## Set Col Affirmative

#### IR is at the cross-roads of settler society. International norms are structurally incapable of navigating the crises which settler-society itself has created. Climate change, accelerating genocide, and massive patterns of environmental destructing are rendering the ground of IR open to contestation. Settler society responds anxiously to a world where-in apocalypse is constantly on the horizon. Rather than confront the violence of their own making, Settlers perform voyeurism through an invocation of a “universal humanity” threatened by a collective apocalypse. Such narratives construct the foundations for bio-political governance, and the management of colonized nations. This fear constructs a form of colonial correlationism that equates western experience with true, excluding alternative indigenous cosmologies.
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Radical finitude and global extinction Does life on earth have a long-term future? Increasingly influential discourses of ‘existential risk’ argue that states and international institutions need to pay more attention to developments that ‘threaten the existence of our entire species’ (CSER, 2015). They examine a range of possible threats to the survival of homo sapiens, from those raised by emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, nano-technology and synthetic biology to climate change, global pandemics, nuclear terrorism and even cosmic events such as asteroid strikes and gamma-ray bursts (Bostrom and Cirkovic, 2008). Although the probability of these events varies considerably, they each present a non-zero possibility that homo sapiens might be eliminated. For this reason, existential risk researchers seek to shift the register in which threat and the possibilities of survival are understood and governed globally. As Martin Rees (2013) has suggested, IR, global politics and international policy-making should focus less on the ‘minor hazards of everyday life’, such as car accidents and carcinogens, and more on events that ‘have not yet happened but which, if they occurred even once, could cause worldwide devastation’ (Rees, 2013). Homo sapiens, however, is not the only life form thought to be facing the possibility of extinction. Since the 1980s, biologists and ecologists have warned that sharply accelerating rates of extinction may mark the beginning of a new ‘mass extinction event’. This term refers to an earth-wide pattern of extinctions – which Western science defines as death of every member of a species – that eliminates 75 percent or more of extant life forms. Unlike the previous five mass extinctions experienced by earth, which had diverse causes such as the emergence of cyanobacteria and an asteroid strike, the potential ‘sixth mass extinction crisis’ is thought to be driven by ‘anthropogenic’ change. In particular, Western scientists identify four main drivers: climate change, habitat destruction, direct killing and the transfer of life forms across the planet. Although these drivers are attributed to the activities of ‘humanity’, they are predominantly associated with Western political formations such as industrialization, colonization and extractive capitalism (Mitchell, forthcoming). In combination, these phenomena have driven the extinction rates of recorded species well above the ‘background rate’, or the presumed standard rate of extinctions before ‘human’ activities became a determinant factor. This has produced significant decreases in the diversity of life forms globally and across all major taxa. For instance, the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF, 2016) recently reported a 58 percent decrease in species diversity between 1970 and 2012 alone. Anthony Barnosky and his colleagues (2011) claim that current extinction rates could produce – within just three centuries – a magnitude of extinction last seen in the Cretaceous-Tertiary extinction event, which eliminated the dinosaurs (see also Régnier et al., 2015). Several prominent scientists and science journalists working in the area of mass extinction have offered dismal pictures of the implications of these trends for human security. They envision an ‘uninhabitable earth’ (Wallace-Wells, 2017) wracked by global crises in food security, economic collapse (Barnosky, 2014), authoritarian governance, global warfare over dwindling resources (Oreskes and Conway, 2014) and even the forced exile of humans to other planets (Newitz, 2013). Written in overtly securitizing tones intended to shape international governance and policy, these framings of radical finitude have the potential to shape IR and global theory and discourses in problematic ways. In the style of Western disaster or horror films (Colebrook, 2014), they adopt a position of voyeurism that borders on apocalypse porn: it exposes privileged Western readers to thrilling images of sublime destruction, while masking the inequalities of threat and responsibility, and normalizing the violences, that produce these ruptures (Mitchell and Theriault, 2018). For instance, by framing ‘humanity’ as a unitary subject and future victim of ‘extinction’, these narratives obscure the disproportionate effect of global patterns of extinction on worlds in the global south. Moreover, by imagining the destruction of worlds as a future hypothetical, they ignore the modes of world-ending violence enacted by colonization and survived by Indigenous peoples (Whyte, 2016). However, these narratives also confront IR and global theory with irruptions of radical negativity (and possibility) with which it is ill-equipped to contend. Specifically, extinction narratives delineate the boundary conditions of IR, a discipline concerned with, and limited by, its specific concepts of survival. Despite its preoccupation with survival, no branch of IR has directly theorized extinction. In the rare cases where the actual term ‘extinction’ appears in IR discourses, it is used solely as a metaphor for the dissolution of states (see Wight, 1960; Morgenthau, 2005) and should not be interpreted literally. Some major concepts in IR and global theory have flirted with the concept of radical finitude raised by extinction narratives. For instance, the idea of ‘nuclear winter’ popularized by Carl Sagan (1983) predicted that a full-scale nuclear war would destroy life on a massive scale, and undermine the conditions for its regeneration. Remaining humans – and of course, other life forms – would face starvation, viral epidemics and a global-scale deluge of deadly toxins and ultraviolet flux (Sagan, 1983: n.p.). In a similar sense, John Somerville’s (2012 [1983]) concept of ‘omnicide’ suggests that nuclear warfare or ecological collapse could threaten the survival of all modes of life on Earth. Both of these concepts suggest the large-scale destruction of life almost to the point of total extinction. Nonetheless, they treat extinction as a non sequitur, and offer no insights on how awareness of radical finitude might reshape IR thinking. More recently, legal activists have proposed a law of ecocide (see Higgins, 2010) which seeks to extend international laws for the prevention and punishment of genocide to include ecological damage that destroys unique ecosystems and forms of human life. However, the concept of ecocide is designed to fit within the constraints of existing international law. As a result, it only applies to instances in which individual culprits can be identified and accused with prosecutable crimes. Although, as mentioned above, they can be attributed predominantly to capitalist modes of organization, accelerating patterns of extinction are driven by the convergence of multiple forces and systemic patterns. As such, a law of ecocide would do little to address them. Meanwhile, in contemporary security discourses, extinction is understood as a problem of biopolitical management. Over 150 international conventions govern the management of ‘biodiversity’, most notably the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992) which does not even mention the term extinction. Instead, it focuses on means of monitoring and managing the ‘diversity’ of species and mitigating – rather than critiquing, let alone dismantling – the structural political-economic drivers of extinction. Other major treaties, such as the Convention 53 on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and the World Heritage Convention, contain instruments for managing species and biodiversity, such as restrictions on trade and targets for population numbers. Each of these projects assumes that extinction can be allayed by managing biopolitical economies of birth, reproduction and death. The same assumption underpins contemporary security discourses where they intersect with the threat of extinction. In such discourses, human extinction is often framed as a ‘hyperbole of insecurity’ (Aradau and van Munster, 2011: 3) – that is, as an intensification of existing, governable threats. This has helped to generate modes of biopolitical governance that entrench the structural drivers of extinction while producing ‘resilient’ citizens capable of living in its wreckage (Evans and Reid, 2014). Meanwhile, having framed catastrophe as inevitable, states and other security actors increasingly renege on their responsibilities to act to prevent it (Evans and Reid, 2014). In these ways, IR and global theory refuses to address the possibility of radical finitude raised by accelerating patterns of extinction. Apocalyptic rhetorics of total destruction may contribute to this issue by inuring Western subjects to the imagery of the destruction, masking the inequalities and violences that generate it, and arresting ethical response through over-exposure to the sublime. At the same time, IR and global theory is rooted in cosmological assumptions that preclude critical engagement with the possibility of radical finitude. Simply put, IR and global theory has made this possible condition unthinkable by suggesting that the extinction of humans is literally beyond human cognition. This form of unthinkability is based on what Quentin Meillassoux (2009) calls ‘correlationism’: the assumption that existence coincides with the presence of human subjects. For many Indigenous thinkers, engagement with Ancestral presences that long pre-date homo sapiens – and who may be long ‘extinct’ or never ‘alive’ in Western terms – is an integral part of daily life and survival, making the notion of correlationism absurd (Sheridan and Longboat, 2006; Benton-Banai, 2010; Borrows, 2010; Povinelli, 2016). Meillassoux points out that it is nonsensical even within a positivist perspective: after all, Western scientists regularly debate the date of the formation of the earth, the lives of dinosaurs and, indeed, the emergence of homo sapiens – all of which preceded and created the conditions for the existence of modern Western subjects. From these perspectives, it is possible – and common – to think beyond the existence of these subjects, and to theorize their extinction. However, within dominant Western culture, extinction is made unthinkable in a second sense: there is a taboo against discussing it. Such discussions are often understood to be antihuman and misanthropic. As Claire Colebrook (2014) points out, these taboos preclude discussion of whether or not ‘humanity’ – in particular the universalist, exclusive subject of ‘human security’ and ‘humanitarianism’ (Mitchell, 2014) – should exist. This, in turn, entrenches dominant norms of ‘humanity’ as an individualized, rigidly gendered and racialized, economicallymotivated being reducible to biological functions and ontologically separate from other beings (Mitchell, 2014). These narratives ignore the existence of, and preclude the emergence of, postor other-than-human life forms that transcend these boundaries (Braidotti, 2013), or other kinds of human existences, subjectivities and ways of relating to earth (Alfred, 2005). As a result, IR and global theory remains preoccupied with constructing and ensuring the survival of a ‘humanity’ incapable of transformation and exclusive of pluralities. In these conditions, existing IR and global theory’s engagements with radical finitude – constructed as the ultimate threat to this form of survival – are likely to entrench this subject of humanity and the structures that produce it, while ignoring the radical challenges to it raised by the earthly rupture of extinction.

#### This fear of extinction and radical finitude results in cosmic expansionism, the extension of settler agency to the cosmos. This has two impacts:

#### Settler society attempts to escape the limits of earth by transforming the cosmos in their own image. By imagining space as empty, settlers erase indigenous cosmologies which have already exist within what we call outer-space and performs cosmological violence to indigenous people. This mindset thus furthers indigineous violence and erasure on Earth, reproducing a colonial understanding of the world.
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Radical finitude, however, is not the only cosmological challenge undermining the foundations of IR and global theory. In fact, it is deeply intertwined with imaginaries of radical infinitude. Some responses to collective fear of finitude have produced movements that aspire to the extension of control, capital and territoriality into spatio-temporal scales that vastly exceed the limits of Western scientific knowledge. They embody an ethos that I will call ‘cosmic expansionism’: the extension of dominant forms of agency, governance and socioeconomic power beyond the specific, Western spatio-scales associated with ‘human’ experience and cognition. This form of expansionism includes techno-scientific and/or capitalist interventions into the nano-sphere; quantum computing; synthetic biology; and large-scale terra-forming or geo-engineering on earth and other planets. It also involves the colonization of other temporalities, including those of Indigenous and other non-Western worlds (Rifkin, 2017) within the linear, unidirectional, homogenization structures of Western secular time. Cosmic expansionism seeks to offer radical infinitude to ‘humanity’ by asserting domination not only over land and living bodies, but also the conditions of matter, time and space that shape and transform cosmos. One of the most salient expressions of cosmic expansionism is found in movements to colonize and extract resources from outer space. As images of a volatile, irreparably damaged and unsafe earth proliferate – that is, apocalyptic discourses of radical finitude – a new crop of commercial space entrepreneurs (‘NewSpace’) is promising an escape route. They suggest that the colonization of other planets and outer space bodies will create more space for an expanding ‘humanity’, ensuring its indefinite survival. In a 2014 conference address, NASA chief Charles Bolden stated that ‘only a multi-planet species can survive for a long period of time’. Similarly, space entrepreneur Elon Musk warns that ‘either we spread Earth to other planets, or we risk going extinct’ (Kleinman, 2013). Explaining his projects as an ‘insurance policy’ (Carroll, 2013), Musk approaches space colonization as a form of highly profitable yet publicly beneficial speculation against the possible extinction of homo sapiens. Although the colonization of outer space is often dismissed in public discourses as a science fiction plot, NewSpace entrepreneurs are committing billions of dollars to achieving their goals in a matter of decades. If they succeed, they will not be the first members of homo sapiens to make outer space their dwelling place. Many Indigenous peoples maintain relations with Ancestors, animals, plants and places on other planets and celestial bodies. To offer just three examples, Aboriginal people in Stradbroke Island, Queensland, are related to a man called Mirabooka who dwells in Sky Country in the form of a constellation and looks after the people of the earth (Bhathal, 2006). In Anishinaabe traditions, cosmic bodies including the sun, moon and stars form a family, who are the progenitors of earthly life forms and influence their lives (Benton-Banai, 2010). Similarly, within Haudenosaunee traditions, the first human – Sky Woman – fell to the watery abyss that would become earth from a hole made in the floor of Sky World by the uprooting of a sacred tree (Mohawk, 2010). From within these and other Indigenous cosmo-visions, the area designated as ‘outer space’ by Western science has been continually inhabited by Ancestors, the dead, distinct worlds and non-living beings that command respect in their own right. According to Seneca faithkeeper Oren Lyons (cited in Alfred, 2009) his people have always theorized their worlds in relation to the cosmos. This is exemplified by the Thanksgiving Address, a daily offering of gratitude to all beings. As Lyons relates, ‘you start with the grass and you wind up with the heavens and the universe, so obviously you’re thinking even more than just global, you’re thinking universal’ (Alfred, 2009: 237). Within this cosmo-vision, earth and what Western science calls ‘outer space’ are a continuous field of inhabitation and relation. Yet despite their rich and widespread presence in Indigenous philosophies and histories, the existence of these inhabitants is erased within mainstream, colonial discourses on outer space, which treat it as a dead, empty terrain with ‘no natives’ awaiting colonization (Reinstein, 1999; Grinspoon, 2004; NASA, 2014). Based on this assumption, Western scientific, military and commercial interests have made significant strides to annex, claim and shape outer space. Attempts to annex outer space within Western regimes of power have a significant history. Practices of remotely observing, mapping and naming the features of celestial bodies have been employed continuously since the 18th century (Lane, 2010), projecting imaginaries of planets and worlds onto these beings (Dittmer, 2007). Since the 1960s, outer space has been shaped by the material culture of the space race and human commerce, including thousands of satellites, rockets, their debris and the signals they beam to the Earth (Gorman, 2005; Collis, 2009). From this perspective, outer space has already been subject to significant material and ideational colonization

#### NewSpace represents an intensifications of colonial ambitions - a means to quench the ever increasing thirst for more land and more control. Billionaires who acquired their wealth through colonial processes are driven by a gendered and racialized sense of humanism and superiority. They envision a modified body, a superior post-human to ensure the settlers infinite domination of space and time
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The emergence of the ‘NewSpace’ sector marks a significant intensification of these imaginaries and an amplification of their colonial ambitions. Since the 1980s, this group of primarily US-based entrepreneurs, advocates and scientists have sought to commercialize ‘outer space’ through a diverse range of projects, from asteroid mining to space-based tourism (Valentine, 2012). Emerging almost exclusively from backgrounds in technology and venture capital, NewSpace activists fund technological development by reinvesting profits from past technology ventures or by linking technologists with angel investors (Valentine, 2012). Prominent NewSpace actors include PayPal entrepreneur Elon Musk, founder of Space Exploration Technologies Corporation (SpaceX); entrepreneur Peter Diamandis, a principle in mining company Planetary Resources and tourism firm Space Adventures, and who created the $10 million X-Prize for commercial spaceflight innovation; Amazon owner Jeff Bezos; and serial entrepreneur Richard Branson, who owns space travel company Virgin Galactic. These companies pursue various goals, including the development of reusable, cost-effective launch systems (SpaceX, Blue Horizon); off-Earth mining (Deep Space Industries, Planetary Resources) and space tourism (Virgin Galactic, Space Adventures). Many NewSpace entrepreneurs have expressed the aim of creating human colonies in outer space. For instance, Musk has openly stated his desire to ‘occupy Mars’ by the 2020s (Carroll, 2013), while Deep Space Industries trades on its potential to provide fuel for future space exploration and settlement. The emergence of a vibrant and lucrative NewSpace sector marks a shift from state-driven outer space activity towards private enterprises, which many US-based NewSpace entrepreneurs attribute to the retraction of state funding after the end of the Cold War. Many of them frame space colonization as a private-public partnership in which ‘the role of government is to provide the infrastructure and investment to establish a viable industry that will then have “benefits for all mankind”’ (Valentine, 2012: 1054). Jason Beery (2012) points out that although major space agencies such as NASA have been contracting with private companies for decades, governments increasingly regard commercial projects such as space ports as part of their core efforts to promote economic growth, stability and the reproduction of the political-economic system (Beery, 2012: 25). Peter Dickens and James Ormrod (2007) use David Harvey’s (2003) account of interlinked circuits of capital to explain this relationship. Space colonization promises to offer direct profit from the development of technologies and the extraction of outer space resources (the primary circuit), while reinvestment of profits and government funding produces a second circuit, and the accumulation of capital for scientific research and development form a third circuit. Along with this vision of freely-circulating, constantly-expanding capital, NewSpace entrepreneurs also articulate explicit territorial ambitions. Indeed, Virgin Galactic’s (2015, italics mine) slogan, ‘space is Virgin territory’, is surprising literal in its meaning. For many NewSpace advocates, extending capital markets into outer space is a means of gaining exclusive legal control and physical domination over space and resources. In 2015, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship (SPACE) Act passed by the US Congress granted the exclusive right to US companies to exploit minerals, water and other resources (excluding biological life) found in outer space on a first-come, first-served basis. Although the SPACE Act does not technically constitute a claim of sovereignty by the state over any outer space body, it grants sovereignty in the form of property rights to private companies. In so doing, it unilaterally alters the legal status of outer space, which has been recognized as res communis (a global commons) since the ratification of the UN’s Outer Space Treaty in 1969. While the Outer Space Treaty prohibits any state or nation from appropriating outer space bodies, its framers did not anticipate the emergence of private actors with the resources to launch space missions. As a result, its text does not explicitly prevent individuals or private companies from pursuing a policy of ‘first grab’ – a loophole that the SPACE Act openly exploits. The 1979 ‘Moon Treaty’ bans the appropriation of the moon or other space objects by any state or individual (excepting international bodies). However, to date it has gained only 16 signatories, none of which are major ‘space-faring’ countries. Due to these substantial gaps in international law and the difficulty of enforcing law in outer space, this sphere may come to resemble less the American frontier of the 1850s to which is often compared (see Grinspoon, Can IR confront the cosmos? 57 2004; Planetary Resources, 2014) as modern resource extraction frontiers. That is, it is likely to emerge as a weakly-regulated space shaped by destructive, often violent conflict amongst multiple state, commercial and private actors over lucrative resources circulated on global commodity markets (Tsing, 2005). Indeed, the outer space envisioned by NewSpace entrepreneurs offers prime sites for mining and other forms of extraction. Aside from the desire to escape the earth, the value of space colonization lies in its perceived potential to provide access to limitless ‘off-earth resources’ (Virgin Galactic, 2014). For instance, Planetary Resources states that a single platinum-rich 500 meter wide asteroid contains approximately 174 times the annual output of platinum, and 1.5 times the known world-reserves of platinum-group metals (ruthenium, rhodium, palladium, osmium, iridium and platinum) (Planetary Resources, 2014). These resources are intended to meet increasing resource demands made by a rising population on Earth, but also to fuel the extension of resource extraction projects beyond the solar system. As Planetary Resources co-founder Eric C. Anderson describes it: ‘we need to use the resources of space to help us colonize space … That’s why Planetary Resources exists’ (Fallows, 2013). Similarly, Deep Space Industries is preparing itself to be ‘the gas station, the oasis for food and water, and the building supply station for the frontier’ (Deep Space Industries, 2014). These claims suggest that the self-sustaining exploitation of outer space resources will make it possible to put a definitive end to resource scarcity, while creating no adverse environmental impacts on Earth. In fact, they bank on the possibility of exporting the externalities of resource extraction ‘safely outside of our delicate biosphere’ (Planetary Resources, 2014). Consider Eric Anderson’s rhetorical question: Wouldn’t it be great if one day, all of the heavy industries of the Earth – mining and energy production and manufacturing – were done somewhere else, and the Earth could be used for living, keeping it as it should be, which is a bright-blue planet with lots of green? (quoted in Fallows, 2013) This quote suggests that NewSpace entrepreneurs and activists view ‘off-earth’ resources not only as a source of profit but also as a means of ensuring the continual cosmic expansion of ‘humanity’. Indeed, although NewSpace is propelled by the search for profit and economic sovereignty, it is also driven by a form of aspirational, universalizing humanism (Valentine, 2012). As Michael Oman-Reagan’s (2015) work illustrates, this subject is almost exclusively imagined in NewSpace rhetoric and speculative imagery as white, cis-gendered and heterosexual. Indeed, proponents of space colonization promote deeply racialized and gendered images of ideal space colonists who fit the ideal of ‘scientific manliness’ (Lane, 2010) and are assumed to be a **‘superior** subset of the larger group from which they spring’ (Dolman, 2001: 27). Meanwhile, opponents of space colonization – including states who fail to fund it – are characterized as neutered, feminized or sexually impotent ‘eunochs’ (Lewis, 1996). Moreover, **many NewSpace actors envisage an ‘improved’ form of (post)humanity modified to survive in outer space**. These include modifications of lifestyle, culture and perhaps even physique or genetics. As such, while NewSpace entrepreneurs claim to be conquering outer space for ‘humanity’, they are in fact pursuing a particular set of technologically-mediated posthuman futures. Like the issue of extinction, this possibility challenges the bases of existing IR and global theory in a particular notion of ‘humanity’. NewSpace entrepreneurs interpellate these subjects – and work to design futures for them – through initiatives designed to activate emotional investment. This includes Planetary Resources’ online ‘Asteroid Zoo’, 1 an application that encourages members of the online public to ‘hunt mineral-rich asteroids’ using an online application and data from NASA’s Catalina Sky Survey. Similarly, projects such as Google Mars and the World Wide Telescope (funded by Google and Microsoft respectively) enable online users remotely to ‘travel’ across the surfaces of planets’ celestial bodies, compiling their ‘own’ personalized maps based on their aesthetic responses to the data. Strategies like these enable NewSpace actors to frame their efforts as a ‘grand unifying project’ (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007) undertaken in the name of ‘humanity’. Even the resource extraction company Planetary Resources promises that ‘the entire human race will be the beneficiary’ (Planetary Resources, 2014) of its work. These statements give the impression that access to outer space and its resources is, or at least should be, shared across a unified and uniform ‘humanity’. The Outer Space Treaty, the Moon treaty and the European Union’s draft Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities (2014) all call for the distribution of the profits and benefits of space colonization across ‘humanity’. However, they offer no specific prescriptions for effecting the global structural changes necessary to ensure the fair sharing of space technologies, resources or profits, making these goals little more than aspirational norms. Nor do they acknowledge or address existing relationships, patterns of dwelling and laws pertaining to the lands they annex as ‘outer space’. Plans for space colonization are a direct response to the possibility of radical infinitude and an expression of the desire to colonize radical infinitude in order to secure the ongoing survival of a specific norm of ‘humanity’. Above, I discussed the co-existence of multiple temporalities, including Ancestral times, cyclical times and discourses of deep time that not only predate and coexist with Western time, but will also persist beyond its boundaries. Cosmic expansionism is a culturally specific response to awareness of this condition. Through techno-scientific, capitalist and overtly colonial modes of intervention, it seeks to extend and assert a particular form of ‘human’ agency beyond a Western concept of time (and space) limited by the conditions of earth. This movement seeks to ensure the infinite domination of a particular (post)human subject by asserting spatio-temporal dominance over other times and dimensions, violating the forms of sovereignty engendered by the distinct worlds they support (Rifkin, 2017). Indeed, cosmic expansionism puts into question existing accounts of sovereignty rooted in Western scientific beliefs about the limitations and parameters imposed on ‘humanity’ by a recalcitrant earth. Emerging forms of space sovereignty (including the state- and commerciallybased economic sovereignty represented by the SPACE Act) seem to assume that existing statecentric sovereignty can be transferred to space without articulating how this might function. NewSpace entrepreneurs are joined by major state actors such as China and India in the scramble to gain control over ‘off-earth resources’. However, it is entirely unclear how territorial claims or jurisdiction could be determined in the unbounded space of the cosmos – or indeed, what kind of political community might be invested with this power. Current NewSpace projects are crystallizing around corporate structures based on resource extraction, in which communities comprised mostly of workers and some colonists would be sent into outer space at the behest of private companies. It is uncertain whether the citizenship and rights of this (presumably international) workforce would hold on other planets, and whether companies would continue to be regulated by states whose sovereignty is earth-based. The explicit flouting of the Outer Space Treaty by the approval of the SPACE Act (see Mitchell and West, 2016) has set a precedent that international law does not apply to other planets and celestial bodies. Since the jurisdiction of international law is designed to end at the boundaries of the planet, it is unclear whether or not states will respect claims to sovereignty made on outer space bodies. What’s more, even existing international space law ignores, effaces and violates the forms sovereignty embodied by Indigenous modes of dwelling and laws related to Sky Country or Sky Worlds. Indeed, by declaring ‘outer space’ to be res comunis, the UN effectively annexed this vast place, and the plural worlds it fosters, as terra nullius to be colonized and exploited by ‘humanity’. Future IR and global theories addressing ‘outer space’ should attend to the coexistence of multiple forms of sovereignty rooted in plural spatio-temporalities, cosmovisions and relations. Indeed, movements towards cosmic expansionism, and space colonization in particular, demand future IR theories that are overtly decolonial in nature. Crucially, these future decolonial IR theories must be attuned to the transformations of colonial logics and structures as they move across spaces, temporalities and material or technological conditions (see Wolfe, 2006). In NewSpace discourses, modes of colonization and settler colonialism responsible for widespread genocides, displacements and oppression across earth are lauded as desirable strategies. As discussed above, proponents of space colonization justify their rhetoric on the apparently commonsense knowledge that there are no Indigenous people or other ethically-relevant beings in outer space. Yet, the examples above show that the place labeled as ‘outer space’ within Western scientific discourses is richly populated with the relations (human and otherthan-human; living, dead and non-living in Western terms) of plural Indigenous peoples. Colonization of outer space bodies, the mining of asteroids or even movement through interplanetary space may damage these beings irreparably, severing their co-constitutive relations with people and other beings on earth. Moreover, given that each of the Indigenous knowledge systems discussed above considers these beings to be kin, the destruction of or trespass onto ‘outer space’ bodies constitutes a harm or transgression in itself. The space industry has a history of displacing Indigenous peoples and polluting their sacred lands on earth (see Redfield, 2000; Gorman, 2005). Plans for space colonization threaten to extend this violent legacy beyond earth, exponentially extending the spatio-temporal reach of settler colonial violence. In addition, NewSpace promotes colonial cultures based on the transfer of populations to environments to which they are unaccustomed and in which they will be at the mercy of colonial leaders. In this case, access to the technology required to travel to and exit from outer space bodies would remain concentrated in the hands of space entrepreneurs, who would potentially control every aspect of life in the colonies. Given the risk associated with outer space enterprises, and ongoing patterns of migration on earth, it is likely that the first colonizers would be members of economically marginalized and vulnerable groups. This would accentuate inequalities and structural violence currently experienced on earth. Due to the specific conditions of outer space – including distance from the earth and the bounded nature of the economies that would emerge on small, resource-driven space colonies – the power of space entrepreneurs would include almost total control over the social, political and economic aspects of life in the colonies. If the bodies of colonizers require modifications in order to survive in outer space conditions or the ecosystems of particular planets or other bodies, space entrepreneurs may also gain control over the genetic and physical characteristics of colonizers. In this sense, humans travelling to space to join these settlements would simultaneously be colonizers and intensely colonized

#### The development of posthumanism eliminates ontological meaning and value and reaffirms the settler subject by reducing others to a secondary status
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Bioconservatives criticize the notion that human nature can be reshaped into posthuman nature in beneficial ways. Bostrom identifies the most prominent bioconservatives as Francis Fukuyama and Leon Kass.23 Like transhumanists, bioconservatives do not speak with a unified voice, but share overlapping concerns. Chief among these is the fear that the enhancement technology leading to posthumanity may be dehumanizing. Bioconservatives’ worries are two-fold: one, the emergence of a posthuman species might undermine human dignity, and two, the state of being posthuman itself might be degrading. Francis Fukuyama is a right-wing bioconservative who expresses the first concern. In 2004, Fukuyama proclaimed transhumanism to be “the world’s most dangerous idea.”24 His major work on the subject, Our Posthuman Future: Consequences for the Biotechnology Revolution, is a treatment of the potential threat that transhumanism poses to democracy with its challenge of what it means to be human.25 As Bostrom notes, Fukuyama objects to transhumanism on the grounds that radical human enhancement is ultimately not compatible with legal and political rights as we know them. Fukuyama argues that it is a shared human essence that remains undefined which grounds dignity and equality.26 Underlying this idea of the equality of rights is the belief that we all possess a human essence…This essence, and the view that individuals therefore have inherent value, is at the heart of political liberalism. But modifying that essence is the core of the transhumanist project.27 His idea of a human essence is what he calls “Factor X:” an ambiguous, yet essential human quality that is deserving of a minimal level of respect. Bostrom characterizes this a “mysterious essential human quality” and Fukuyama considers it to be simply that which remains when all contingent human characteristics are removed. At the very least, it is a signifier of some unique defining feature of humanity which accounts for a higher moral status, and therefore dignity—a feature that is challenged by the emergence of posthumans. While certainly a shaky concept upon which to build an argument, Fukuyama suggests that Factor X is what Christians receive from God, and the secular might call the Kantian human capacity for autonomous moral choice.28 He is attempting to articulate that the source of dignity is not made—whatever it might be—it is given. This suggests that the bioconservative worry is not that posthumans could possess dignity and therefore moral status. Rather, the worry is that it would be a posthuman dignity that is incompatible with human dignity based on the distinction between the “born” and the “made”. In 1958, Hannah Arendt noted similar reservations about the posthuman when she referred to “future man.” To Arendt, the “future man” is “possessed by a rebellion against human existence as it has been given, a free gift from nowhere…which he wishes to exchange, as it were, for something he has made himself.”29 When Fukuyama speaks of Factor X, he, too, is referring to the givenness of the human condition, the “free gift from nowhere” which comes from humanity itself and is not imposed by culture.30 The overall point of Factor X, then, is rhetorical: it is meant to provide an account of human beings that acknowledges that the complexity of humanity cannot be easily reduced to a materialist theory subject to manipulation. Fukuyama makes the comparison to the ecosystem, noting that like human beings, its complexity precludes total understanding. As a result, there is a greater chance for harm than benefit when it comes to radical alterations. Therefore, he concludes that when it comes to posthuman technologies, the state should be used in a precautionary manner to regulate, minimize, and ban various routes to human enhancement.31 The decision to restrict certain enhancement technologies or limit the pursuit of certain kinds of knowledge is also the conclusion that Bill Joy reaches in his essay with bioconservative overtones, “Why the Future Doesn’t Need Us.” Joy, a pioneer computer scientist, is not anti-technology. However, he stresses the need for technological humility. But now, with the prospect of human-level computing power in about 30 years, a new idea suggests itself: that I may be working to create tools which will enable the construction of the technology that may replace our species… it seems to me more than likely that this future will not work out as well as some people may imagine. My personal experience suggests we tend to overestimate our design abilities.32 To Joy, limiting the development of these technologies is the only way to be certain to avoid the existential risks they entail. The idea of limiting the development of certain technologies based on their possible risk is embodied in the concept of the precautionary principle, which can be summarized by saying “look before you leap.” This principle is Fukuyama’s solution to the threat transhumanism presents to human dignity in Our Posthuman Future. A precautionary outlook is essential to the bioconservative view. The only way to avoid the threat to human dignity entailed by the creation of a “successor” species is to craft arguments in favor of legislation that prevents the creation of a new human species engineered through biotechnology. For transhumanists, Max More created the proactionary principle as the conceptual counterpoint to the precautionary principle. The proactionary principle is fundamental to transhumanism due to the stress it places on reinterpreting risk as an opportunity: precautionaries aim to prevent the worst possible outcomes, while proactionaries aim to promote the best available opportunities.33 Steve Fuller speculates that a proactionary world would not simply tolerate technological risk-taking, but encourage it through legal incentives—what Fuller calls speculating with one’s “bioeconomic assets.”34 A primary motivation for adopting a proactionary outlook is the concern that a precautionary approach hampers the process of learning through experimentation by emphasizing the perception of risk, rather than the reality of risk. According to Fuller, the primary “risk” that the precautionary approach is meant to protect against is a change in the transcendent order, nature or God, that places limits on what humans can do or become.35 Leon Kass is the most prominent bioconservative who expresses the precautionary approach in the way mentioned by Fuller. He also voices the concern that the state of being posthuman may itself be degrading. Kass, who, for several years was “the most politically influential bioethicist on the planet,”36 justifies his position against radical technological enhancement through an appeal to nature. Most of the given bestowals of nature have given species-specified natures: they are each and all given a sort. Cockroaches and humans are equally bestowed but differently natured. To turn a man into a cockroach—as we don’t need Kafka to show us—would be dehumanizing. To try to turn a man into more than a man might be so as well…We need a particular regard and respect for the special gift that is our own given nature.37 Kass appeals to the natural as a guide to what is both desirable and normatively correct. One way that Kass claims that the natural functions as a guide is through what he calls “repugnance.” Repugnance, or the “yuck factor” is the basis of an argument that cannot fully articulate why radical posthuman technologies are wrong—though they are felt to be. Kass does not believe that this feeling of repugnance should be ignored. While a gut feeling of revulsion is not an argument, Kass argues that it deserves to be acknowledged.38 Kass’ own repugnance is evidenced in a strong precautionary stance. He asserts that technological mastery over human nature would result in the posthuman as a degraded state of being. The final technical conquest of his own nature would almost certainly leave mankind utterly enfeebled. This form of mastery would be identical with utter dehumanization. Read Huxley’s Brave New World…read Nietzsche’s account of the last man…Homogenization, mediocrity, pacification, drug-induced contentment, debasement of taste, souls without loves and longings—these are the inevitable results of making the essence of human nature the last project of technical mastery.39 Kass is making a Heideggarian argument in defense of the human against the posthuman. Kass’ intellectual heritage does not mention Heidegger, however he does claim a debt to Hans Jonas, one of Heidegger’s students. Kass’ concerns about radical technologies are grounded in fears that by applying a calculating, measuring, or datacentric approach to everything, not only will nature be manipulated endlessly, but humans as well. The problem, then, is that people will be reduced to subjects of efficient enhancement. The result is a world where the unenhanced, or that which is unenhanced-able, comes to have a secondary status against a backdrop of homogenization. The tradition of bioconservativism is traced by philosopher Johnathan Moreno to the critique of technology presented by Martin Heidegger in 1954.40 In “The Question Concerning Technology,” Heidegger suggests that the threat of technology is not a technical problem for which there is a technical solution. Rather, it is an ontological condition from which we can be saved that prevents us from conceiving of meaning in any way beyond the technological. 41 Heidegger felt that this was an ontological threat because technological rationality was an expression of nihilism: if technology (the tool) is a means, then an age of total technical solutions is an age without ends. Put differently, if technology becomes the singular answer to all questions, there is no meaning to the question. On this account, to ask why humans die, or why we experience uncertainty and suffering, is tantamount to posing a technical problem with a technical solution. In this way, Heidegger is in agreement with Kass’ assertion that a posthuman state of being could be degrading in itself in its promise to turn human beings themselves into technological objects. The problem is that transhumanism embraces what is seen by Heidegger and Kass to be the threat imposed by radical technological enhancement as an omnipotent solution. Heidegger’s argument that the technological rationality is an ontological condition can be expanded to accommodate transhumanism, and clarify the core distinction between a transhumanist and a bioconservative. For Heidegger, technology has become an ontological question because it raises the possibility of making finitude into a choice. Following Heidegger, the bioconservative position is to see human finitude not as a choice, but as the source of our shared humanity. On this account finitude and limits are not technical problems that can be solved, but structures of meaning and identity. Transhumanists, however, see finitude and limits not as anything ontological, but simply epistemological: once there is enough data, all limits can be transcended. On this account, there is nothing fundamentally defining about human limitations. To be a transhumanist, then, is to degrade the human being by denying the ontologization of finitude.

#### Thus: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### The Role of the Judge is to Decolonize Educational Spaces, which means keeping the space open to non-Eurocentric ways of knowing.

Pratt 18: Pratt, Yvonne Poitras [The University of Calgary], Dustin Louie [The University of Calgary], Aubrey Hanson [The University of Calgary], Jacqueline Ottmann [University of Saskatchewan]. “Indigenous Education and Decolonization.” Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education, January 2018. Recut AX

Indigenous education attends to understandings of education that are indigenous to particular lands and places, and “the path and process whereby individuals gain knowledge and meaning from their indigenous heritages” (Jacob, Cheng, & Porter, 2015, p. 3). There are as many unique approaches to Indigenous education as there are diverse Indigenous nations around the globe—yet a central aim is “holistically nurturing future leaders who will be able to speak and act on behalf of their people” (p. 2). In a contemporary context, it is a continuance of Indigenous Knowledges, yet also entails fostering ethical, reciprocal relations between Indigenous and other knowledge systems (Ermine, 2007). Returning to the epistemological and ontological systems of a country’s Indigenous peoples in order to shape educational systems or institutions in that place is a way of Indigenizing education. Indigenous educators also recognize that colonialism continues to shape contemporary schooling: colonial education can exist even when explicitly assimilative systems of formal education have been closed and condemned. Colonial dynamics in contemporary schooling are often less visible because of how deeply and unknowingly educators can be entrenched in hegemonic assumptions, arising from colonial mentalities and further entrenched by dominant structural systems. Indigenous Knowledges are bodies of knowledge that arise from the long-term occupancy of a specific place over time. Such knowledges include “traditional norms and social values [alongside] mental constructs that guide, organize, and regulate the people’s way of living and making sense of their world” (Dei, Hall, & Goldin Rosenberg, 2000, p. 6). Such knowledges arise from the collective experiences and understandings of a people. They add: Colonizing is the physical and ideological domination of peoples in order to separate them from their culture and resources, while creating external and internalized assumptions of the supremacy of the colonizer. Conversely, the project of decolonizing challenges and disrupts assumptions of colonial superiority. For Smith (2012), decolonization is the revitalization of the ways of being and knowing prior to colonization, while unearthing the manner in which colonization was achieved. It is not enough to simply reconnect with the past; in order to pursue decolonization, we must also untangle the complex web of internalized oppression created by colonization. Furthermore, decolonization requires the colonizers to recognize and challenge their own socialized presumptions of superiority.

#### [ROB] Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to Endorse Alternative Resistance Strategies Against Colonialist Violence.

#### The affirmative approaches this through a politics of decolonial IR which recognizes the imminent forms of Indigenous Ancestry that precede New Space’s attempt to colonize the outer-space. Only this account of contemporary space politics is able to grapple with the colonial underside of NewSpace.

Mitchell 4 (Audra Mitchell is an Associate Professor of Global Political Ecology @ Wilfrid Laurier University, “Can International Relations Confront the Cosmos” in Routledge Handbook of Critical International Relations, pg 60-61)//Recut AX

Future decolonial IR and global theory need not rule out the inhabitation of other celestial bodies, but it could envision non-violent modes of life that respect outer space beings. This would involve taking seriously Indigenous and other non-Western ethical-legal systems and kinship relations, and ensuring that any actions within Sky Country/Sky Worlds or other Ancestral territories were respected. What’s more, imaginaries of outer space should include Indigenous and non-Western visions of these forms of dwelling. Morten Klass (2000) notes that existing plans for space colonization envision communities in ‘outer space’ that almost exclusively feature North American and (north) European community and economic structures. As Dickens and Ormrod (2007) suggest, most imaginaries of space colonization are rooted in Western forms of science fiction such as Star Trek, which reinforce images of eminent domain and expansive capitalism. A future decolonial IR and global theory could engage with the emerging genres of Afro-futurism (Nelson, 2000; Womack, 2013) and Indigenous futurisms (see Dillon, 2012) to imagine other futures. Through visual, digital, musical and filmic mediums, many works in these genres imagine futures in which Ancestral knowledges and contemporary realities fuse with emerging technologies to engender nonviolent forms of encounter and co-existence with other beings on earth and elsewhere. A future decolonial IR and global theory could take its cues from these sources – not simply Western science fiction – to imagine plural future forms of flourishing on and off earth. Conclusion As earthly ruptures puncture and deflate the globe that underpins IR and global theory (Latour, 2016), these disciplines need to attune themselves to different forms of critique. These ruptures expose profound gaps between existing IR and global theory and the cosmological conditions in which it is embedded. As a result of these gaps, IR and global theory is unable to confront some of the most profound and challenging conditions that face it. The contributions to this book each, in different ways, query the limits of critique in IR, and whether IR can still be meaningfully understood as a discipline. In this chapter, I have foregrounded a form of critique that goes beyond the limits of existing frameworks: the direct critiques asserted through the eruption of planetary crises and cosmic conditions into the frameworks of IR. I have also centred speculative theory and philosophy as a potent mode of critique within, and of, IR and global theory. To some degree, all of the arguments made in this chapter rely on speculative thought – that is, reasoned thought abstracted from current knowledge about possible future events. This form of critique is not ‘mere (science) fiction’: it involves modes of reason that integrate elements of imagination and the contingency of the unknown. Speculative thought, which has become an important aspect of contemporary philosophy (see Bogost, 2012; Morton, 2013), anthropology, science and technology studies (see Haraway, 2008) and which has for centuries been central to Western science, offers a great deal to scholars interested in the future of earth and the wider cosmos. Indeed, rather than limiting critique and the projection of futures to existing theory, it draws on incipient, emergent patterns (Connolly, 2011) to imagine other possible worlds and configurations of existence. Finally, I have engaged throughout with Indigenous philosophies and cosmo-visions. In so doing, I have sought to highlight the plurality of worlds that co-exist on earth, and the multiplicity of forms of dwelling, relations with earth and other planets, and possible futures they incubate. This, in turn, performs a critique of the universalizing tendencies of existing Western-centric IR and global theory, whose exclusions and erasures of these worlds have helped to alienate it from the conditions in which it is embedded. These modes of being, dwelling, flourishing and imagining challenge dominant Western, colonial norms of ‘humanity’ and the oppressive, often violent, political and economic structures they engender. In combination, these forms of critique open up possibilities for plural futures – even in the face of radical (in)finitude.

#### It is only by rejecting the call to survive at all costs through space colonization that we can produce an ethics of care which can produce a de-colonial space.

Mitchell 5 (Audra Mitchell is an Associate Professor of Global Political Ecology @ Wilfrid Laurier University, “Can International Relations Confront the Cosmos” in Routledge Handbook of Critical International Relations, pg 54-55)//Recut AX

All of this suggests that mainstream IR and global theory, and the global politics it sustains, are not capable of addressing extinction or the condition of radical finitude it foregrounds. On the contrary, they are constructed to be unreceptive to the material, ecological and cosmological critiques of its theories, structures and practices raised by escalating patterns of Audra Mitchell 54 extinction. An IR and global theory more attuned to the pluralities of expressions of ‘humans’ and other life forms, or for their potential emergence, would loosen the grip of dominant norms and open up space for alternative ideas of survival and flourishing. By rejecting the demand for the survival and security of ‘humanity’ at all costs, this future IR might embrace forms of flourishing and well-being that do not imply or assume permanence but rather embrace fluidity. It might also involve creating space for posthuman futures enabled by the nourishing of links with other life forms or technologies (see Braidotti, 2013; Colebrook, 2014; Evans and Reid, 2014). Moreover, this future IR and global theory might center Indigenous modes of governance rooted in treaties, protocols and other ethical-legal relations with other beings – including other animals, water and earth itself (see, for instance, Atleo, 2011; Simpson, 2011; Kimmerer, 2013). Each of these possibilities would contribute to an IR and global theory more attuned and responsive to earth, to the structural violences that existing IR and global theory bolster, and to the multiple possible futures that can be imagined against images of radical finitude. Indeed, confronting radical finitude opens up opportunities for creativity. Numerous cosmo-visions suggest that negation is the source of re-creation. For instance, the Kumolipo, the cosmogonic chant of the Kānaka Maoli people of Hawai’i, locates the origins of the universe in what Western science might label as ‘nothingness’ (Oliveira, 2014). Hopi Elder Thomas Banyacya (cited in Mohawk, 2010), relates his peoples’ cosmological history, in which earth has been totally destroyed and regenerated three times in response to the breaking of protocols by humans. Working within Western critical theory, Alain Badiou (2009) suggests that irruptions of ‘the void’ – the field of non-being and total negation – are the source of radical transformation. Each of these perspectives suggests that negation can be a profound source of creativity, and that confronting radical finitude can create opportunities for co-creating plural futures. Future IR theories that take seriously the critiques raised by earthly ruptures such as extinction might relinquish their grip on the survival of a particular model of ‘humanity’ to make space for these futures.

# 1AR

## Extensions

### Thesis

Settler society correlates colonial experience as the only account of existence and denies the existence of alternative cosmologies – this affirmation of a unified humanity is racialized and excludes non-white and non-western modes of thought that contradict the settler view of the world:

IR is currently at a crossroads between radical finitude and radical infinitude. Rather than a confrontation with extinction, settlers escape this anxiety through expanding into the cosmos.

They conceded the first ontology card which is damning – Extend Mitchell 19 – Settler society correlates colonial experience as the only account of existence and denies the existence of alternative cosmologies – this affirmation of a unified humanity is racialized and excludes non-white and non-western modes of thought that contradict the settler view of the world:

1. Proves that a) Settler society is the root cause of extinction and CC because of the settler mindset to exploit and conquest at all costs b) Guts neg solvency bc w/o indigenous and alternative forms of IR, settler society will continue to ignore and repress CC until its too late – thus the aff is a prior q to any of the neg impacts

Extend the RoJ to decolonize educational spaces – by keeping educational spaces open to non-western conceptions of the world, we help deconstruct the internalized oppression from colonization

Extend the RoB to Endorse Alternative Resistance Strategies Against Colonialist Violence - The aff comes first under the rob bc

### Thesis v2

Contemporary Space Policies are confronted with the possibility of radical finitude, the possibility that settler society has reached it limits, and flees towards the possibility of radical infinitude through scientific rationality in space. This corresponds with a broader settler-trend that operationalizes rationality in the name of capital to erase Indigenous perspectives. **It is not just that rationality disagrees with Indigenous perspectives, but rather that they violently deny their possibility**. This has manifested throughout history – the doctrine of terra nullius which argued that colonists were justified in taking land because Indigenous spiritual practices weren’t rational or the mass violence in boarding schools to kill the Indian to save the man.

This means that the Role of the Judge is to Decolonize Educational Spaces, which means keeping the space open to non-Eurocentric ways of knowing.

Only by prioritizing alternative relations to the cosmos can we reorientate debates research practices in face of alternative accounts of the cosmos which new space prevents.

Cosmic expansionism from private entities has multiple impacts:

1. Cosmic expansionism reinforces the erasure of indigenous knowledges and cosmologies that is the root cause of oppression
2. It creates a racialized post-human that a) Deems indigenous and non post-humans as racially inferior b) Destroys ontology by eliminating the conception of “human”

The aff solves bc we reorient IR by recognizes different futures and imagines other worlds and configurations where we can explore space – rather than annexation and conquest, decolonial IR seeks cooperation and fluidity that allows us to deconstruct settler dominated views of the world

## Blocks

### A2: T

CI: The aff must not defend the policy action in a plan text in the 1ac if they defend the consequences of the resolution

Violation: I meet

1. Limits – Speccing justifies an infinite number of 1acs – a) unpredictable and hurts neg grd – causes an infinite prep skew for neg – ow prevents engagement w ac b) Inf regress bc the neg can just force the aff to spec something more and more specific or arbitray
2. Clash – Speccing a super small portion of the res ow bc it prevents you from reading core neg grd on the topic like Mining and Satellites – ow clash constitutive of debate

TS: Shiftiness

Turn: Spec is worse a) sets the norm that you can NEVER read certain args b) Norm of speccing just means each aff will spec something different, makes all ur grd args nonuq since ur norm doesn’t solve

TS: Limited number of words in res,

But there are always more specific definitions for EACH of the words – eg. Private entities can be Starlink, SpaceX, Blue Moon, Virgin galactic

### A2: Kant (0:33)

1. Their statement that “ethics must be universal” is exactly what we are trying to critique-Western phils need to establish a universal white man at the center of ethics is what causes the exclusion of non-white voices and leads to their oppression
2. Cross app our analysis on rationality from case – western rationality not only disagrees with indigeneity but violently denies their possibility – don’t allow for Kant solves case
3. Regardless of whether or not reason can be universally applied – the attempt to create dichomoty between reason v. nonreason always become picked up and circulated to become anti-indig
4. Settlers have desire to know + map out everything – Want to control not just all space but all time – Kant’s desire for a-priori truths is part of the conquistador mentality

A2: Korsgaard

1. Mitchell critiques this in two ways
   1. Human value is synonymous with western scientific values
   2. Even if its not true the negs equation of human value w universal value is colonialist in of itself

### A2 Util

Cross apply Mitchell which states that the neg’s fundamental understanding of human experience being universal experience is inherently colonialist and ignores non-western views of epistemology

We directly impact turn Todd 19 and their entire extinction first rhetoric

1. Util and extinction rhetorics masks real world inequalities and normalizes extinction occurring to indigenous ppl in the squo
2. Allows for the theft of indig land because spiritual cosmologies and sanctity are ignored in the name of settler survival
3. **Util has empirically been used as a justification for native erasure in places like the US and Australia – Proves that util is morally repugnant and is an independent reason to drop it**
4. **Util excludes the pain and pleasures of Native Americans, aren’t included in the util calculus**

**TS: Actor spec**

1. **Impact turn: States bad – used to justify set col + genocide of indig ppl**
2. **We are still conseq, just believe in a cooperative non-exploitative view of society**

### A2: CP

#### Mega constellations results in space debris, loss of bio-diversity, 4200 falling satellites a year, climate change, ozone depletion, increased radiation, and hurts weather satellites.

Coma 2021 (Miguel Coma is a writer for Wall Street International after graduating from honours as an electronics and telecommunications engineer (MSc) from Brussels' Industrial Engineering Institute (ISIB), Satellite mega-constellations’ mega-threats, July 23, 2021, https://wsimag.com/science-and-technology/66440-satellite-mega-constellations-mega-threats)//NotJacob

Producing junk Nature’s1 May 2021 report reveals that each of Elon Musk’s satellites operates for only five to six years—less than a personal computer. Musk swears he’ll take out his trash by having dead satellites re-enter the atmosphere and turn into dust. So, beside his 42,000 functioning satellites, expect an additional 4,200 de-orbiting satellites at all times. Expect 8,400 new satellites launched each year to replace the ones that no longer work. Every day, Starlink alone can produce about six tons of electronic waste that re-enters the Earth’s atmosphere. This junk increases the risk of cascading collisions with untracked debris. Indeed, “a major fragmentation event from a single satellite could affect all [satellite] operators in LEO [Low Earth Orbit]”.1 Make a wish on a falling satellite! During satellites’ re-entry into the atmosphere, pieces large enough to harm people, wildlife and property can fall. NASA recommends a human casualty risk lower than 1/10,000 per satellite re-entry. However, launching permits do not consider the cumulative or combined risks of launching hundreds of thousands of satellites. Operators do not always respect safety standards1. Scientists find that pieces larger than 10 cm might not fully disintegrate when they fall back to Earth5, and yet SpaceX claims that their next-generation satellites will completely turn into dust. No agency has tested this claim; and no agency can require other satellite operators to turn their debris into dust. If you watch a falling satellite, make a wish that everyone will stay safe! Chemicals and ozone depletion During a satellite launch, rocket fuels (e.g. hydrazine) and rocket parts that contain hazardous substances may fall into the ocean and harm marine life.1 In the upper atmosphere, high temperatures (generated by friction) lead to the formation of ozone-consuming chemicals.6 Ozone provides a protective layer around the Earth. Depleting it can increase people's exposure to the sun’s ultra-violet light and cause skin cancer. Forty years ago, NASA scientist Michael Zolensky was looking for comet and asteroid dust in the high atmosphere. Mostly, he found particles of rocket exhaust, spacecraft protection paints and aluminium. Do space engineers know this? Martin Ross of The Aerospace Corporation confirms a lack of interdisciplinary communication. Scientists and engineers need to talk—but “that usually doesn't happen." Starlink’s average daily satellite waste (six tons) will dramatically increase aluminium deposits in the stratosphere7. When the aluminium in satellite cases burns, aluminium oxide (alumina) forms and can deplete the ozone layer. Would wooden satellite cases (developed in Japan) be less harmful? But solid-fuel rockets cause the most damage to the ozone layer—because of their hydrogen chloride and alumina emissions1. Weather forecasts and global warming Deploying 5G networks that use millimetre wave frequencies on the Earth’s surface could significantly jam satellite weather and climate observations8. Besides Earth-based 5G radio-frequencies, even higher frequencies used by future satellite constellations could interfere with weather observations. Facebook’s constellation is still experimental, but it might use frequencies near 88.2 gigahertz, which weather-observing satellites9 currently use. Space launches have significant global warming effects1. Some satellite-launching rockets such as SpaceX’s Falcon 9 consume liquid kerosene and release black carbon. Solid-fuelled rockets produce alumina particles. All of these increase the greenhouse effect. Global warming from kerosene rockets has been modelled for 1,000 annual rocket launches during one decade. Scientists find that these kerosene rockets’ greenhouse effects are comparable to pre-Covid emissions from aviation. SpaceX’s Starship, the most powerful rocket ever built, fuelled by liquid methane, can launch 400 Starlink satellites at one time. Methane combustion produces soot that increases global warming. Liquid rocket fuels can also impact cloud formations—and the Earth’s climate. Radiation all over (and above) the Earth’s surface The magnetosphere (the magnetic envelope surrounding the Earth) shields our planet from solar and cosmic particle radiation. How/does microwave radiation emitted by satellites impact it? The Van Allen belts surround and protect the Earth with electric charges. Could satellites’ microwave radiation emission drain the belts’ electrons into the atmosphere, and change its electric properties? How are the Schumann resonances, the electromagnetic “heartbeat” of the atmosphere to which living beings on Earth are attuned, affected by satellites’ emissions? Satellites beam massive amounts of microwave radiation day and night from within the magnetosphere and through the atmosphere. What effect does this have on the magnetosphere and the electromagnetic balance of all life? Should subject matter experts study this before we deploy any more satellites? There are very few studies of millimetre waves’ impacts on plants and animals10. Consequently, predicting the effects of tens of thousands of satellites beaming millimetre waves on biodiversity is nearly impossible. As long as we fail to limit deployments, we risk increasing loss of biodiversity. Unlike Earth-based networks, satellite constellations will virtually radiate even areas with low population density. There will be no place for humans and wildlife to escape microwave radiation—or its potentially harmful effects. The Earth’s gigantic electric circuit allows a permanent flow of electrons from the ionosphere to the planet’s surface, and back to the ionosphere when lightning strikes. According to Eastern medicine, this electric current flows supportively through our chakras and meridians. The potential health effects of satellites beaming radiation from the ionosphere—and interfering with the Earth’s natural electromagnetic fields—have not been studied.

“Helping indig people by putting environmentally unsafe things into the atmosphere”

* This colonial mentality obsessed w profit and connectivity is the exact thing we are critiquing the aff
* Produce 6 ton daily waste just for starlink

1. Turn: The CP reinforces the western dominated idealogy of conquest + the expansion into the cosmos for the purpose of profit – Justifying the erasure of native life + governance for the 1% prob that the white settler can get rich
2. This is just a fantasy a) aff ows on probabilitiy all indig groups included will never happen, super vague = just form of tokenisim
3. The CP only understands indigenous ppl as a political prop/tool for them to retroactively their own unethical policies which is patronizing – supercharged by how they don’t know what indig tribes they are even including-this Justifies perm - Only the perm solves bc we center indig perspectives not for an extrinsic goal but bc its intrinsically valuable
4. Doesn't disprove the general thesis of the aff - We say newspace + space conquest bad, inidg ppl getting internet access still votes aff
5. Perm do the CP through the aff mindset - allows for ACTUAL change with indig ppl at the forefront bc combines the aff's centering of indig futurism with satellites led by indig ppl

### A2: Asteroid Mining PIC

1. Turn: The CP reinforces the western dominated idealogy of conquest + the expansion into the cosmos for the purpose of profit – Cross apply the two impact cards on case
   1. Justifying the erasure of native life + governance for the 1% prob that the white settler can get rich
   2. Billionaires who acquired their wealth through colonial processes are driven by a gendered and racialized sense of humanism and superiority – Justifies post-humanism
2. The CP is patronizing – no indig ppl are asking for asteroid mining – they just want to not be ignored – the CP is a form of political posturing that “helps” indig ppl without materially benefitting them which prevents real change from occuring
3. Perm: Do the CP with a politics of decolonial IR
   1. They concede the first Mitchell 19 card which is damning – settlers love to contemplate how they can prevent extinction while ignoring the genocide towards indig ppl happening in the squo
   2. The Perm solves by reorienting mineral extraction and asteroid mining through an indig perspective that focuses on how resource extraction can be used for indigeneity rather than for preventing a 1% risk of extinction
   3. Remember, the aff doesn’t say that Space exploration is inherently bad, just says that the focus on going to space due to a fear of extinction is harmful

### A2: CCP

On Blumenthal and urda 9/28

1. The logic of the card is literally – Xi is like mao, mao invaded taiwan
2. The card is super vague – doesn’t mention satellites once, don’t buy the link chain

### A2 Kant NC

**No one has claims to property in space – terminal defense**

**Silk ’21:** Matthew S.W. Silk. “Ethical Concerns About Space Mining”. The Prindle Post. February 3rd, 2021. <https://www.prindlepost.org/2021/02/ethical-concerns-about-space-mining/>.

It was a big news day in Canada last month as it was announced that, thanks to an agreement on the Artemis program, a Canadian astronaut will join the United States on the first crewed mission to the moon scheduled to take place in just a few years. While the Canadian government was happy to note that this will mean that [Canada will be only the second country to have an astronaut in deep space](https://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/canada-astronaut-moon-1.5843540), the efforts to return to the moon are not driven only in the interests of science and discovery. This may be only a first step towards mining in space and that prospect raises ethical concerns. The Artemis program followed the signing of [Space Policy Directive 1](https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/presidential-memorandum-reinvigorating-americas-human-space-exploration-program/) which calls for the United States to return humans to the moon for “long-term exploration and utilization.” Since then, in collaboration with private companies and international partners, missions have been scheduled for crewed missions in just under three years. While much of the program is scientific in nature and is being led by NASA, part of the program includes the Artemis Accords which have been signed by several nations and which outline some guidelines for the mining of space resources. According to [the accord](https://www.nasa.gov/specials/artemis-accords/img/Artemis-Accords-signed-13Oct2020.pdf), the signatories affirmed various guidelines for the “extraction and utilization of space resources.” According to the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, no nation may claim ownership of the moon or other celestial body. Space shall be free for exploration and use by all signatories. The Moon Treaty of 1979, drafted by the United Nations states that the Moon is a common heritage of humans and harvesting its resources is forbidden except by an international regime. It also bans any ownership of extraterrestrial property by a private organization. However, the United States, Russia, and China [have not ratified it](https://www.thespacereview.com/article/1954/1). Instead, in 2015 the United States passed the Commercial Space Launch Competitive Act which explicitly allows private corporations to engage in commercial exploitation of space resources even while avoiding asserting sovereignty over a celestial body. In April of this year, Trump signed an [executive order](https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-encouraging-international-support-recovery-use-space-resources/) encouraging space mining with it noting, “it shall be the policy of the United States to encourage international support for the public and private recovery and use of resources in outer space.” The moon, in addition to several other space objects, contains minerals which can be extremely valuable in space and on Earth. Some of these are difficult to get on Earth and are located mostly in places like China, Russia, and Congo. For example, the moon is estimated to have more helium-3 than Earth and has several uses, including a possible use as fuel for nuclear fusion. The moon also contains lithium, titanium, aluminum, cobalt, silicon, and other important minerals. Materials like these can be useful for building everything from medical equipment to [electric cars](https://www.bbc.com/news/newsbeat-52228423) which can help with environmental problems. In space, such materials can be used for making things like [rocket fuel and solar panels](https://theconversation.com/us-seeks-to-change-the-rules-for-mining-the-moon-136665). There are several reasons why such mining can be beneficial.

**This also justifies an aff ballot since it proves that the Outer Space Treaty of ’67 prohibits private entities from appropriating its resources.**

### A2 Moon Treaty proves regulation possible

#### Moon Treaty is meaningless and proves nothing

Steffen 2021 (Olaf Steffen, Explore to Exploit: A Data-Centred Approach to Space Mining Regulation, Space Policy, December 2 2021, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515#bib15)//NotJacob

One could argue that under these terms, the case for space resource utilisation is clear, and a way towards its regulation has already been sketched out. However, with only 18 parties and 11 additional signatories [31], the Moon Agreement carries far less weight than the OST. In fact, none of the major space faring nations has ratified the Moon Agreement, with developing countries comprising the majority of its signatories. None of the nations that today claim the possibility of commercial appropriation of resources removed from celestial bodies has ratified the Moon Agreement

### A2 REM RENEWABLE ENERGY DA’s

#### U.S. is already building alternative supply chains for Rare Earth Minerals. MP Materials and Lynas prove Chinese monopoly isn’t going to exist forever

Subin 2021 (Samantha Subin is a news associate with CNBC, currently covering tech, The new U.S. plan to rival China and end cornering of market in rare earth metals, SAT, APR 17 2021, https://www.cnbc.com/2021/04/17/the-new-us-plan-to-rival-chinas-dominance-in-rare-earth-metals.html)//NotJacob

MP Materials bought the mine and restarted production in 2017. The Las Vegas-headquartered company is vying to restore the domestic rare earths supply chain from mine to magnet, and is hedging its bets on neodymium-praseodymium, with the hope of becoming the lowest-cost producer. In recent years, the Las Vegas-headquartered company received a myriad of grants and contracts from the Department of Defense and Department of Energy to research and improve domestic capabilities. One of the company’s largest customers is Shenghe Resources, a Chinese company responsible for processing, distributing and refining, which also owns a stake in the company. The connection raised some concerns among DOE scientists, according to Reuters, but government funding has continued for a rare earths separation facility. Shenghe Resources distributes the concentrate produced at Mountain Pass to refiners in Asia, “capabilities that simply do not exist at scale in the West,” according to an MP Materials spokesman. The company plans to reinvest the free cash flow generated from operations into expanding MP’s U.S. capabilities, including a restoration of domestic refining capability at Mountain Pass by next year. Ultimately, the company, which went public last year through a SPAC merger, plans to “restore the full rare earth supply chain” to the U.S., the spokesman said, including refining and separation, and magnet-making by 2025, as the domestic electric vehicle market ramps up production. “This is happening and I think it’s happening much much faster than I think anybody had anticipated,” said Ryan Corbett, the company’s chief financial officer. “We can compete and we’re going to continue to do it.” Another key player in the space is Lynas Corporation, one of the largest processors of rare earths outside China. The Australian mining company, which operates a separation facility in Malaysia, recently received $30.4 million in funding from the Pentagon to build a Texas light rare earths processing facility and earned another contract, in partnership with Blue Line Corp., also based in Texas, to build a heavy rare earths separation facility. A Lynas spokeswoman referred to the new facilities in an email to CNBC as an “essential foundation” for renewing downstream metal making and implementing magnet manufacturing into the U.S. She wrote that diversifying outside the Chinese magnetic materials supply chain is important to create competitive markets and meet the growing demand for 21st-century technologies.

#### Dangers of REM monopoly are overstated.

Mishra and Shukla 2019(ACHYUT MISHRA and SRIJAN SHUKLA, Rare earth elements have a strategic value for China, but that could be overstated, The Print, 31 August, 2019, https://theprint.in/world/rare-earth-elements-have-a-strategic-value-for-china-but-that-could-be-overstated/284989/)//NotJacob

Is the strategic utility of REEs overstated? According to Tim Worstall, senior fellow at UK-based policy think-tank Adam Smith Institute, the fears of China’s monopoly are overstated. Making his point, he said a sudden hike in REE prices by China wouldn’t affect the US economy adversely for two reasons. Firstly, “the world uses products that contain rare earths. But near all of them are actually made in China”. Most of China’s rare earth production isn’t exported directly. Rather REEs are “exported embedded into products”, not as raw material. Secondly, Worstall argued that “a near monopoly is a wonderful thing to have”, but if it is a “contestable monopoly”, then people would create alternate supply chains after “you try to throw your weight around in the market”

### A2: Asteroid Mining DA

#### Asteroid mining results in militarization

Steffen 2021 (Olaf Steffen, Explore to Exploit: A Data-Centred Approach to Space Mining Regulation, Space Policy, December 2 2021, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964621000515#bib15)//NotJacob

Complementing the proven ability to access asteroids from earth, Sanchez and McInnes [5] have shown that there is ‘ample material that could potentially be exploited at a relatively low energy’. Genta [6] considers asteroid mining to be a necessary foundation for establishing humanity as a spacefaring civilisation. Companies with the goal to realise space mining, for example, Planetary Resources and Deep Space Industries (now acquired by Consensus Space [7] and Bradford Space [8]), have been in existence for many years. Other companies, such as Momentus Space [9] or Honeybee Robotics [10], have a technological profile or dedicated roadmap set on the goal of space mining. Together with technical, legal and environmental views on the matter, some authors are also critical of space development and how it will evolve. For example, counterarguments against space expansionism in general were recently published by Deudney in his book ‘Dark Skies’ [11]. He describes the large-scale development of space as a source of conflict with potentially existential consequences for humanity and advocates for a policy of space development that serves Earth by focussing on space-based astronomy, Earth system science, a strengthening of the Outer Space Treaty and research techniques for asteroid deflection through an international consortium. With respect to the latter, Deudney warns of the dual-use character of asteroid mining technology. Asteroid orbits could be changed to intercept the Earth's orbit and could thus be used for orbital bombardment in a terrestrial conflict scenario or, as he states, in a war between Earth and off-world colonies. The ‘destructive capability vastly exceeding nuclear weapons’ of techniques that alter asteroid orbits should not lie with single companies or nations [11].

**Mining can’t solve environmental crisis – technical barriers**

**Riederer ’14:** Rachel Riederer. May 19th, 2014. “Silicon Valley says space mining is awesome and will change life on earth. That’s only half right”. The New Republic. <https://newrepublic.com/article/117815/space-mining-will-not-solve-earths-conflict-over-natural-resources>.

It's become clear that there’s just not enough stuff on Earth to go around. We’re constantly fighting over land and water, jockeying for access to our home planet’s diamonds or oil or sugarcane or schools of fish. In the last few years a chorus of voices has arisen to suggest that we could solve these petty human squabbles by looking to space. “Everything we hold of value on this planet, metals, minerals, real estate, energy sources, fuel—the things we fight wars over—are literally in near infinite quantities in the solar system,” [says](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dVzR0kzklRE) Peter Diamandis, one of the founders of the asteroid-mining company [Planetary Resources](http://www.planetaryresources.com/). He claims we have a “moral obligation to become an interplanetary species,” and [that](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7fYYPN0BdBw) if we harness the resources in space, "the entire human race will be the beneficiary." Naveen Jain, founder of [Moon Express](http://www.moonexpress.com/), wants to do on the moon what Diamandis wants to do with asteroids. A recent CNBC profile quotes him as [saying](http://www.cnbc.com/id/101531789), “Once you take a mind-set of scarcity and replace it with a mind-set of abundance, amazing things can happen here on Earth.” This kind of exultant talk is perhaps to be expected from entrepreneurs describing their companies’ dreams, but Diamandis and Jain are not alone. In a [radio interview](https://soundcloud.com/bullseye-with-jesse-thorn/neil-degrasse-tyson) this April, Neil deGrasse Tyson, the public face of American astrophysics, also voiced his excitement about the potential of space mining. “If you haul an asteroid the size of a house to Earth, it could have more platinum on it than has ever been mined in the history of the world. More gold than has ever been mined in the history of the world. When that happens”—and here his voice takes on the dreamy tone familiar to fans of "[COSMOS: A Spacetime Odyssey](http://www.cosmosontv.com/)," the Fox series he hosts—“the scarcity that has led to human-to-human violence, there’s a chance it could all go away.” Tyson admitted that he was being “a little hopeful”—he has also noted that it is far more likely that any resources found in space will be put to use in space first, not hauled back to Earth (more on that later)—but his comment captures the aura of starry-eyed excitement that surrounds space mining ventures. At Slate, Will Oremus wrote about the terrestrial tech world’s blasé response to the founding of Planetary Resources, and [commanded](http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2012/05/asteroid_mining_the_crazy_awesome_plan_to_grab_platinum_from_outer_space_.html), “Wake up! This is outer space we’re talking about! This is awesome!” It is awesome. To read about these ambitious plans, and to contemplate the scale of human brainpower and industriousness required to pull them off, fills one with awe. These new companies talk about space in a way that sounds unfamiliar to the civilian ear accustomed to the reverent tone of planetarium field trips; rather than the vastness of space, the companies emphasize its accessibility. Moon Express calls the moon “the eighth continent.” Planetary Resources wants to “bring the solar system into humanity’s sphere of influence.” Experiencing awe is fun. It's even more fun to imagine a world of outer-space abundance in which we don’t have to worry about fossil fuels and everyone can afford a platinum case for their iPhone. And there is great potential for resource extraction in space, though these ventures will carry great upfront costs and plenty of uncertainty about whether they will actually come to fruition. Many deadlines and timeline estimates are fast approaching or have passed already. What’s misleading about these projects isn’t that they’re subject to budget problems and delays, but that they come couched in overblown rhetoric about their potential to radically alter human life, to do away with the notion of scarcity and deliver us to a future of plenty and peace. It’s a pattern that has become familiar in Silicon Valley: develop a plan for a business that will do something cool and make a lot of money, but describe it instead as something that will change the world. Return to that platinum asteroid for a moment. There’s one that Planetary Resources has been tracking: It passes near the Earth’s orbit every 23 months and is a half-kilometer by one kilometer in size. A spacecraft could travel to it in around eight months. Diamandis estimates its total worth at between $300 billion and $5 trillion. If it were to be mined at some point in the future, it would drive down the global price of platinum, which might make some items more affordable—luxury jewelry, of course, but also catalytic converters for cars and hard disks for laptops and DVRs—but it would primarily make the investors of Planetary Resources extremely rich. Allusions to the Wild West abound in the literature of space-mining companies. The Moon Express website talks about “brave pioneers” who explored new territories "with the backing of a monarch or a state.” For these entrepreneurs, space is not a distant emptiness; beyond the frontier, they envision a business-place. And with the exception of a Cold War–era treaty prohibiting national appropriation of the moon, there aren’t laws about ownership in space; its riches are there for the taking, like gold nuggets in a California stream. In a March [debate](http://www.amnh.org/2014-isaac-asimov-memorial-debate) on "Selling Space," at the American Museum of Natural History, Space Foundation CEO Elliot Pulham said that asteroids are clearly up for grabs: “There’s no law that says you can’t snag an asteroid. Knock yourself out.” It’s certainly true that space is full of valuables. Billions of years ago, during the formation of the solar system, gravity pulled the heavy materials on would-be planets toward their cores, forcing the comparatively lighter rocky material out to the surface. When those planets broke apart, they became asteroids. Some are made of rocky surface fragments, but some are made of the core materials—platinum, gold, silver, palladium—that are rare and precious on Earth. At a press roundtable after the "Selling Space" debate, Tyson explained why this process matters so much to those who would mine the sky: “Nature has pre-sifted the ingredients for you. You go grab yourself an asteroid made from the core of a planet that never survived, and you’ve got this stuff concentrated in the palm of your hand.” This is what Manifest Destiny must have felt and sounded like. Wealth beyond your wildest dreams, and it’s there for the taking. You just have to get there first. The “getting there first” will not be simple, or cheap. Most of the asteroids in the solar system are in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter. But the orbit paths of some [near-Earth asteroids](http://www.iau.org/public/themes/neo/nea/), or NEAs, bring them relatively close to our planet—that is, within around 30 million miles. Planetary Resources has developed what is essentially an outer-space drone: a small telescope-equipped spacecraft, around the size of a desktop computer, that will survey near-Earth asteroids. Once an asteroid is identified and determined to be valuable, the extraction could begin, though that introduces a new set of technical obstacles. Because of the difficulty and expense of getting heavy machinery from Earth into space, some have [suggested](http://www.businessinsider.com/deep-space-industries-asteroid-mining-plans-2013-1) using 3D printing technology to use materials found in space to create the necessary equipment. Then, some modified version of a terrestrial mining method, like drilling or magnetic separation, [could be used](http://www.theengineer.co.uk/aerospace/in-depth/your-questions-answered-asteroid-mining/1015966.article) for the mining itself. But these extraction processes have been developed for the pressure and gravity of Earth, and they would need to be overhauled to function in the low-gravity, vacuum environment of space. If this part of the process sounds unclear, it’s because it is. To give an idea of the scale—in time and difficulty—of these kinds of operations, consider the government’s version of asteroid prospecting. In April, NASA greenlighted a mission in which a spacecraft called [OSIRIS-REx](http://www.asteroidmission.org/) will rendezvous with an asteroid called Bennu. OSIRIS-Rex is scheduled to launch in 2016, reach the asteroid in 2018, reconnoiter it for over a year, and then bring back samples for scientific study. The amount of asteroid that NASA plans to collect after all this time and trouble? [Two ounces](http://www.nasa.gov/press/2014/april/construction-to-begin-on-nasa-spacecraft-set-to-visit-asteroid-in-2018/#.U3Y00FhdUnC). A major premise of private space mining companies is that they will be able to work far faster and more economically than NASA, and will be willing to take on levels of risk beyond that of a government operation, but the scale and timeline of OSIRIS-REx shows how complex these operations will be, even for the swiftest companies. The most far-out proposal in space mining is to "redirect" an NEA toward Earth and into lunar orbit. There, the asteroid could spin safely around the moon, accessible to our planet. A 2012 Cal Tech [study](http://kiss.caltech.edu/study/asteroid/asteroid_final_report.pdf) determined that this method would be not only feasible, but “essential” for long-term human space exploration. According to the study, it will soon be possible for an unmanned spacecraft to identify a target asteroid—one around seven meters in diameter and 500,000 kilograms in mass—approach it, “loiter” nearby to determine its spin, and ultimately enclose the asteroid in what is described as a “draw-string bag.” (Take a moment to imagine a man-made drawstring bag capturing a giant mass of precious metal hurtling through space. “This is awesome!” does feel like the only reasonable response.) Once the asteroid and spacecraft are connected, a solar-powered propulsion system could fly the asteroid back to our moon and deposit it in lunar orbit. Depending on the mass of the asteroid, this retrieval flight would last between six and ten years. This idea, like the other space-mining projects, will require tremendous patience, money, vision, and bluster. So it's no surprise that the futurists of Silicon Valley are behind them: The group of companies founded with the intention of mining space are backed largely by investors who made their names and fortunes in tech. Peter Diamandis is the founder of the X Prize Foundation and of Silicon Valley’s Singularity University, which he co-founded with futurist Ray Kurzweil; Eric Schmidt is one of Planetary Resources’ major investors; before starting Moon Express, Naveen Jain was a senior executive at Microsoft and then CEO of his own startup, InfoSpace; [Elon Musk](https://newrepublic.com/tags/elon-musk) founded PayPal and now has a private space company, SpaceX, currently under contract with NASA to begin carrying astronauts to the International Space Station. The New Yorker's George Packer [identifies](http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2013/05/27/130527fa_fact_packer?currentPage=all) the “conflicting pressures” of Silicon Valley as “work ethic, status consciousness, idealism, and greed.” All of these pressures are present in the space-mining race, too. The work required to pull it off is undeniable—as is the idealistic delusion that outer-space extraction would bring world peace. Whoever accomplishes this first will be hailed, from Mountain View to Capitol Hill, as a genius. They will also become unfathomably wealthy, and rightly so: Entering a new, high-risk, high-tech field of business should come with the possibility for enormous reward. These entrepreneurs have evinced as much in less-utopian, off-the-cuff remarks. Diamandis has joked that his company’s financing plan is to buy [puts](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/put.asp) in the platinum market and then announce their plan to bring a platinum asteroid home. Jain imagines coming back from trips to the moon with payloads worth billions of dollars: “I don’t care what people say," he [said](http://www.wired.co.uk/news/archive/2013-10/31/naveen-jain-moon-express) in an interview with Wired's editor last year. "That’s a shit load of money.” It’s telling that the foundational text of the space mining industry—1997's [Mining the Sky](http://www.amazon.com/Mining-The-Sky-Asteroids-Planets/dp/0201328194), by John Lewis, a professor of planetary science at the University of Arizona and the chief scientist of [Deep Space Industries](http://deepspaceindustries.com/)—begins not with a catalog of the wealth of space, but with a brief history of exploration and military domination on Earth. Here, there isn’t enough, but in space, rather than nothingness, we find “a lively, rich understanding of the unity and lawfulness of Creation, within which the diversity and complexity of local materials and events falls into place.” Thanks to the saving power of technology, the very ideas of “limited resources and finite living space” are “tired old myths,” he writes. It’s exhilarating, this notion that tech advances could end scarcity as we know it, relegating wars over mineral wealth and energy sources to the list of woes defeated by science, alongside plague and polio. But it’s a dangerous exhilaration. It seems far more likely that new sources of wealth will, in their abundance, be one more thing for us to scrabble over. The space-mining notion is immensely appealing: the sky is full of infinite riches and abundance leads to peace. But why wouldn’t riches from the heavens cause conflicts and problems? Their vulgar terrestrial cousins always have. The problem with comparing space-mining to the Wild West isn’t just that it won’t revolutionize our economy like Manifest Destiny did. It isn’t even that there’s something suspect in taking the sky—something that feels so shared, so very deeply part of the commons—and turning it into a set of privately held commodities. It’s that this rhetoric gives the industry a kind of up-by-the-bootstraps patina, calling to mind a situation in which anyone with a gold-pan could go and seek their fortune, if one were plucky and lucky enough to set out for virgin territory. This simply does not apply to space mining, an industry where—to an even greater degree than modern-day resource extraction businesses on Earth—the barriers to entry in terms of both technology and capital are so immense that it is only open to entrepreneurs who are already billionaires. Would-be space mining companies are often called “crazy,” their plans described as wild schemes. In fact, these companies are not crazy at all. As Jain, of Moon Express, says in a [promotional video](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=erP8BUs4gyI), "It is not just a fun project. It is also a great business." Space-mining investors may be thinking extremely far outside the box, and willing to take on levels of risk that governments—the only entities with dealings in space until just recently—would never take on. But these are savvy investors, not a bunch of kids with a kooky dream, and they expect an eventual return on that investment. That might explain why, as the Wall Street Journal [reported](http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303417104579544072639525550?mod=WSJ_DefenseandAerospace_leftHeadlines&mg=reno64-wsj) recently, Planetary Adventures has shifted its focus from precious metals "to a more mundane space resource: water," which "could be processed into fuel to extend the useful lives of aging commercial satellites." Granted, water has been a part of Planetary Resources’s business plan for years: When the company announced two years ago its intentions to mine asteroids, it said in a press release that “accessing water resources in space will revolutionize exploration.” But it never got headlines, for obvious reasons. As John Logsdon of the GWU Institute of Space Policy said after the "Selling Space" debate in March, “It’s not as sexy as platinum but I think the most valuable resource in space is water.” Harvesting asteroid ice could be very profitable in its own right, but it doesn’t conjure the same Panglossian platitudes as giant chunks of space gold do. That's just as well. It's a more practical approach for the near future. Because of the tremendous cost—both in terms of energy and money—of launching something out of Earth’s atmosphere or back into it, the most efficient use of resources extracted in space will be right there: in space. And that, in turn, should help bring the peace-and-abundance rhetoric back down to Earth. It's like much of what Silicon Valley invents: Not as awesome as the elevator pitch makes it sound, but useful in its own little way.

**No sustainability impact – super-exploitation in outer space makes exhaustion of resources inevitable**

**Silk ’21:** Matthew S.W. Silk. “Ethical Concerns About Space Mining”. The Prindle Post. February 3rd, 2021. <https://www.prindlepost.org/2021/02/ethical-concerns-about-space-mining/>.

It was a big news day in Canada last month as it was announced that, thanks to an agreement on the Artemis program, a Canadian astronaut will join the United States on the first crewed mission to the moon scheduled to take place in just a few years. While the Canadian government was happy to note that this will mean that [Canada will be only the second country to have an astronaut in deep space](https://www.cbc.ca/news/technology/canada-astronaut-moon-1.5843540), the efforts to return to the moon are not driven only in the interests of science and discovery. This may be only a first step towards mining in space and that prospect raises ethical concerns. The Artemis program followed the signing of [Space Policy Directive 1](https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/presidential-memorandum-reinvigorating-americas-human-space-exploration-program/) which calls for the United States to return humans to the moon for “long-term exploration and utilization.” Since then, in collaboration with private companies and international partners, missions have been scheduled for crewed missions in just under three years. While much of the program is scientific in nature and is being led by NASA, part of the program includes the Artemis Accords which have been signed by several nations and which outline some guidelines for the mining of space resources. According to [the accord](https://www.nasa.gov/specials/artemis-accords/img/Artemis-Accords-signed-13Oct2020.pdf), the signatories affirmed various guidelines for the “extraction and utilization of space resources.” According to the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, no nation may claim ownership of the moon or other celestial body. Space shall be free for exploration and use by all signatories. The Moon Treaty of 1979, drafted by the United Nations states that the Moon is a common heritage of humans and harvesting its resources is forbidden except by an international regime. It also bans any ownership of extraterrestrial property by a private organization. However, the United States, Russia, and China [have not ratified it](https://www.thespacereview.com/article/1954/1). Instead, in 2015 the United States passed the Commercial Space Launch Competitive Act which explicitly allows private corporations to engage in commercial exploitation of space resources even while avoiding asserting sovereignty over a celestial body. In April of this year, Trump signed an [executive order](https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-encouraging-international-support-recovery-use-space-resources/) encouraging space mining with it noting, “it shall be the policy of the United States to encourage international support for the public and private recovery and use of resources in outer space.” The moon, in addition to several other space objects, contains minerals which can be extremely valuable in space and on Earth. Some of these are difficult to get on Earth and are located mostly in places like China, Russia, and Congo. For example, the moon is estimated to have more helium-3 than Earth and has several uses, including a possible use as fuel for nuclear fusion. The moon also contains lithium, titanium, aluminum, cobalt, silicon, and other important minerals. Materials like these can be useful for building everything from medical equipment to [electric cars](https://www.bbc.com/news/newsbeat-52228423) which can help with environmental problems. In space, such materials can be used for making things like [rocket fuel and solar panels](https://theconversation.com/us-seeks-to-change-the-rules-for-mining-the-moon-136665). There are several reasons why such mining can be beneficial. As mentioned, there are plenty of materials that could be enormously helpful for further space exploration. Bringing material like rocket fuel from Earth is expensive, and [while the costs have dropped in price](https://theconversation.com/how-spacex-lowered-costs-and-reduced-barriers-to-space-112586) in recent years, it will be cheaper if materials can be sourced from space itself for projects like the planned Lunar Gateway and for missions to Mars. A big reason why the costs of space travel have come down is owing to the investment of private companies. Greater private investment into mining may make the costs even cheaper over time, and this may allow for more efforts at scientific exploration and experimentation. It can also be of benefit on Earth as many of these materials can be used in medical technology. Another important reason for the Artemis Accords is that the laws and treaties governing space were outdated. The nations that have signed on believe that it is a necessary step [to establish guidelines](https://www.theverge.com/2020/10/13/21507204/nasa-artemis-accords-8-countries-moon-outer-space-treaty) for lunar exploration and to avoid conflict between different parties from Earth. The accords stress that while no one owns the Moon, parties that send equipment do own it and are liable for any damage they may cause. Setting out clear expectations for commercial interests now may help facilitate standards regarding issues like waste and prevent the moon from being an industrial dump. On the other hand, there are several concerns that could arise with mining either the lunar surface or other celestial bodies. For example, there are several legal and political concerns. Russia and China are not part of the Artemis Accords. [Russia has been critical](https://www.theverge.com/2020/10/12/21512712/nasa-roscosmos-russia-dmitry-rogozin-artemis-moon-interntational-cooperation) of the accords and the Artemis program for being too U.S.-centric and for being a step back from the Outer Space Treaty whose central provision is that all nations of the world should benefit from space exploration. Indeed, one main criticism is that this is not being governed by the United Nations. A recent article [for the journal Science](https://www.space.com/us-space-policy-mining-artemis-accords) argues “NASA’s actions must be seen for what they are—a concerted, strategic effort to redirect international space cooperation in favor of short-term U.S. commercial interests, with little regard for the risks involved.” There are also the larger ethical concerns about who owns space, whether it should be mined, and what kinds of problems this could create. For example, in their article [How much of the Solar System should we leave as wilderness?](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0094576517318507) Martin Elvis and Tony Milligan suggest that we should already be concerned about “super-exploitation” where a growing space economy could lead to exhaustion of the finite resources of the solar system “surprisingly soon.” They note, “Approaching a point of super-exploitation is something that we ought to be concerned about if we assume that we ought to be concerned, at this point in time and in action-guiding ways, not only about ourselves but about future generations of humans.” They suggest that so long as economic growth is exponential, we should limit ourselves to 1/8th of the exploitable materials of the solar system with the rest being left “wild.” The economic concerns may not stop there either. Efforts to mine material on the moon may negatively impact the national economies who may rely on selling those resources. There is also the potential worry about how much could be brought back. A single asteroid of platinum has been valued at possibly [50 billion dollars](https://www.businessinsider.com/goldman-sachs-space-mining-asteroid-platinum-2017-4). One-eighth of the iron in the Asteroid Belt contains more than a million times all of Earth’s current reserves. Such dramatic changes in resource extraction and refinement has the potential to dramatically harm an economy as well. There is also a concern about possible future militarization. While current treaties and laws regarding space prohibit many forms of military operations, if mining begins and not everyone agrees to the same rules, then future conflicts in space may then require [militarization](https://www.financialexpress.com/defence/mining-on-the-moon-by-the-us-will-space-militarization-follow-soon/1927922/) to support commercial interests. The United States Space Force Guardians may be called upon to secure U.S. interests in space. Lunar mining, and the mining of celestial objects in general, will carry with a large host of ethical problems and concerns and these will likely become better known to us sooner rather than later

# Jacob Lesson Blocks

1. Megaconstellations by nature + starlink only operate for 5-6 years
   1. Requires constant upkeep
   2. Constant deorbiting
   3. 4200 satellites deorbiting evety yr
   4. 8400 new atellites launched each day
   5. Possibility for debris
2. Destroys ozone – massively increases aluminium deposits in atmosphere
3. Hurts weather satellites
4. Lots of methane

## T

### A2: Parcher

Comes from policy debate – it’s the NDTCEDA archives – cant use policy debate to justify using ur def of resolved in

A2: Grd

* No warrant – U can still read asteroid mining
* No process based DA’s
* Just means u have defend util

A2: Vagueness

* CX checks – insofar u ask about what DA to read
  + “Do we get asteroid mining” – aff vague/shifty response
  + If purposefully don’t ask cuz scared of arg don’t get to make vagueness q
  + TS: Not a requirement
    - Also not required to make args on case
    - Something u should
* A2: Prerd prep lost
  + Interp doesn’t solve

CI: Definioin of resolves

* Can just say all friv theory arg
* They justify infinite theory args - Every friv theory arg justification is that it’s not that its resolutionally based, just abstractly good
* Even if u did, based on resolutional basis, don’t get to change it in 2nr
* If they switch, I get semantic ows justifications
  + If we are abandoning what res says

A2: TVA

* Doesn’t solve – Without reorientation of IR global commons can’t solve
* Just as vague -don’t know what global commons looks like – no new 2nr extrap

## A2: Megaconstellations CP

#### Mega constellations results in space debris, loss of bio-diversity, 4200 falling satellites a year, climate change, ozone depletion, increased radiation, and hurts weather satellites.

Coma 2021 (Miguel Coma is a writer for Wall Street International after graduating from honours as an electronics and telecommunications engineer (MSc) from Brussels' Industrial Engineering Institute (ISIB), Satellite mega-constellations’ mega-threats, July 23, 2021, https://wsimag.com/science-and-technology/66440-satellite-mega-constellations-mega-threats)//NotJacob

Producing junk Nature’s1 May 2021 report reveals that each of Elon Musk’s satellites operates for only five to six years—less than a personal computer. Musk swears he’ll take out his trash by having dead satellites re-enter the atmosphere and turn into dust. So, beside his 42,000 functioning satellites, expect an additional 4,200 de-orbiting satellites at all times. Expect 8,400 new satellites launched each year to replace the ones that no longer work. Every day, Starlink alone can produce about six tons of electronic waste that re-enters the Earth’s atmosphere. This junk increases the risk of cascading collisions with untracked debris. Indeed, “a major fragmentation event from a single satellite could affect all [satellite] operators in LEO [Low Earth Orbit]”.1 Make a wish on a falling satellite! During satellites’ re-entry into the atmosphere, pieces large enough to harm people, wildlife and property can fall. NASA recommends a human casualty risk lower than 1/10,000 per satellite re-entry. However, launching permits do not consider the cumulative or combined risks of launching hundreds of thousands of satellites. Operators do not always respect safety standards1. Scientists find that pieces larger than 10 cm might not fully disintegrate when they fall back to Earth5, and yet SpaceX claims that their next-generation satellites will completely turn into dust. No agency has tested this claim; and no agency can require other satellite operators to turn their debris into dust. If you watch a falling satellite, make a wish that everyone will stay safe! Chemicals and ozone depletion During a satellite launch, rocket fuels (e.g. hydrazine) and rocket parts that contain hazardous substances may fall into the ocean and harm marine life.1 In the upper atmosphere, high temperatures (generated by friction) lead to the formation of ozone-consuming chemicals.6 Ozone provides a protective layer around the Earth. Depleting it can increase people's exposure to the sun’s ultra-violet light and cause skin cancer. Forty years ago, NASA scientist Michael Zolensky was looking for comet and asteroid dust in the high atmosphere. Mostly, he found particles of rocket exhaust, spacecraft protection paints and aluminium. Do space engineers know this? Martin Ross of The Aerospace Corporation confirms a lack of interdisciplinary communication. Scientists and engineers need to talk—but “that usually doesn't happen." Starlink’s average daily satellite waste (six tons) will dramatically increase aluminium deposits in the stratosphere7. When the aluminium in satellite cases burns, aluminium oxide (alumina) forms and can deplete the ozone layer. Would wooden satellite cases (developed in Japan) be less harmful? But solid-fuel rockets cause the most damage to the ozone layer—because of their hydrogen chloride and alumina emissions1. Weather forecasts and global warming Deploying 5G networks that use millimetre wave frequencies on the Earth’s surface could significantly jam satellite weather and climate observations8. Besides Earth-based 5G radio-frequencies, even higher frequencies used by future satellite constellations could interfere with weather observations. Facebook’s constellation is still experimental, but it might use frequencies near 88.2 gigahertz, which weather-observing satellites9 currently use. Space launches have significant global warming effects1. Some satellite-launching rockets such as SpaceX’s Falcon 9 consume liquid kerosene and release black carbon. Solid-fuelled rockets produce alumina particles. All of these increase the greenhouse effect. Global warming from kerosene rockets has been modelled for 1,000 annual rocket launches during one decade. Scientists find that these kerosene rockets’ greenhouse effects are comparable to pre-Covid emissions from aviation. SpaceX’s Starship, the most powerful rocket ever built, fuelled by liquid methane, can launch 400 Starlink satellites at one time. Methane combustion produces soot that increases global warming. Liquid rocket fuels can also impact cloud formations—and the Earth’s climate. Radiation all over (and above) the Earth’s surface The magnetosphere (the magnetic envelope surrounding the Earth) shields our planet from solar and cosmic particle radiation. How/does microwave radiation emitted by satellites impact it? The Van Allen belts surround and protect the Earth with electric charges. Could satellites’ microwave radiation emission drain the belts’ electrons into the atmosphere, and change its electric properties? How are the Schumann resonances, the electromagnetic “heartbeat” of the atmosphere to which living beings on Earth are attuned, affected by satellites’ emissions? Satellites beam massive amounts of microwave radiation day and night from within the magnetosphere and through the atmosphere. What effect does this have on the magnetosphere and the electromagnetic balance of all life? Should subject matter experts study this before we deploy any more satellites? There are very few studies of millimetre waves’ impacts on plants and animals10. Consequently, predicting the effects of tens of thousands of satellites beaming millimetre waves on biodiversity is nearly impossible. As long as we fail to limit deployments, we risk increasing loss of biodiversity. Unlike Earth-based networks, satellite constellations will virtually radiate even areas with low population density. There will be no place for humans and wildlife to escape microwave radiation—or its potentially harmful effects. The Earth’s gigantic electric circuit allows a permanent flow of electrons from the ionosphere to the planet’s surface, and back to the ionosphere when lightning strikes. According to Eastern medicine, this electric current flows supportively through our chakras and meridians. The potential health effects of satellites beaming radiation from the ionosphere—and interfering with the Earth’s natural electromagnetic fields—have not been studied.

2. None of their impacts are abt indigenus ppl

What need to indig ppl are you serving?

Haven’t highlighted in any sense that broadband solve

The CP only understands indigenous ppl as a political prop/tool for them to retroactively their own unethical policies – patronizing – supercharged by how they don’t know what policy action ur talking abt

Will just pick indig ppl who fit their agenda to be on it

Justifies perm – The CP by itself patronizing – Only the perm solves bc we center indig perspectives not for an extrinsic goal but bc its intrinsically valuable

Just proves u have a policy doesn’t mean ur not vague

Who’s asking for broadband

Goal of broadband is to bring them into western civilization – inclusion into cap

Megaconstellations bad

“Helping indig people by putting environmentally unsafe things into the atmosphere”

* This colonial mentality obsessed w profit and connectivity is the exact thing we are critiquing the aff
* Produce 6 ton daily waste just for starlink

CP doesn’t solve case bc its so vague

Make T arg for why megaconstellations not topical – uplayer in 1ar

T interp: Megaconstellations don’t caount as i

1. Precision – expanding/occupying space epands to include every form of satellite-topic just bcms things in space bad
2. Limits-Explodes neg prep – Megaconstellations don’t fit stock neg grd – asteroid + colonization good – if they don’t spec advantage grd is unpredictable
3. Predictable

Wouldn’t interpret something with false bc its good for debate

A2:

1. Vagueness
2. Which indig ppl-they homoginze – reproduce colonial violence

# Jacob Lesson

* Hard to construct impact
* There are things in space what do we do
* Either
  + No visual/compelling impact
  + Concede all their impact/solvency stuff
    - Need to concede space col works
* Fungal Ontology
  + Cornum 17 card
* How can IR confront extinction?
  + IR crossroads – Problems which it seemingly can’t solve
  + Fear of extinction
* Card 2 – Fear of existential risk bad
  + Assumes correlationism – Value + existence corresponds w human value
    - Colonial way to account for existence
    - Deny the existence of alt cosmologies – eg. Indig ones
    - Doesn’t make sense bc value existed b4 humans
    - Kinda similar to deleuze
    - Affirmation of unified humanity – racialized assumption
  + Creates temporal distinction between us experiencing extinction vs. indig ppl experienced
    - Justifies any unethical solution
* Radical finitude – Confrontiation w scarcity
  + In face of extinction, retreat back
* Radical infinitude – If anxiousness, then settlers expand into cosmos
  + Allows settlers to escape idea of radical finitude
  + Allows cosmic expansionism
  + Settlers have access to all spaces/times
  + Move that relates w settler understandings of identity
* NewSpace – view themselves as final frontier – saving us all from X
* Cosmology impact
  + NewSpace first ppl inhabit space
  + These narratives allow settlers to reimagine themselves in
  + Worried that there are indig cosmologies that relate w ancestors + spirits
  + Colonization/appropriation WOULD destroy these relationships from indig ppl
    - Ability to claim ownership -Annexation
    - Mythos they construct – idea of frontier, endorsement of hyper-rational politics they would be critical of
* New Space
  + Virgin galactic – gendered
  + Legal rights, not super regulated
  + Allows them to expand humanity through colonial mindset + profit mindset
    - Feminizes opponents to space
  + Results in transhumanism/post-humanism
    - Could be clearer impact – why that’s bad
* Advocacy
  + Decolonial IR doesn’t have to rule out space travel – Just change how we view it
    - From annexation to way to live in conjuction with
  + Alternative imagining
  + Rejecting
  + Defending:
    - Outline post-humanism bad args
    - Include arg abt space-col producing dystopias
    - Continues genocide at home
  + How to solve colonization on Earth?
    - Doesn’t have to solve colonization everywhere
    - Creates theory with sociality/care that escape/alternative worlds
* Framework interactions
  + Explain why correlationsim
  + Don’t need to prove conseq bad – just violates ethical principle
    - Need respct for cosmology
* Clear RoB is helpful for this aff
  + IL to fw arg – utilize random small things
* Henderson 17 – Listen to indig ppl
  + Mitchelll
* Impacts
  + Correlationism – Epistemological colonization – correlated w violence
    - Led to genocide etc. etc.
    - Why this mindset/universalization of human experience colonial way of understanding world
    - Correlationism causes posthumanism
  + Posthumanism stuff
    - Fermi Paradox – Such high probability of life, but yet haven’t seen aliens
      * Great filter – Prevents humanity/life from being intergalactic societies
      * Prevents most planets from producing space-bearing societies
    - Great filter b4 or ahead of us
      * If passed it, we good, can discover life
      * Ahead of us, can never
    - Neoreactionaries – allow us to select best traits + best genes that would select through race science
    - No concept of human solidarity
  + If whole purpose of going to space is for promoting the settler – posthuman is natural
    - Transhumanism settler colonialism myth
  + Cap K impact – racial politics
* A2: Cap K
  + Alt forms to space flight would be equitable ones
* Post Scarcity Politics
  + Politics of scarcity are bad
  + Marxist believe that scarcity is basis of cap
    - Artificial scarcity for higher profits
  + Going to space allows for more resources
* Pros:
  + Solves content of DA
  + + good against anti-space Ks
* **Util debate**
  + **Private space isn’t key, aff solves through other fashion**
  + **Framing impact turn**
* Aff -> IL is escapism, but impact isn’t escapism
  + Normally: aff good bc we could spend money on social goods
* To Do:
  + Impact
  + 1ar extension of impact
  + RoB
  + Clear advocacy stuff
  + Not trying to come off as shifty
* 1ar Util stuff
  + Generic answers to key
  + Cap K, pessimism

Extra cards

Mitchell 2019 (Audra Mitchell is an Associate Professor of Global Political Ecology @ Wilfrid Laurier University, “Can International Relations Confront the Cosmos” in Routledge Handbook of Critical International Relations, pg 51-52)// Recut AX

Earthly ruptures such as climate change and accelerating patterns of extinction are rocking the foundations of International Relations (IR) and global politics. These phenomena do not simply demand critique: they are modes of critique in themselves. In their diverse eruptions, they manifest and expose enormous gaps between IR and global theory, earth and the broader cosmos. These earthly critiques are framed in a number of ways: for instance, as ‘evidence’ in Western scientific discourses of climate change; or as the expression of broken laws, protocols and relations with many Indigenous knowledge systems (Mitchell, 2018). By making themselves felt in plural ways, they force IR and global theory to confront two profound possibilities: radical finitude and radical infinitude. ‘Radical finitude’ refers to the idea of the total, complete and possibly imminent negation of existence. Meanwhile, ‘radical infinitude’ reflects existences that vastly exceed the temporal horizons of dominant, Western modes of human life – for instance, Ancestral beings that pre-date, co-exist with and will post-date Western time. Both of these possible conditions place central concepts and assumptions of IR and global theory into question. For instance, as a knowledge system fundamentally invested in sustaining dominant forms and subjects of survival, IR and global theory cannot – or will not – address the radical finitude raised by the possibility of ‘mass extinction’ (Mitchell, 2016). On the contrary, concepts such as ‘security’ and ‘survival’ generate blind spots that maintain IR’s alienation from earthly conditions, and its own role in generating them. On the other hand, some anticipatory responses to the possibility of radical finitude aim to extend these subjects of survival, and particular modes of ‘human agency’ into more spatio-temporal dimensions. In particular, plans for the colonization of outer space, emerging largely within the private sector, challenge existing understandings of survival, colonial power and sovereignty. In this case, too, these foundational concepts of IR and global theory close the disciplinary imaginary to the possibilities and pitfalls of addressing radical infinitude. In combination, these blockages prop up an IR and global theory that is inarticulate about, and unresponsive to, the conditions that shape the multiple, co-existent presents and possible futures of worlds on earth. This raises an important question for the future of IR and global politics: can they confront radical (in)finitude and respond to critiques raised by earth and the broader cosmos? By critiquing mainstream responses to radical (in)finitude – or the lack thereof – this chapter questions whether IR’s foundational concepts can address the critiques raised by earth 51 and the broader cosmos, and better attune itself to their conditions. To this end, it engages with several important forms of critique that might shape the future of, and beyond, IR and global theory. First, by framing earthly disruptions as direct, material critiques of abstract frameworks, it calls for future IR theories that are attuned and responsive to their cosmological conditions. Second, by engaging with speculative critique and theory, it opens up space for the imagination of multiple possible futures that transcend foundational concepts such as survival, security, sovereignty and mainstream norms of ‘humanity’. Third, it engages with Indigenous thought, including Indigenous futurisms, which challenge the colonial cosmovisions of mainstream IR by bringing Ancestral knowledge to bear on multiple future modes dwelling in relation to other beings on and off earth. Together, these modes of critique offer radical visions of future IR theories that could open up space for plural modes of coflourishing in the face of profound, earthly disruptions.