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#### 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 ecocide, 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.
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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.