

I value morality because just is defined as based on or behaving according to what is morally right which indicates a moral obligation

First, reason is the source of morality: a) it is the only inescapable source because we can always question why we follow desires or the law, but we cannot ask a reason for following reasons which concedes the authority of reason b) empirical uncertainty – not everyone shares the same experiences, our perception can be manipulated; the one constant is reason bc principles remain the same for everyone c) is/ought gap – descriptive statements can't generate prescriptive obligations

Reason must be universal: a) otherwise morality would be arbitrary and subjective which is bad and would not bind people to act b) reason is universal because in order for a reason to be considered legitimate it must be shared by everyone e.g. it would be illogical to say $2+2=4$ for you but 5 for me

Finally, we can never will a violation of freedom because it creates a contradiction – violating someone's freedom requires the extension of my freedom over another which restricts another's freedom so I am simultaneously willing both an extension and limitation of freedom which is incoherent.

Thus, the standard is consistency with equal outer freedom.

Prefer my criterion additionally:

[1] In order to justify arguments, it assumes the concept of freedom because communication is impossible unless we are free to do so. This means all other frameworks assume the validity of my framework

[2] My framework best respects human worth – in order for humans to have value, we have to value it unconditionally – otherwise, human worth is only instrumentally valuable and not intrinsically – we can violate anyone's human worth as a result

[3] Reject utilitarianism: a. We can never predict every consequence of our action because there are unintended effects, which means it cannot guide action b.

Aggregation is impossible – it is impossible to compare 10 headaches to one migraine c. It leads to atrocities – we can justify any action as long as it benefits more people than it harms which means we can justify mass death

My thesis and sole contention is that corporations have a legitimate property rights claim to outer space that must be respected.

Respecting private property rights is a fundamental duty - it preserves autonomy and enables freedom of action, Kuznicki '17:

Kuznicki, Jason. "A Kantian Case for Libertarianism." <https://www.libertarianism.org/publications/essays/kantian-case-libertarianism>

How then do property rights and cosmopolitan law relate to Kant's ethical project? Neither will necessarily make us good people; nothing prevents the propertied individual from having a bad will. Nor are property rights even necessary for possessing inward ethical freedom, for one always has the capacity to will the good—or not—regardless of how unfree or poor one may be. A good person may live, and be good, under a bad government, or in destitution. The traits are in this sense quite independent. But **property rights in things alone**—and never in persons—**can help us obey more perfectly the negative duties that are most clearly implied by the second formulation of the categorical imperative: by granting individuals each the capacity to acquire, modify, and alienate property, we also allow them to use property to their own ends**, and we declare, as it were, our maxim that only unreasoning things are to be used as tools—and never people. A cosmopolitan regime of private property that excludes slavery thus draws a bright line between the kingdom of ends, which is reserved for people, and the kingdom of means, which largely overlaps the legal category of property. This outward conformity, Kant believed, could lead people to the inner apprehension of the moral law. 27 Under a cosmopolitan, property-holding regime, **we likewise obtain a similar type of outward autonomy for ourselves**. Much of the cosmopolitan project seems aimed at making the outside more closely resemble the inside. It **aims at expanding our freedom of action in the phenomenal world, that is, the world of exterior experiences, to more closely resemble the freedom of action in the interior world of the mind**. **What we do with our property, do note, may be good or bad, but we will at least have secured one of the foundations of leading a morally good external life, which is the capacity for self-rule.** (For Kant, the growing capacity for an adult-like self-rule, a rule independent of the state, was also the essence of the Enlightenment. 28) Under free institutions, obedience to the written law and obedience to the moral law may now begin to harmonize, even if, as Kant warned, our current property claims may not be fully settled or just. In time, they can be, if only we continue to will it.

That negates:

1) Private entities use their own property and resources for space exploration – banning appropriation of outer space limits the exercise of their currently existing set of property rights

2) Libertarianism mandates a market-oriented approach to space—that negates

Broker 20 [(Tyler, work has been published in the Gonzaga Law Review, the Albany Law Review and the University of Memphis Law Review.) **"Space Law Can Only Be Libertarian Minded."** Above the Law, 1-14-20, <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/>] TDI

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, "2020 promises to be a big year for space

exploration." Yet, as Rand Simberg points out 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 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 within our current reach/capabilities 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, 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, or as some call it “the Magna Carta of Space,” 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 also makes the concept of common ownership of resources incoherent – given that space resources are nearly infinite, private appropriation does not trade off with the consumption of others