

Robert Nozick is making an analogy here about the rich paying taxes so that the money can be redistributed to those in need. Libertarians are against this as it is not voluntary.

Suppose that Wilt Chamberlain is greatly in demand by basketball teams, being a great gate attraction. He signs the following sort of contract with a team. In each home game, twenty-five cents from the price of each ticket goes to him. The season starts, and people cheerfully attend his team's games; they buy their tickets, each time dropping a separate twenty-five cents into a special box with WC's name on it. They are excited to see him play; it is worth the total admission price to them. Let us suppose that in one season one million persons attend his home games, and WC winds up with \$250,000, a much larger sum than the average income and larger even than anyone else has. Is he entitled to this income?

There is no question about whether each of the people was entitled to the control over the resources they held. Each of these persons chose to give twenty-five cents of their money to WC. They could have spent it on going to the movies, or on candy bars.... But they all, or at least one million of them, converged on giving it to WC in exchange for watching him play basketball.

If the people were entitled to dispose of the resources to which they were entitled, didn't this include their being entitled to give it to, or exchange it with, WC? Can anyone else complain on the grounds of justice?