

Which kind of resources and powers can be legitimately claimed for purposes of social justice? Is a public service requirement a justifiable solution for labor shortage for essential goods? The standard liberal view holds that labour is a personal power that falls under the right to self-ownership, hence compulsory public service is impermissible. It draws an analogy between body parts and labour and argue that both are closely tied to personal plans of life and should fall under self-ownership. They conclude that making coercive demands on individuals' labour violates the right to self-ownership. It is only justified under emergency conditions when the liberal state itself is under threat.

I challenge the idea that our labour falls under self-ownership. I argue first, that the standard liberal view has not paid sufficient attention to the normatively salient differences between the moral ownership of body parts and the moral ownership of our labour. Second, it has not adequately shown that restricting life plans *directly* is unjustifiable, while restricting life plans *indirectly* by reducing the resources available to persons via taxation is justifiable; third, it has not adequately defended the extreme justificatory burden tied to coercively insisting on labour. The standard liberal argument only shows that public service requires a different, more compelling justification than taxation.

I argue that instead of conceptualizing labour as closer to the body than money, labour is better seen as combining morally salient features of both personal powers and social resources. Therefore, justifying the moral ownership of labour must be suitably adjusted to its nature and account for both (a) the way it is intertwined with personal life plans, and (b) the way it depends on the contribution and cooperation of others. I conclude that based on this more circumspect account of rightful ownership of labour, an autonomy sensitive public service requirement is justifiable.