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## A-to the Asteroids Reps K

( ) Reject the rep, not the team…

The modern vision of “reps first” has turned the *90’s harm takeout* into a voter. It’s an educationally-unsound return to stock-issues debate at the expense of holistic thinking.

At most, we should lose the asteroids adv.

( ) Perm – do plan and the part of the alt that drives to discourages militarization.

( ) none of their args are mutually exclusive – and the perm contextualizes this

The arg is really just a dual-use disad… this effect of plan is remedied by the perm as well as it’s remedied by the alt…

All of the surveilliance and sovereignty args assume military args that don’t apply.

## A-to the Asteroids Reps K

( ) the causality runs in the opposite direction

Space military push IS ALREADY OUT THERE. NON-MILITARISTIC space reps discourages the militaristic drive

SAGE ‘8

 DANIEL **SAGE** – Institute of Geography and Earth Science, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, UK – Geopolitics, 13:27–53, 200**8** – DOI: 10.1080/14650040701783482

Bonestell’s vision of outer space is all the more distinctive because of the contrast it struck with contemporaneous images of outer space. During the 1950s, Hollywood sci-fi regularly constructed dystopian images of outer space as another setting for the movie horror genre; it was a fearful realm full of warmongering aliens.50 Despite Bonestell’s work on films such as War of the Worlds, his non-fictional representations of outer space *provided an alternative,* wherein outer space could be habituated as the utopian or heroic destiny of America and humanity. As a result, the geopolitical connotations of Bonestell’s romantically uplifting vision of space exploration resists equivalent interpretation as a metaphor for Cold War anxieties, **such as nuclear armageddon,** anti-communism or **the de-humanising effects of technoscience.**51 Instead of evoking these anxieties directly, Bonestell’s detailed images presented a much more comforting and structured view of the universe and the progressive role of technoscience, which may well have helped to allay such Cold War anxieties. The rocket, for example, was readily familiarised as an emblem of national futurity and progress instead of war and destruction. Augmenting this sense of order was a frame of authority: Bonestell’s vision was presented as a factually determinate, even quasi-scientific, estimate of what these other worlds would look like and how space travel would take place. For example, as Willy Ley explains of Bonestell’s art in the Conquest of Space book of 1949, “[They] should not be considered ‘artistic conceptions’ in the customary sense of the phrase . . . but a picture which you might obtain if it were possible to get a very good camera with perfect color – true film into the proper position.”52 And yet it is precisely this frame of objectivity that makes Bonestell’s work all the more geopolitically significant, as such neutrality and detachment belied its innate equivalence to the ideologically and morally charged approaches of the Rocky Mountain School and American Romanticism. These similarities are rendered all the more remarkable because Bonestell himself was a self-declared atheist who no doubt would have rejected the thought that his work was acquiescing, even if inadvertently, with the explicitly evangelical idiom of American landscape art. And yet, as many commentators on space art rightly acknowledge,53 the implicit inter-textuality between Bonestell’s astronomical art and the geographical imaginations reproduced in artwork from ‘The Rocky Mountain School’ is central to disentangling its socio-cultural context, popular reception, and, in turn, its geopolitical significance. Two inter-related visual incongruities in Bonestell’s representation of the Moon help us to approach the more implicit, popular geopolitical connotations present in his work. The first relates to the lunar landscape and the ‘problem’ of depth. After walking on the moon the Apollo astronauts repeatedly reported their problems judging distance, depth and scale on the featureless and bland lunar landscape.54 By contrast, Bonestell employed an Olympian perspective that conveyed an immediate sense of scale, vastness and immensity. And yet, given Bonestell’s contact with leading space scientists and interest in astronomy he would have likely known that judging scale on the relatively featureless lunar surface would have been much more difficult. When asked about his use of perspective, Bonestell explained how he “used the device of near rocks and distant mountains, separated by a plain glimpsed beyond the foreground, to give the impression of depth and distance.”55 More inconspicuously, and echoing Bierstadt, Bonestell often placed tiny human figures in the foreground of his paintings to heighten a sense of scale and immensity. The importance of this enhanced sense of depth from an elevated perspective is that it inherently approaches many of the techniques found in the Rocky Mountain School (and American Romanticism generally). To re-iterate an earlier point, this Olympian perspective had been long employed to correlate natural feelings of terrestrial transcendence, uplift and wonder within moral and religious frameworks.56 Moreover, as Boime acknowledges,57 this Olympian perspective also had important geopolitical connotations in the context of American culture, providing a sense of the artist as occupying a ‘heightened position’, surveying the past, present and future horizons of humanity itself.

## A-to the Asteroids Reps K

 ( ) Asteroid Reps – even sensationalized ones – encourage important real world solutions

Prof. David A. Kirby is a Lecturer in Science Communication at the University of Manchester – Molecular Interventions 3:54-60 –2003 – http://molinterv.aspetjournals.org/cgi/content/full/3/2/54

Indeed, many advisors perceive fictional film as a way to promote their science in the hope of convincing the public that their research is worthy of increased research funding. Often, advisors will proclaim that the film on which they are working highlights an issue that needs more "attention" from the American public. For example, Near-Earth-Objects (NEOs) permeated the scientific and cultural climate in 1997, the year Deep Impact and Armageddon (1998), two films that deal with catastrophic asteroid/comet impacts upon the earth, went into production. These films provided an opportunity for science advisors, all of whom had a stake in NEO research and funding, to present the hypothetical dangers of NEOs to the public. For example, Joshua Colwell, whose research involves "small objects" in the solar system (e.g., comets), hoped that his consulting work on Deep Impact would help inform the public about the dangers of comet impacts (16) : The more realistically things are portrayed, the better it is for everyone—producers and public alike. The basic premise of Deep Impact is scientifically sound in that life on Earth faces a threat due to comet and asteroid impacts. That threat might be mitigated through observation and destruction or deflection of the object with nuclear bombs. The fact that the movie made an effort to portray all this realistically helps convey this message to the public and raise awareness of a real issue. Many news commentators, in fact, opined that the publicity surrounding these two films, and their influence of public opinion, played a major role in the development of a NEO agency in the U.S. An editorial in the Denver Rocky Mountain News , for example, claimed that the U.S. Near-Earth Object Program Office, founded in June of 1998, would not have come into existence without the help of these two films and other popular cultural sources (17) : Sensationalize it, and the government will follow. Thanks to movies like Armageddon and Deep Impact and TV shows like "Asteroid" and countless lurid magazine covers about asteroids and comets destroying Earth, or at least seriously damaging midtown Manhattan, NASA has set up a special office to track threatening stuff in space. Members of Parliament, such as Lembit Opik, and Britain’s Science Minister, Lord Sainsbury of Turville, acknowledge the direct role the two films played in their decisions to lobby for the British National Asteroid and Comet Information Centre (NACIC), and ultimately in their ability to establish the governmental task force. Opik, who led the charge for the task force, directly attributes its passage to the public support garnered by the two films (18) : Two or three years ago there was a high giggle factor about NEOs but in the last 18 months the scientific community and the general public have changed their view measurably. The popular media has woken up to the threat because of Deep Impact and Armageddon . Lord Sainsbury has further acknowledged that that public concern over the chances of annihilation were expressly heightened by the two Hollywood movies (19) . This example shows that not only members of the scientific community, but also governmental policy makers themselves, consider fictional films to be effective promotional tools. Science advisors who are involved in the construction of films can thus significantly shape the public face of their research areas and help make the case for more research support.

( ) Fear/curiousity distinction is contrived and means the alt won’t solve…

Their args is that if our Aff technology is motivated by fear, it will get coopted… but history is on our side… when curious physicists genuinely and peacefully made advancement in nuclear fission, it was co-opted.

( ) These fears simply don’t spillover – asteroid fear ballooned since “Deep Impact” and “Armageddon” and has not been co-opted.

## A-to the Asteroids Reps K

( ) Anxiety not a bad starting point.

Buss ‘97

(Psychological Inquiry, 8, David, Department of Psychology at University of Texas)

A central premise in TMT is that the evolution of human intellectual capacities brought about with it the unfortunate consequences of awareness of our own mortality. This awareness is presumed to cause “paralyzing terror,” which renders goal-directed activities impossible unless it is subverted through psychological means. An unexamined premise in this theory is the origin of terror or anxiety itself. Precisely why awareness of death should provoke anxiety is unclear. Why wouldn’t such awareness provoke a host of other phenomena, such as careful planning of one’s life or a surge of hedonic sexual promiscuity? Presumably, we need an explanation for why such awareness would produce anxiety and not some other psychological state, but I could not discern in their article a rationale for this premise. Self-esteem is proposed as an evolved mechanism designed to protect us from anxiety, but a prior question is why we have anxiety-producing mechanisms to begin with. If the distribution of fears and phobias is any indication, the human anxiety appears to be highly domain specific and tailored to particular adaptive problems. We tend to develop fears of snakes, spiders, darkness, heights, and strangers, all of which were presumably hazardous to our survival in human ancestral environments (Marks, 1587). Moreover, anxiety about social exclusion may have specific survival functions, such as ensuring the protection and resources of the group and reproductive functions such as ensuring access to potential mates (Buss, 1990). Thus anxiety, rather than being a byproduct of our greater cognitive capabilities leading to awareness of death seems tailored, at least in part, to the solution of specific problems of survival and reproduction.

( ) Historically, anxiety doesn’t lend itself towards violence – casuality runs in the opposite direction.

Ahrensdorf 2K (Peter J, Associate Professor of Political Science, Davidson College, *American Political Science Review,* Sept. 2000 “Fear of Death and the Longing for Immortality”)

But if the threat of anarchy is rooted in human nature, then how can that threat ever be overcome once and for all, to be replaced by the security of an immortal peace” (see Leviathan xxxi, 395)? The answer, of course, is the Leviathan, that artificial state whose goal is only peace, which subordinates all other possible goals- such as justice or virtue or salvation or truth itself- to this goal, and which aims therefore at peace at any price. [16] This state must possess absolute power as a necessary means to achieve the limited aim of peace, above all, in order to “bridle men’s ambition, avarice, anger, and other Passions” through the threat of punishment. [17] But Hobbes emphasizes that the absolute power of the state cannot, by itself, establish peace, since the threat of punishment alone will not always deter people from rebellion. Accordingly, the state must also enjoy the enlightened, moral support of the people. The people must believe, in other words, that the state has right, as well as might, on its side (see Leviathan xxx, 376-85). [18] Yet, how can we human beings, whose vain and anxious nature leads us to anarchy, be lead to embrace the artificial state, whose goal is to avoid anarchy at all costs? We must first experience the horrors of the state of war (Leviathan xviii, 236-7; xlvi, 699). According to Hobbes, the two principal natural passions of human beings are the desire for security and the desire for honor, and both passions are equally natural, but they do not both equally lead to the natural state of war. Your anxious desire to preserve yourself may lead you to kill others, but your fundamental desire is to be left alone, in peace, and this desire does not necessarily lead you into conflict with others who feel desire. In contrast, your desire for honor does necessarily lead you into conflict with others, since in seeking honor from others you demand that other human beings, who are just as self-regarding as you are, honor you more than they themselves (see xiii, 184-5). [19] In order to induce humans to quit the state of war, the natural desire to preserve oneself, or the fear of death, must be inflamed an instructed, while the natural desire for honor must be weakened and controlled. How is this conquest of honor-loving human nature to be achieved?

## A-to the Asteroids Reps K

( ) Felicity mellor is not qualified to comment on what motivates the US military

She is a former physicist that got a humanities degree… She has absolutely zero idea of how the military decides to co-opt dual-use technologies.