# Space Anarchism K

#### Definition based on on 6 legal documents:

Law Insider, no date. https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/private-entities

***Private entities* means**[**individuals**](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/individuals)**or**[**organizations**](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/organizations)**other than**[**federal**](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/federal)**,**[**state**](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/state)**, or**[**local personnel**](https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/local-personnel)**or**[**agencies**](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/agencies).

#### LINK: The state reproduces itself when it goes to space – turns case – Laursen 21:

Laursen, E., 2021. The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State.

But why, one might ask, does that discussion have to take place? Isn’t it possible that **we can reform the State** and make it work for us rather than for its elites? This would **only** be the case **if the State really was transcendent, as it claims** to be, if it really did exist on a plane over and above all human existence, such that it perfectly comprehends and can legislate for every aspect of human life and society satisfactorily and equitably at any given time. **It isn’t**, and it doesn’t. **It’s the product of** a particular five-hundred-year period of **history**, and its principal skill at any given moment is its own survival. This is all the more unfortunate since **the problems the** **State** has **created** **are becoming more severe**, not less. Wholesale stripping of natural resources, which began with the early modern State’s consuming quest for gold and silver, has escalated in vulnerable regions like the Amazon and parts of Indonesia, threatening to make the earth’s atmosphere unbreathable. The State’s intrusion into our personal lives, growing ever more sophisticated, now threatens to entirely destroy privacy and create the most efficient police state in history; in 2020, the coronavirus pandemic provided yet another handy excuse to take this capability further. The revival of the nuclear arms race and the expansion of the “family” of nuclear-armed countries has made **the State an existential threat to life on this planet**; right away in 1945, the State established that it was willing to use such weapons. All of these developments took place within the past one hundred years. We’re **already getting a glimpse of the next stage**. In May 2020, President Trump held an Oval Office ceremony to unveil the official flag of the newest branch of the U.S. armed forces: **the Space Force**. Calling it a “very special moment,” Trump congratulated his administration for having “worked very hard on this and it’s so important from a defensive standpoint, from an offensive standpoint, from every standpoint there is,” thereby **admitting** up front **that U.**S. **militarization of outer space was aggressive in intent**. “We have developed some of the most incredible weapons anyone’s ever seen,” including a new “super-duper missile,” he enthused, “and it’s moving along very rapidly.” 49 The new Space Force amounted to **an abrogation of the Outer Space Treaty** that the United States and other governments signed in 1967 **to prevent** “a new form of colonial competition” and to bar **the use of outer space for military purposes**. The same month that Trump held his flag ceremony, the White House announced that the United States would begin negotiating accords with other governments including Canada, Japan, the United Arab Emirates, and European countries with “like-minded” interests in mining the moon. The “Artemis Accords,” as the projected agreement was named, would include “safety zones” surrounding future moon bases to prevent damage or interference from rival countries—or companies. These would presumably include Russia, which was pointedly left out of the negotiations. 50 Neither of these developments should have been the least bit surprising, despite more than half a century of protestations that no state was interested in turning outer space into a battlefield, a shooting gallery, or another natural resource to be despoiled. It **never was within** the **logic of the State to stick** **to** **any** such **pledge**, and there should be no doubt that these initiatives will continue, in the United States and elsewhere, outlasting parties, individual politicians, and shifts in alliances. ¶¶ The larger implications are also clear: the State refusesto be bound to one planet or one environment. It is greater than the earth, and greater than any human population. **If it turns this planet into an unlivable husk** through environmental depredation, race war, or nuclear holocaust, so be it; the **State will find other worlds to** shape to its will, other settings in which to **reproduce** **itself**.

#### Capitalism is destroying every good thing about Earth. The Earth is no longer saveable, and it will kill us if we stay any longer. Going to space is easier than trying to save the world—we have to try. The Anarchist Library:

The Anarchist Library. (2015). *An illegalist space program in four parts*. The Anarchist Library. Retrieved January 7, 2022, from https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/anonymous-an-illegalist-space-program-in-four-parts

**Fuck Earth.** Industrial capitalism has put shoes on all our feet, and now our toes are permanently fucked up. Look it up. I was born in a domesticated place, at the beginning of the end of American hegemony. I was all tuned up to give an honest try at revolution or liberation or whatever, and then Occupy collapsed into it's obvious conclusion. Prison support makes me want to shoot myself, because I can never do enough, I forget things, and I'm just not ready to die for people I haven't met yet. Primitivism is embarrassing. I lived with some people who only wore skins that they tanned, and stole bison meat from Whole Foods. It smelled, and little kids thought they were LARPing. **The cops keep shooting people.** Perhaps in response**, people keep shooting themselves. I** live out of my truck. **I am not trying to save the world. The world is constantly trying to save me.** The priests of science want to give me pills. Patriarchy wants to get me laid. Racism wants to give me a nice new house in Nairobi, and capital wants to give me a job. It is funny to me that they have all failed. The Earth is covered in humans like ants, and they all drag their ideologies and stupid tribal wars around like trophies**. People of every nationality and creed waste their breath trying to push the Earth this way or that way,** trying to fake **like there is some where to go.** They have nothing to push off of, no leverage. Would you like to watch the last forests become toilet paper? Would you like to contact and destroy the last indigenous tribes, to tell them "I'm sorry, but we figured out how to turn pig farts and air into fertilizer, and things got out of hand. Here's some fried chicken and an eviction notice." **I'm not trying to take over, save the world, and steal the bacon. I just want to build a new world** somewhere else. I bought a seven dollar microscope at GoodWill, and a 10X loop with lights on it that make me look like a mad scientist. I've made whiskey. **I don't believe that rocket science is more difficult than insurrection. Let's get** the fuck **out of here** as soon as possible. You'd be surprised to learn that hippie dippy shit like ecosystem management actually makes sense when you live in a built environment. Theoretically, at least, **it makes** a hell of alot **more sense than what they do in the ISS. We can probably make it work. Are you seriously gonna sit back and let fuckin Elon Musk turn Marsinto a reality TV show? Earth is a tiny blue dot covered in troubles,** and the endless wild universe isn't responding to state sponsored attempts to communicate. Perhaps aliens don't know what to say when we beam Kim Kardashian and I Love Lucy into their motherships. More importantly, **space is SPACE. Distance between you and** the cops. Distance between you and the church, the courts, **the great failure that is** Terran **society** and all of itsstupid gravity. **Instead of** pounding the pud and **waiting to die, why don't we** get our shit together and **make a break for it?**

#### The idea is not as absurd as it seems. Space is the perfect home for anarchists. It is up to us to not let billionaires spread violent imperialism to another world. Bevensee:

Bevensee, Emmi. No Date. “Anarchists Need Space Because We’re Fighting in All Directions.” <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/emmi-bevensee-anarchists-need-space-because-we-re-fighting-in-all-directions>

Space travel throws the entire game board up in the air. The first and most obvious way is that it makes the available places to build muchmore numerous. **The notion that anarchists could have our own spaceships** and be exploring and setting up shop on distant rocks might seem absurd now, but **it’s an eventuality** in time. **The technology will** continue **get**ting **cheaper**. We will steal and reverse engineer. **The radicals will go to space** and when we get there, we will find places with no life on them that we’re can’t introduce microbiomes and decimate and we will be able to **practice our ways of being** without having to pry the space back from the landlords capitalists and state thugs. Or **if there are** signs of **life**, because anarchists actually care about deeply rooted ethics, **we’ll be thoughtful** and considerate about what our presence could mean. We need to play to our strengths. We should **try to avoid war** not just because it is fundamentally terrible, but because we’re not well suited for it. Guerilla insurrection we can do, but the losses are extreme. Because we’ll never have the monopoly on brutality we should try to go somewhere where we’re not bothering anyone and can more or less do our own thing. We would obviously still need to be able to defend ourselves but we can completely **disentangle ourselves from the imperial geopolitical games of earth**. To those ends, we should avoid trying to militaristically seize territories whenever possible because it sucks and again we suck at it. Assuming colonies will get set up on every rock within humanities ever expanding sphere of reach, we shouldn’t just keep to ourselves. We can do our thing and infiltrate and agitate and challenge everywhere we are but **the vastness of space gives us more room to be ourselves.** We can deter a lot of threats by just being far enough out that we are perceived as a non-threat and that travel costs make attacking us less appealing anyways. It works similarly with politics. Rather than playing the endless tug-of-war with reform and direct action we can follow our instincts and just leave the whole thing alone. We can actuallyput our ideas into practice **without the** constant sabotage of state political repression and counterproductive liberal progressivism. Obviously anarchist ideas, practices, and victories often make it into the mainstream of society but nonetheless we are often a movement in the margins. This isn’t a defeatist view either. It’s just because the truly nuanced struggle for freedom is always going to be, in a sense, opposed to the prevailing order. That’s why we need to carve out our spaces here on earth, but if we can find them out there, it would be even better. The typical lefty retort to something like this is to compare the inherent homesteading attitude of these ideas to homesteading as it was practiced by colonists on earth. To be clear, the homesteader movement in the U.S. and most other places is deeply entrenched in the violence of indigenous dispossession and outright genocide. But what makes it bad isn’t the desire to move and to explore. Remember, those very same indigenous people also moved and explored depending on the timescale at play. What makes it bad is the murder and dispossession. With space colonization it’s a very different situation because the vast majority of places we would go will be completely lifeless. We will not be murdering or dispossessing anyone. In that sense the entire paradigm of colonial extraction is mis-played. So while the explorer mindset is horrifying for brutalist conquistadors, for nerdy anarchist scientists deeply rooted in a desire not to harm, it’s a very different situation. Aside from issues of defensibility and minimizing the need for defensive violence, there’s also a range of other practical issues. For example, if we can scrape together some rock hoppers we can ethically harvest materials from asteroids to develop and sustain our societies. No slave labor. No deforestation. No ecocide. We can build research labs unencumbered by the fascist nationalism and capitalism in our present society that massively throttle progress. We can have ecosystems of testing that allow us to try out a wide range of anarchist approaches to existence.The **love of space and the love of anarchism** are themselves related in the degree to which they **provide habitable environments to the other**. Much like anarchists, earth itself faces existential risks from all sides. Whether climate change or the boogey-man of unaligned AI, the human race faces massive threats to continuity. **Humans will go to space** and **it’s up to us to decide what that looks like.** For anarcho-transhumanists specifically, we know that the existential risks facing humanity will require us to dramatically shift our notions of what being human means at a core level. We need to make ourselves into swarming, stigmergic networks of interconnected minds. We need to technologically, pharmacologically, emotionally, and intellectually widen the bridges between us, increase our abilities, and decrease our needs. We need to develop what consciousness can be and hack ourselves to be able to meet the challenges we face. For climate change we need to change what our bodies need and what conditions we can live under. For AI we need to grow alongside it if we hope to maintain any of what makes being human special and meaningful. Our adaptations to both AI and climate X-risks aid our ability to go to space and our ability to blossom once there while simultaneously cultivating our adaptive resilience as a weapon for positive change. **Changing what it means to be human** is a part of changing what we see as possible in terms of our anarchist visions. One important piece of changing what it means to be human is **changing where we associate being human with.** For those of us who know that we stand in the lineage that hopes to create paths not just to survive, but to radically thrive in space and a transhumanist world, these are the exciting questions. We know that we want and need space and are more than anything just excited to build and dream. We are here for the gritty details. How can we steal or build ships to mine asteroids? How will we terraform in a way that promotes non-hierarchical societies of exchange and mutual-aid? To what extent can we cultivate connections that would give us access to the closed source patent world of space-tech monopolies that we need to liberate? What do we need to learn now to survive then? How will we hold up against the sheer expanse of space? What vegetables would grow best on a long-distance space flight? How could we network our minds to catalyze our problem solving abilities? Should we settle-down or stay on the move? In the anarchist struggle we get tired of fighting battles in all directions at once. When you get tired, I encourage you to take some space and notice the feeling it gives you. Respite and recharging. A revitalization and centering of our vision and faculties. The playful curiosity is born again anew. When we follow that curiosity we often find something amazing hidden in its path. Our eyes get big and glittery with awe. This is a tiny shard of what we want. Space gives us a chance to transform the struggle into a joyous militancy of hope capable of exponentiating our goals. And if **we don’t do it... we all die anyways.** So **we might as well try** our damndest **to** do it and **do it radically**. Besides building our own better world and salvaging this one though, **who but us will fight the** authoritarians and **space capitalists** andprevent them **from expanding their sphere of havoc**?

#### IMPACT: Capitalism is a death cult and it has already led to the destruction of our planet. We have to eliminate the oppressive and catastrophic capitalist ideals or we will all be wiped out like the dinosaurs. Allinson 21

Allinson, J. (2021). *The tragedy of the worker: towards the proletarocene*. Verso Books. pg 8-17

Capitalism, like certain bacteria, like the death-drive, is immortal. It has its limits and crises but, perversely, seems to thrive on these. Unlike the multi- species life-systems powering it**, the only terminal** **limit to capital’**s perpetual augmentation **is**, if driven towards from within, external: either **revolution or human extinction**; communism, or the common ruin of the contending classes. Long ago, both Max Weber and Walter Benjamin saw an occulted religious foundation in capitalist civilisation. As Michael Löwy points out, Benjamin, by defining capitalism as a cultic religion, went much farther than Weber in identifying a Puritan/Capitalist guilt-driven imperative to accumulate. ‘The duration of the cult’, for Benjamin, ‘is permanent’. There are ‘no days which are not holidays’, and ‘nothing has meaning that is not immediately related to the cult’. In what sense is capitalism a cult? What are its rituals, its fetishes? Those of investment, speculating, buying and selling. It has no dogma other than those ‘real abstractions’, as Alfred Sohn-Rethel put it, entailed by its rituals. In Sohn-Rethel’s words, the act of commodityexchange is the key exemplar of a social action governed by an abstraction of which the participants have no consciousness. The buyer may be concerned only with the sensuous particularities of the commodity, the needs it fills, but behaves, structurally, in the moment of exchange as though what matters is the quantity of exchange-value embedded in it. Ritual action determines dogma; social being, that is, determines consciousness. Capitalist theology, however, instates not dogma but unyielding imperatives governing action. ‘Accumulate, accumulate! That is Moses and the prophets!’, Marx sarcastically withered in Capital. Accumulation is, for capital, an imperative, not an option. To exist as a unit of capital in conditions of universal competition is to accumulate or die. As long, therefore, as there is labour-power to exploit and, in Jason W Moore’s term, ‘cheap nature’ to appropriate, capital will augment itself. This very bifurcation of life into the exploitable and the appropriable, which Moore identifies as the foundation of a ‘Cartesian dualism’ unsustainably counterposing ‘Nature’ to ‘Society’, is not dogma but programme. It is related to a distinctive move of capitalist theology, currently given right- Evangelical sanction by Calvin Beisner and the Cornwall Declaration, to disavow in practice the existence of inherent physical limits. It posits, in its action, the earth as limitless cornucopia over which humans have dominion, and from which limitless accumulation must be extracted. This disavowal, this ‘real abstraction’, is the social basis of capitalist implicatory denial: the seemingly evidence-proof conviction of capitalist states that capitalogenic climate change can be remedied by means, and according to systems, that guarantee its perpetuation. The capitalocentric purview is commonly, but mistakenly, identified with the anthropocentrism of ancient and medieval monotheisms. Here, however, it is clearly not the Anthropos that stands at the centre, as though appointed by God to steward the garden of earth. At the centre is the ritual: that unconditional imperative to accumulate. And insofar as this imperative drives ‘adorers’, as Benjamin put it, to the horizon of human extinction, **capitalism** can – **must – be described as a death cult**. Fossil capital is but one modality of the death cult, albeit a paragon. The ‘externalities’ of capital – **climate chaos, biosphere destruction**, **resource depletion**, topsoil erosion, ocean acidification, mass extinction, the accumulation of chemical, heavy metal, biological and nuclear wastes – extend far beyond the specific catastrophe of a carbonized atmosphere. **Capitalism** **is** a comprehensive system of work-energetics. The food industry, which powers waged labour, and is key to the shifting value of labour-power itself, is as **central to the deterioration of the** **biosphere** as is fossil-fuelled transit. Nonetheless, the continuing decision for fossil fuels as a solution to the energy demands of capitalist production, for all the growing denial of climate-change denial among the antivulgarian ruling class, for all their concerned mouth music, is an exemplary case of the capitalist imperative of competitive accumulation at work. As Andreas Malm has fiercely and beautifully argued, capitalism did not settle for fossil fuels as a solution to energy scarcity. The common assumption that fossil energy is an intrinsically valuable energy resource worth competing over, and fighting wars for is, as geographer Matthew Huber argues, an example of fetishism. At the onset of steam power, water was abundant, and, even with its fixed costs, cheaper to use than coal. The hydraulic mammoths powered by water wheels required far less human labour to convert to energy, and were more energy-efficient. Even today, only a third of the energy in coal is actually converted in the industrial processes dedicated thereto: the only thing that is efficiently produced is carbon dioxide. On such basis, the striving for competitive advantage by capitalists seeking maximum market control ‘should’ have favoured renewable energy. Capital, however, preferred the spatio-temporal profile of stocks due to the internal politics of competitive accumulation. Water use necessitated communal administration, with its perilously collectivist implications. Coal, and later oil, could be transported to urban centres, where workers were acculturated to the work-time of capitalist industry, and hoarded by individual enterprises. This allowed individual units of capital to compete more effectively with one another, secured the political authority of capital and incorporated workers into atomised systems of reproduction, from transport to heating. Thus, locked in by the short-termist imperatives of competitive accumulation, fossil capital assumed a politically privileged position within an emerging world capitalist ecology. It monopolised the supply of energy for dead labour, albeit in a highly inefficient way. This is the tragedy of the worker. That, as avatar of a class in itself, she was put to work for the accumulation of capital, from capitalism’s youth, amid means of production not of her choosing, and with a telos of ecological catastrophe. That thus, even should **the proletariat** become a class for itself, and even if it does so at a point of history where the full horror of the methods of fossil capitalism is becoming clear, **it** would – **will – inherit productive forces inextricable from mass, trans-species death**. This does not preclude systemic, planet-wide transformation. Particularly given the inevitably uneven global growth of class consciousness and resistance, however, and the concomitant embattledness of any reformist, let alone revolutionary, power on the global stage, it does ensure that it faces extraordinary barriers. As will become clear. As of 2015, estimates suggested that humanity produced a total of 15.5 trillion watts of energy each year, of which a considerable 29 per cent was not used. At an average of 2,000 watts per person (rising to 10,000 watts in the core capitalist economies), the majority was used for industry, commerce and transit, with only 22 per cent for household consumption. Some 90 per cent of this output was powered by fossil fuels: oil, coal, gas. This monopoly, enabling superprofits as monopolies do, ensured that fossil capital would always realise profit margins far higher than the industrial average. It has, in Malm’s term, become worth a ‘planet of value’. Each fossil fuel plant represents decades of investment awaiting realisation. **To avert planetary disaster is to inflict an earth-sized blow on capitalist industry**. It is to choose between burning a planet of value, and burning the planet itself. But the death cult is so strong, so pervasive, that, against all resistance, the choice has already been made. **Apocalypse has begun**. The button has been pushed. Humanity is already committed to irreversible climate change. In May of 2020, levels of CO2 in the atmosphere hit 417 parts per million, the highest ever recorded – and the first breach of 400 ppm since the Pliocene. Climate activists are, in Richard Wilbur’s phrase, ‘mad-eyed from stating the obvious’. To understand the scale of what faces us, and the way it ramifies into every corner of our lives, is to marvel that we aren’t having emergency meetings in every city, town and village every week. **We are**, increasingly, **out of time.** In the capitalist untimelich, the time of the living and the time of the dead, human history and the history of inorganic sediments, collide. ‘Millions of years of concentrated solar energy’, as Huber calls it, have been released in an historical blink of an eye, only to rebound just as fast: the Deep Time equivalent of an asteroid strike. The cyclical time of seasons turns freakish, leaving us uneasily sweating in the clammy mid-winter. Spring comes too early, hurricane-force winds and flash floods break the October calm, polar ice melts while temperate zones are plunged into polar winter. The Arctic burns, boreal forests turned to charred sticks. The Greenland ice sheet melts even in winter. Antarctic sea ice has suddenly and drastically contracted in recent years. The polar vortex wanders, perturbed, and the mid-West freezes. In a parody of Revelations, Mediterranean storms rain fish on the island of Malta. Stochastic weather events accumulate. Birds fall dead from the sky. The progression of geological deep time, with its periods, eras and epochs speeds up so rapidly that it precipitates a crisis in the temporal order itself: spinning so fast, we may as well be standing still. The progressive time of human civilisation, reduced to the endless accumulation of stuff, collapses into nonsense. The cycle of ice ages, a necessary condition for human evolution, melts away for eternity. With awareness of which comes a wave of eco-anxiety, for which we grope for names – Glenn Albrecht’s ‘solastalgia’, Ashlee Cunsolo and Neville Ellis’s ‘ecological grief’, Renee Lertzmann’s ‘environmental melancholia’. Even at the end of 2018, 70 per cent of Americans describing themselves as ‘worried’ about climate change, and it has been a long two years for that fear to wax. The sixth mass extinction, signalled by what one study calls ‘**biological annihilation’, is underway**. The oceans, which produce roughly half of the oxygen we breathe, are acidifying, and are swept by heatwaves, says a recent study, ‘like wildfire’. Coral reefs, home to a quarter of marine life, are bleaching. Insect biomass collapses, with 40 per cent of all species undergoing drastic decline. The bees, that once we believed were saved, are disappearing eight times faster than are mammals, birds or reptiles. Without their pollination work, 70 per cent of the crops that feed 90 per cent of the planet will fail. The **question of human survival is inextricable from** that of **what sort of humans we should be**. By 2070, MIT research says, the new norm for ‘many billions’ of people will be impossibly high temperatures that will kill less fit people and make outdoor work impossible. Half a billion will experience temperatures that would ‘kill even healthy people in the shade within six hours’. The Arctic, that ‘sluggish and congealed sea’ discovered by Pytheas, a breathing ‘mixture like sea-lung’, will be gone, on conservative estimates by 2040. In 2019, the usually snow-bowed woodlands circling this uncanny sea-continent burned more fiercely than ever. Precise metrics of the scale of what will unfold are to be determined, not least by class struggle, but there is no longer, if there ever was, a choice between adaptation and mitigation. So adapt. But to what? Those species now going extinct were once well adapted. The widely accepted geo-logism, ‘Anthropocene’, is in one sense an obvious political evasion, diluting as it does the necessary focus on capital accumulation itself. Yet, of course, capitalism is something that the human species, and no other, does. And while there are unthinkably vast disparities in power and responsibility in the production of petro-modernity, the latter has had a proven – if, crucially, hardly irrevocable – popular base: the vatic rage of activists notwithstanding, no politician has been crucified for promising fuel tax cuts. This fact can easily be weaponised by the right. Of the recent protests of the gilets jaunes in France against declining wages and rising inequality and sparked by a rise in diesel tax later reversed by Macron faced by the scale of the protests, Trump tweeted that ‘[p]eople do not want to pay large sums of money ... in order to maybe protect the environment’. In fact, however, and allowing that the movement is hardly monolithic, the French uprising was characterised by a remarkable refusal to refuse to engage with questions of ecology, particularly compared, say, to the fuel- price protests in the UK in 2000 and 2005. Far from being characterised by ecological indifference, what characterised much of the French protest was disagreement between those for whom talk of ecology comes too soon, and those for whom such talk is inextricable from social – class – justice. One example of the former is visible in the claim of the prominent activist Jerôme Rodriguez that ‘[e]ventually, when we obtain the first things, ecology will have its place’; of the latter, the words of another, François Boulot, that ‘[t]he social and ecological emergencies are inseparable’, that ‘[w]e will not be able to operate the ecological transition without an equitable wealth redistribution’. Rodriguez’s rationale for his position, that ‘nowadays, people aren’t concentrated on this’, is not supported by the superlative gilets jaunes slogans, ‘End of the month, end of the world: same perpetrators, same fight’, and ‘More ice sheets, fewer bankers’. This refusal to compartmentalise is energising evidence of the new politicisation of the moment. Still, that not everyone opposed to the fuel tax rise has been so assiduous in drawing the connections is in part because the dispersed, privatised accommodation and individualised transportation of modern life offer individualised, immediate-term and distinctively capitalist answer to specifically human strivings. The concept of the Anthropocene is a tacit acknowledgment that the **alienated labour of humanity has itself become a** selective **evolutionary pressure**. It has already forced rapid adaptation in some species, where it has not resulted in extinction, as Bernard Kettlewell’s experiments with peppered moths show. The besooting of tree bark in industrial areas became a powerful selective force, favouring darker moths, harder for birds to see and pick off. Now such pressures are coming for us, as powerful as the asteroid strike behind the Cretaceous-Paleogene mass extinction. We are compelled to adapt to ourselves. From this point of view, there is no difference between adaptation and mitigation. To close the fossil fuel plants, to destroy a planet of value, or even, dare we hope, the value-form itself: are these not adaptations? Of course, this is not what is generally meant by **adaptation**. Implicit **is** a Green Zone-style survivalism of the rich; explicitly touted are permanent adaptations of capitalism to the consequences of capitalism. The ideology of ‘adaptation’ has become **the ideology of capitalism’s triumph over all life.**

#### The state will inevitably commit violence against marginalized populations. Laursen 21:

Laursen, E., 2021. The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State The Operating System An Anarchist Theory of the Modern State. pg 175-

Not surprisingly, then, when viewed from a bird’s-eye perspective, the history of **the modern State** often **looks** dramatically **like** the career of **a sociopath**. Almost as soon as it appeared, wars involving state actors of unprecedented geographic reach broke out in Europe, starting with the War of the League of Cambrai in 1508; these continued semiregularly for centuries. **Violence has always been the State’s** most frequent **means** of getting its way on other fronts as well, beginning with the enclosure of the commons, the violent enforcement of property rights, and the capture and management of enslaved populations in the New World and elsewhere. The State subdued, subjected, and in some cases wiped out Indigenous populations in Asia, Africa, and the Americas through **a deadly combination of** what anthropologist Jared Diamond neatly summed up as “**guns, germs, and steel.”** The process quickened in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with the invention of reservations for Indigenous groups, concentration camps for dissident populations, forced labor camps for political and “common” criminals, the death camps of Nazi Germany, and death squads, which are sometimes employed by the State, sometimes by capital, and sometimes by the State with corporate subsidies, as in the case of Colombia, where global oil companies paid government security forces to provide private protection for their facilities. 28 Today, as police become more and more like the robocops seen in the movies and drone warfare mechanizes killing, the death machine no longer needs traditional human actors; it can be operated remotely or by cops trained to think and operate as automatons. The motivation behind these increasingly sophisticated, technocratic applications is complex and individual, but there are always three common purposes:to control and manage populations, to impress State authority, and **to fulfill the State’s vision of an** orderly**, harmonious, and productive society**. This **vision,** then**, is built on violence**. If the State exercises a monopoly on the use of force, however, that doesn’t mean it’s the only entity allowed to inflict it. The State gives individuals within the Core Identity Group—even extreme groups like right-wing militias—wide latitude to commit acts of violence against less favored groups, in part to maintain a racial caste system and in part to reassure the Core Identity Group of their special role within the State. **So long as we have the State, this is not** afeature that can **be reformed out of existence;** the violent reinforcement of racism, gender inequality, homophobia, and transphobia, andthe **marginalization** of specific religious groups **is basic to the system.**

#### ALT: The alternative is an anarchist space program making us space pirates. Revolution on earth is doomed. We don’t need to solve—we need to dream. Debord 2020:

Debord, Syzygy. 2020 “Another Galaxy for Another Life.” <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/syzygy-debord-another-galaxy-for-another-life>

Closed Doors Brings Open Minds **Life on this planet being,** at best, an utter bore and, at worst, **entirely grotesque** — there remains to open-minded, irresponsible, thrill-seekingpro-**revolutionaries** only to **disregard the government, build our own spaceships**, and establish outer-space autonomous communities. The world of Tomorrowland is already yesterday with the totality of capitalism complete. If the socialistic alternatives couldn’t defeat the capitalist system in its earliest stages, what hope is there in the present? Or worse, how much longer must one wait for the material conditions for a revolution to be appropriate? **Accepting the existing order** in one way or another **is absurd.** What is **needed is an alternative to the alternative.** A program that begins with the rejection of the spectacle’s permanence and holds no definitive end. An alternative that yields to individualist self-determination in place of concessions to reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries. The only alternative possible**: autonomous astronauts.** “It’s easier to imagine the end of the world than it is to imagine the end of capitalism,” so says some benign theorist. But! We have no need to imagine either if we leave this planet. **Let the capitalists fret over their** sacredprivate property**.** Let the Earth cowards cling to their faith of monetary riches. Let these Terran revelers keep their third world, third rate, third class slum known as “America.” They can have this **wretched heap** they are so fond of, their patriotic submission. They can stay behind and suffocate on the noxious fumes of pollution while battling yet another carnivorous disease. Let them enjoy their skies cluttered by ugly fucking buildings and their repugnant light pollution that asphyxiates the night. Such archaisms are of no use to us. We won’t even give a minute of our life in the hope that the multitude will suddenly become aware and take off! If the gravitationally oppressed are not ready to raise the launchpad, this is a problem of the gravitationally oppressed.[[1]](https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/syzygy-debord-another-galaxy-for-another-life#fn1) Let us begin by detailing why we have abandoned the socialist alternative on Earth. Assuming even a poor understanding of dialectics, with capitalism serving as the thesis and the socialistic tree as the antithesis — the synthesis is always a reinforced spirit of capitalism. Perhaps in some instances the abuses of the capitalist system against the working class lessen, but overall, **the socialist** and communist **antitheses only serve as** mere **corrections** and additives to the initial thesis **of capitalism. Nothing truly changes.** Not even in what you feel. In ourhearts, we all know **Earth will not be saved.** Every revolt is cut off from its mode of success in advance. The empire squats solidly upon its own immunity! However, this does not mean the proposed systems in space will necessarily fail. What will a socialistic community look like without imperialism imposing on self-determination? What will anarchistic communities look like when freed of the threat of state violence? What objectives, what plans, what lives, what adventures are there when the oppressions are abandoned and **we float away from the world;** not disabled by disillusionment, but unburdened by it? No gods, no masters, no gravity – no problem! lways Falling **Life on this planet is unsatisfactory.** Yet we are not resigned to it. **We refuse to be fooled. We fear nothing: being misunderstood,** being **criticized,** being **labelled ‘**jokers’ or **‘insane’,** suffering, life or death – nothing. We are neither dreamers nor idealists nor unrealistic… The AAA is an attitude of reaction, defiance, and distrust. A distrust of the illusory philosophies at the level of the naïve, a distrust of unctuous and sonorous morals… No galaxy is obscure… So as not to be overloaded with rhetoric or cloying sincerity, the astronaut’s message is no less a song in which emotion’s modesty dismisses fine transports. When a spider flings itself from a fixed point down into its consequences, it continually sees before it an empty space in which it can find no foothold, however much it stretches. And yet, it finds corners and crevices to build its place of rest, its source of nourishment. So it is with the AAA; before us is continually an empty space, and we are propelled by the conditions that lie behind us. What is going to happen? What will the future bring? I do not know, I offer no presentiment. Those who consider our goals impossible to achieve will necessarily find our methods impossible to think. Trapped in the false permanency and ahistoricism of the spectacle, these “realistic” pro-revolutionaries are quick to assure our naivety and imploring failure. But why not fail? Is the guarantee of dying from boredom recourse from the risk of dying from spaghettification? Perhaps knowing there is no future is our greatest freedom. Waiting With The Coffins Under Heaven The AAA is not a strand of Posadism and does not share their helpless hopes of communistic Alien salvation or global collapse. Their yearning is the same as the pious Christians, waiting for Christ’s return and direction to a better place in a better time. The lathe of heaven does not exist. It must be built. Nor does the AAA urge a resignation to one’s docile fate on this planet. However much it hurts to hope for the impossible, to imagine a future we don’t believe in (the Earth being saved, Global revolution, etc.**), what matters is the strength we feel** every time we don’t bow our heads, every time we destroy the false idols of civilization**, every time our eyes** meet those of **our comrades,** every time that our hands set fire to the symbols of Power. In those momentswe don’t ask ourselves: ‘Will we win? Will we lose?’ In those moments **we just fight.** Even if we have no future on this planet, we can still find life on it today. One does not have to return to sleep after the alarm clock rings. Most importantly**, we are not advocating a** definitive **plan for leaving this planet** or for what ought to be done in space. It is left to the self-determination of individuals and unions to decide what is appropriate and ideal for them. **The accent is placed not on the content of a choice** proposed**, but the fact of choosing**. Thus, the AAA decision is a decision to decide no longer (that is, the free activity of space without geography would be betrayed if it is subordinated to some conception beforehand.) As I could sit here and lament about Stanford Toruses, O’Neill Cylinders, and my frothy daydreams of surgically implanting bonsai trees into lungs and dining at souvlaki space stations, but why burden this manuscript with frivolities?

#### ROTB: The role of the ballot is fidelity to the truth – dedication to a shared horizon is liberatory and space is the best horizon of all, Dean 19:

Dean, Jodi. Comrade: An essay on political belonging. Verso, 2019. // LHP BT + LHP PS

The idea that comrades are those who belong to the same side of a political struggle leads to the fourth thesis: **The relation between comrades is mediated by** fidelity toa **truth; practices** of comradeship **materialize** this **fidelity.** The “same side” points to the truth comrades are faithful to—the political truth that unites them—and the fidelity with which they work to realize this truth in the world**.** “Belonging” invites attention to the expectations, practices, and affects that being on the same side generates. The notions of truth and fidelity at work here come from Alain Badiou. In brief, Badiou rejects the idea of truth as a proposition or judgment, arguing instead thattruth is a process**.** The process begins with the eruption of something new, an event. Because an event changes the situation, breaks the confines of the given, it is undecidable in terms of the given; it is something entirely new. Badiou argues that this undecidability “induces the appearance of a subject of the event.”[60](about:blank) This subject isn’t the cause of the event. It’s an effect of or response to the event, “the decision to say that the event has taken place.” Grammar might seduce us into rendering this subject as “I.” We should avoid this temptation and recognize the subject as designating an inflection point, a response that extends the event. The decision that a truth has appeared, that an event has occurred, **incites a process of verification**, the “infinite procedure of verification of the true,” in what Badiou calls **an “exercise of fidelity**.”[61](about:blank) Fidelity is a working out and **working through** of the **truth,** an **engagement** with truth **that** extends out into and **changes the world.** We should recognize here the unavoidably collective dimension of fidelity: in the political field, verification is a struggle of the many. Peter Hallward draws out some implications of Badiou’s conception of truth. First, it is subjective. Those faithful to an evental truth involve themselves in working it out, exploring its consequences.[62](about:blank) Second, fidelity is not blind faith; it is rigorous engagement unconcerned with individual personality and incorporated into the body of truth that it generates. Hallward writes: Fidelity is, by definition, ex-centric, directed outward, beyond the limits of a merely personal integrity. To be faithful to an evental implication always means to abandon oneself, rigorously, to the unfolding of its consequences. Fidelity implies that, if there is truth, it can be only cruelly indifferent to the private as such. Every truth involves a kind of anti-privatization, a subjective collectivization. In truth, “I” matter only insofar as I am subsumed by the impersonal vector of truth—say, the political organization, or the scientific research program.[63](about:blank) **The truth process builds a new body**. This body of truth is a collective formed to “work for the consequences of the new” and this work, this collective, disciplines and subsumes the faithful.[64](about:blank)Third, collectivity does not imply uniformity. The infinite procedure of verification incorporates multiple experiments, enactments, and effects.Badiou writes, “An organization lies at the intersection between an Idea and an event. However, this intersection only exists as process, whose immediate subject is the political militant.”[65](about:blank) We should amend this statement by replacing *militant* with *comrade*. Comrade highlights the “discipline of the event,” the way that political fidelity cannot be exercised by a solitary individual—hence, the Marxist-Leninist emphasis on the unity of theory and practice, the barren incapacity of each alone. Comrade also affirms the self-abandonment accompanying fidelity to a truth: its vector, its unfolding, is indifferent to my personal experiences and inclinations. For communists, the process of truth has a body and that body is the party, in both its historical and formal sense. Already in Theory of the Subject, Badiou recognizes the necessity of a political body, the party as the “subject-support of all politics.”[66](about:blank) He writes: The party is the body of politics, in the strict sense. The fact that there is a body by no means guarantees that there is a subject … But for there to be a subject, for a subject to be found, there must be the support of a body.[67](about:blank) As a figure of political belonging, the **comrade** is a faithful **response to** the evental rupture of crowds and **movements,** to the egalitarian discharge that erupts from the force ofthe many where they don’t belong, to the movement of the **people as** the **subject of politics.**[**68**](about:blank) **Comrades demonstrate fidelity through political work;** through concerted, disciplined engagement. Their practical political work **extends the truth of the** emancipatory egalitarianstruggle of the **oppressed into the world.** Amending Badiou (by drawing from his earlier work), we can say that the comrade is not a faithful subject but a political relation faithful to the divided people as the subject of emancipatory egalitarian politics.[69](about:blank) Forus to see the revolutionary people as the subject in the struggles of the oppressed, for their subject to be found, **we must be comrades.** In *Ninotchka*, Nina Ivanova Yakushova can’t tell who her comrades are by looking at them. The party has told her who to look for, but she has to ask. After Iranoff identifies himself, Yakushova tells him her name and the name and position of the party comrade who authorized her visit. Iranoff introduces Buljanoff and Kopalski. Yakushova addresses each as comrade. But it’s not the address that makes them all comrades. They are comrades because they are members of the same party. The party is the organized body of truth that mediates their relationship. This mediation makes clear what is expected of comrades—disciplined, faithful work. Iranoff, Buljanoff, and Kopalski have not been doing the work expected of comrades, which is why Moscow sent Yakushova to oversee them in Paris. That Kopalski says they would have greeted her with flowers demonstrates their embourgeoisment, the degeneration of their sense of comradeship. But they are all there for work. Gendered identity and hierarchy don’t mediate relations between comrades. The practices of fidelity to a political truth, the work done toward building that truth in the world, do. The solidarity of comrades in political struggle arises out of the intertwining of truth, practice, and party. It’s not reducible to any of these alone. Comrades are not simply those who believe in the same truth—as in, for example, the idea of communism. Their fidelity to a certain truth is manifested in practical work. Work for the realization of a political truth brings people into comradely relation. But carrying out similar tasks in fidelity to the same truth isn’t sufficient for comradeship. The work must be in common; **no one is a comrade on their own. Practices of comradeship are** coordinated**, organized. The party is** the organization out of **which comradeship emerges and** that comrade **relations produce. It concentrates comradeship** even as comradeship exceeds it. constraint later, when day is done, to perfect the design – grown greater in the uncertain twilight of mere dream – in that inward moment that turns upon itself, yet never repeats itself. The AAA is less of an organization than it is a network of individuals and unions cooperatively working toward a defined beginning – leaving this planet. All that can come from the AAA are tools, not answers. Because as much as this reads as a manifesto, it isn’t one. It is an invitation. I’ll see you on the dark side of the moon… **Astronauts of all determinations, unite! We have a world to lose, but a universe to gain!**