, other, noninvasive ways in which those rights might be violated. If, to use an example of Mack’s, I effectively nullify your ability to use your hand by creating a device that causes anything you reach for to be propelled beyond your grasp, making it impossible for you ever to grasp or manip- ulate anything, I have violated your right to your hand as much as if I had cut it off or tied it down. I have, in any case, prevented your right to your hand from being anything more than a formal right, one that is practically useless. In the interests of guaranteeing respect for substantive, robust rights of self-ownership, then, “[t]he SOP requires that persons not deploy their legitimate holdings, i.e., their extra-personal property, in ways that severely, albeit noninvasively, disable any person’s world-interactive powers.” 31 The SOP follows, in Mack’s view, from the thesis of self-ownership itself; or, at any rate, the considerations that would lead anyone to accept that thesis should also, in his view, lead one to accept the proviso.**32 A brief summary of a few of Mack’s thought experiments should suffice to give a sense of why this is so.33 In what Mack calls the Adam’s Island example, Adam acquires a previously uninhabited island and later refuses a shipwrecked Zelda permission to come ashore, as a result of which she remains struggling at sea (and presumably drowns). In the Paternalist Caging example, instead of drowning, Zelda becomes caught offshore in a cage Adam has constructed for catching large sea mammals, and, rather than releasing her, Adam keeps her in the cage and feeds her regularly. In the Knuckle-Scraper Barrier example, Zelda falls asleep on some unowned ground, whereupon a gang of oafish louts encircles her and, using their bodies and arms as barriers, refuses to let her out of the circle (accusing her of assault if she touches them in order to climb over or break through). In the Disabling Property Barrier example, instead of a human barrier, Adam constructs a plastic shield over and around the unowned plot of ground upon which Zelda sleeps, accusing her of trespassing upon his property when she awakens and tries to escape by breaking through the plastic. And in the (similarly named) Disabling Property Barriers example, seem to suggest an Aristotelian-Thomistic conception of natural function, and though this by no means troubles me, it might not be what Mack himself has in mind (nor, of course, is it something every philosopher is going to sympathize with). Mack’s view nevertheless seems to require something like this conception. And something like it —enough like it to do the job Mack needs to be done, anyway—is arguably to be found in Larry Wright’s well- known reconstruction, in modern Darwinian terms, of the traditional notion of natural function. See Larry Wright, “Functions,” Philosophical Review 82, no. 2 (1973): 139–68. Adam, instead of enclosing Zelda in a plastic barrier, encloses in plastic barriers every external object that Zelda would otherwise be able to use — thus, in effect, enclosing her in a larger, all-encompassing plastic barrier of a more eccentric shape. In all of these cases, Mack says, although Zelda’s formal rights of self-ownership have not been violated—no one has invaded the area enclosed by the surface of her skin —her rights over her self-owned powers, and in particular her ability to exercise those powers, have nevertheless been nullified. But a plausible self-ownership- based theory surely cannot allow for this. It cannot, for instance, allow the innocent Zelda justly to be imprisoned in any of the ways described!

#### [2] No one owns space; thus, their rights cannot be violated.

**Feser 05** Edward Feser, Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION," 1 January 2005, Cambridge University Press, accessed 12 1 2022, Pg. 58-59, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1> JS recut

The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. **The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place.** In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. **Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisition of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R. By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all.** So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after someone has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.

#### [3] Space appropriation only changes the location and not the nature of property claims, which makes it just.

**Baca 93** Kurt Anderson Baca, Associate at Gallop, Johnson & Neuman, “Property Rights in Outer Space,” 1993, SMU Scholar, accessed 13 January 2022, Pg. 1083-1084, <https://scholar.smu.edu/jalc/vol58/iss4/4/> JS recut

**The powers necessary to constitute an efficient system of property rights on Earth have been found, by deduction** from first principles by political philosophers influential in the development of the Western institutions and from history and practice in the courts, to be the power to exclude, to use, and to dispose. 98 The resulting system is also inherently equitable as it benefits society as a whole and as it protects investments and expectations. This system would remain equitable so long as the initial allocation of any new resource was, and is, not based on mere usurpation of unclaimed property, but is based on investment in the property that adds to its value. 99 This system of property rights relies on the provision of powers to the holder of the property. **The source of the power is ultimately in the state that enforces the liabilities of parties corresponding to the powers of owners: the liability to exclusion, the liability for interference with use, and the liability to respect contracts and to refrain from hindering disposition.** °0 This implies that sovereign power is essential to any functioning system of property rights, and in the absence of a general sovereign body, sovereignty is to be found in the nation-state. **How does the extension of man's activities into space and onto the celestial bodies change the basic necessities of an efficient and equitable property rights system? The movement of activities into space affects only the place of activities. The nature of those activities and of the actor remain unchanged. The nature of efficiency and equity are likewise unchanged, and the need for certain securities and guarantees to foster productive activity by man is unchanged.** The same property rights system that is most beneficial on Earth will be most beneficial on the celestial bodies.