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## Plan

The United States Federal Government should substantially increase the exploration the possibility of extraterrestrial life beyond the earth’s mesosphere.

## Contention One—Sovereignty:

### The state demonizes the study of ET life and shrouds any potential evidence in secrecy—UFOs and ET life are relegated to non objects and systematically ignored—its not really important whether aliens actually exist, but we should still be open to the possibility

Alexander **Wendt and** Raymond **Duvall, ‘8** (“Sovereignty and the UFO”, Profs at OSU and U of Minnesota, Political Theory)

One might expect unexplained incidents in NATO airspace to concern the authorities, particularly given that since 1947 over 100,000 UFOs have been reported worldwide, many by militaries.9 However, neither the scientific community nor states have made serious efforts to identify them, the vast majority remaining completely uninvestigated. The science of UFOs is minuscule and deeply marginalized. Although many scientists think privately that UFOs deserve study,10 there are no opportunities or incentives to do it. With almost no meaningful variation, states—all 190+ of them—have been notably uninterested as well.11 A few have gone through the motions of studying individual cases, but with even fewer exceptions these inquiries have been neither objective nor systematic, and no state has actually looked for UFOs to discover larger patterns.12 For both science and the state, it seems, the UFO is not an “object” at all, but a non-object, something not just unidentified but unseen and thus ignored.13

The authoritative disregard of UFOs goes further, however, to active denial of their object status. Ufology is decried as a pseudo-science that threatens the foundations of scientific authority,14 and the few scientists who have taken a public interest in UFOs have done so at considerable cost. For their part, states have actively dismissed “belief” in UFOs as irrational (as in, “do you believe in UFOs?”), while maintaining considerable secrecy about their own reports.15 This leading role of the state distinguishes UFOs from other anomalies, scientific resistance to which is typically explained sociologically.16 UFO denial appears to be as much political as sociological— more like Galileo’s ideas were political for the Catholic Church than like the once ridiculed theory of continental drift. In short, considerable work goes into ignoring UFOs, constituting them as objects only of ridicule and scorn. To that extent one may speak of a “UFO taboo,” a prohibition in the authoritative public sphere on taking UFOs seriously, or “thou shalt not try very hard to find out what UFOs are.”17

Still, for modern elites it is unnecessary to study UFOs, because they are known to have conventional—i.e., non-ET—explanations, whether hoaxes, rare atmospheric phenomena, instrument malfunction, witness mistakes, or secret government technologies. Members of the general public might believe that UFOs are ETs, but authoritatively We know they are not. In the next section we challenge this claim to knowledge. Not by arguing that UFOs are ETs, since we have no idea what UFOs are—which are, after all, unidentified. But that is precisely the point. Scientifically, human beings do not know that all UFOs have conventional explanations, but instead remain ignorant.

### The ET taboo created by the government is a manifestation of modern biopolitics—in order to preserve universal sovereignty the government demonizes any research into potentially more intelligent life—the plan is vital to disrupt this violent politics that demonizes ET exploration

-no claim to truth of ET—must overcome the ignorance

Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall, ‘8 (“Sovereignty and the UFO”, Profs at OSU and U of Minnesota, Political Theory)

A Key Premise and the Argument in Short First the argument. Adapting ideas from Giorgio Agamben, supplemented by Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, we argue that the UFO taboo is functionally necessitated by the anthropocentric metaphysics of modern sovereignty. Modern rule typically works less through sovereign coercion than through biopolitics, governing the conditions of life itself.22 In this liberal apparatus of security, power flows primarily from the deployment of specialized knowledges for the regularization of populations, rather than from the ability to kill. But when such regimes of governmentality are threatened, the traditional face of the state,23 its sovereign power, comes to the fore: the ability to determine when norms and law should be suspended— in Carl Schmitt’s terms, to “decide the exception.”24

The UFO compels decision because it exceeds modern governmentality, but we argue that the decision cannot be made. The reason is that modern decision presupposes anthropocentrism, which is threatened metaphysically by the possibility that UFOs might be ETs. As such, genuine UFO ignorance cannot be acknowledged without calling modern sovereignty itself into question. This puts the problem of normalizing the UFO back onto governmentality, where it can be “known” only without trying to find out what it is—through a taboo. The UFO, in short, is a previously unacknowledged site of contestation in an ongoing historical project to constitute sovereignty in anthropocentric terms. Importantly, our argument here is structural rather than agentic.25We are not saying the authorities are hiding The Truth about UFOs, much less that it is ET. We are saying they cannot ask the question.

### The ET taboo fosters a contemporary alien discourse that is highly securitized, drawing on and replicating discourses of racial hierarchy which justifies massive violence in the name of protecting white western privilege—the belief in the crafty alien outsider who will try to trick us with superior technology is a product of an orientalist logic that must be called into question.

Christopher F. Roth, Anthropology—University of Northern Illinois, DeKalb, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 71-7

As anthropologists, we want to read abduction narratives as emerging from rather than impinging on a human belief world. Even if we are being visited by immensely superior aliens, our visitors would be understandable and perceptible only after being fitted into a preexisting cultural scheme for categorizing beings, as has often been the case among human societies, with different peoples perceiving one another at first—and often thereafter as well—as ghosts, animals, angels, or devils. This should be equally true of imagined, posited, or otherwise invented visitors. For want of a better term, such a classification is racial*—*and we have no better term precisely because popular discourse has clung to concepts that anthropologists have had to abandon as scientifically untenable. Race is an appropriate template for viewing the abduction phenomenon because race has always been more mythology than biology.

In North American English, *black, white,* and *red* are longstanding terms for African Americans, Europeans, and American Indians, respectively, *yellow* and *brown* being more recent additions to represent East Asians and Hispanics. In an exploration of why American Indians are "red," Raymond Fogelson points first to an older black-white opposition in European folk ethnology that pivots on an "ancient Cold-Hot, North-South . . . axis" (1985: 10; see also Kossy 2001: 69-116). The Columbian encounter, and European oceanic expansion in general, supplemented this original diehotomy, Fogelson writes, by bisecting it with "a Wet-Dry, East-West axis encompassing a Yellow-Red polarity" (10). Here American Indians are associated with arid climates and Orientals with tropical ones. Tempera­ments and predispositions can be superimposed on this scheme, going back to Linnaeus. This Last-West dichotomy converges to some extent with the Old W0rld longitudinal divide between western European Aryans and darker, shorter, eastern Slavs, which nineteenth century racist scholars such as Gobineau and Klemm......described in terms of a divide between "active," western, light-skinned peoples and "passive," eastern, dark-skinned ones (Kossy 2001: 83).

The East-West cline, unlike the North-South (white-black) one, is a cline of indigenousness, too, and here it is important to look at the role of westward migration in Theosophical racial theory and its convergence with ideologies of manifest destiny. One of the more persistent racial themes in ufology has been an interest in tribal or "primitive" peoples, especially American Indians. Indians are in a sense to white Americans what humanity in general is to the aliens (or, what I will argue is analogous, what Anglo-Saxon Americans are to more recent immigrants).

For Europeans, the American Indian became associated in folk thought with a vainglorious vigor, strength, and individualism. Indians in this folk view were portrayed—and in popular culture continue to be portrayed — as destined for defeat and eradication, despite their physical strength. Vigor and a harmonious relationship with their natural environment are contrasted with technological and organizational deficiencies that doom them to defeat. One of the most enduring images of the American Indian in popular culture is the "last of his tribe," admirable, proud, defiant, and unbowed but doomed in the march of history. This Indian is seen as individualistic and, paradoxically, symbolic of the American ideal of liberty. In this view, his nobility is vicariously absorbed into the American sense of self even as the people themselves fade from history (Berkhofer 1978; Weatherford 1988: 117-31). But this nobility is also literally absorbed, as (again according to the national myth) scattered Native American genetic lines survive in an attenuated form in a new, mongrelized but coded-as-white majority.

This subtheme of the national myth has its blunter counterpart in New Age historiographic discourses. In addition to inventing what we recog­nize today as the alien conspiracy theory, George Hunt Williamson also innovated, in *Other Tongues—Other Flesh,* another trend that has become strongly associated with New Age and ufo lore: an interest in the role of the American Indian in human history and alien contact. *Other Tongues* sets out new terms for the occult approach to human history, focusing moresharply on Native Americans.

As Theosophy fragmented in the early twentieth century, meanwhile, Asiacentrism was being, challenged in the domain of ethnology by Benjamin Lee Whorl, an anthropologist, linguist, and Theosophist who specialized in Mesoamerican and Pueblo peoples. Whorf, addressing the matter (like Miiller) at the level of grammar, argued (unlike Muller) for the particular suitability of many Amerindian languages and their concomitant cosmologies for expressing revolutionary ideas in twentieth-century physics for which "standard average European" languages were poorly equipped (1941,1950). For Whorf, this was a scientific revolution with spiri­tual implications. Whorf's romanticization of Native American languages in what was otherwise a Boasian, antievolutionist "linguistic relativity hy­pothesis," dovetails with Theosophical tenets such as the inevitable waning of Anglo-Saxon domination, anticipation of the new ascendant civiliza­tion (the Sixth Root-Race), and a call for the unity of science and reli­gion. In more private pronouncements intended for Theosophist ears only, Whorf argued that America would be the home of the Coming Race, its destiny assured by the subtle infusion of Amerindian blood into a largely European-dominated gene pool. For him this Amerindian blood derived from a proto-Mongol stock older and purer than those that remained in eastern Asia (n.d.: 569). These mongrelized descendants of the Indians "will be the future and true lords of the Western Hemisphere, as indeed the colonization by the whites was also preparatory to this destiny. It has been, in point of fact, the function of the Indian to prepare the ground of a wild continent, which never before had known the tread of man, so that it could be entered and inhabited by civilized man" (568).

This shift in occult historiography was an American innovation. Like the *Book of Mormon* a century earlier (Wauchope 1962: 50-68) or the Mu (i.e., Lemurian) historiography of James Churchward (1931; Wauchope 1962: 28 49), Williamson's work draws the New World into a sacred Old World (geography and history, while retaining a broadly Theosophical model. This recentering of world history toward the Americas was a necessary stage in the transplanting of occult racial concepts into the new American soil. This was later echoed in the resurgence of the ancient astronaut spurred *by Chariots of the Gods?* (Daniken 1969), arguably the most popular ufo book ever, An easy criticism of Daniken's view of history is that it sees Indians as effectively extinct and looks only to their ancient monuments, not their living cultures, for evidence of a civilization "high" enough to require hypothesizing alien intervention. But in this way Amerindian archaeology becomes "our" past, the heritage of all Americans, including European Americans. This privileged role of the American Indian, among the world's tribal peoples, as the seeding ground for a European-based New World civilization is, then, explicitly a genetic model — metaphoric in mainstream culture but real for Whorf and white New Age and secular liberal dis­courses that valorize any Native American ancestry, no matter how remote (see, e.g., Deloria 1970: 1-27; Churchill 1992: 215-22; Francis 1992: 109-43; and Kehoe 1990).

This New Age racial order is at the root of the racial schema whose branches are the alien and the "oriental." As we will see, this "occidentalism" of the noble savage complements the ignoble civilization of the aliens. But the aliens, as we will see, are an extension of an orientalism that was first extended to Eastern immigrants to the Americas.

Aliens and Immigrants

Mirroring in some ways the relationship between indigenous Indians and white settlers in American ideology is the relationship between white settlers and nonwhite or "less white" immigrants to America, including groups that had to "earn" their whiteness, such as southern Europeans, Irish, and East European Jews (Jacobson 1998). Again the relationships among ethnic groups ranged conceptually along this East-West cline have always been more shifting, more permeable, and more fraught with am­bivalence (Said 1978) than has been the case with the harsh taboos against miscegenation that traditionally patrolled the black-white color line (which is essentially a North-South cline, whether Europe versus Africa or north­ern versus southern states). Much of this anxiety is rooted in the paradox of Anglo-Saxon anti-immigrant sentiment in a nation founded by Anglo-Saxon immigrants. These ambiguities are resolved only through a racial supremacism that transcends history and autochthony. In this, it has become expedient for Anglo-Saxon supremacism in the United States, overtly or covertly, to reproduce arguments and conceptual structures from tradi­tional European racist anthropologies that defined Slavs, Jews, Orientals, and other structural easterners (including East Asians in the twentieth century and Arabs in the twenty-first) as simultaneously predatory and inferior Others.

des 1991). This narrative unites two images: the predatory, conspiring Jew; and the physically weak Jew dependent on the essence of decent folk for his or her sustenance. This paradoxical combination of weakness and menace has structured anti-Semitism throughout history, up to and includ­ing the forged (but still widely circulated) nineteenth-century *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and the Ariosophy of the Nazi era. The operative idea is that, individually and physiologically, Jews are weak, but they are a threat through their shrewdness and intelligence and their capacity for clandestine collective strategies. This idea, along with the vivid imagery of cannibalism or blood drinking, reverberates in other European folk be­liefs as well and frequently converges with a class dimension. The emperor Constantine was rumored to require the blood of peasants for his nutritive therapeutic baths, it was no accident that the gaunt but nonetheless deadly Count Dracula was an eastern European aristocrat, and socialist rhetoric in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries drew heavily on the metaphor of the bloodsucking capitalist.3

These themes from anti-Semitism and its allied folk imagery have their echoes in official U.S. racial ideology. The intersection of anti-immigrant legislation and eugenics in the early twentieth century led, for example, to the identification of Jews as an oriental race whose physical deficien­cies threatened to contaminate the Anglo-Saxon gene pool. Short stature, a compromised lung capacity, and other maladaptive effects of interbreed­ing or of breeding with other Asiatic groups were cited in defense of anti-immigrant policies and legislation. As one historian of this line of thinking points out, "Interestingly, this image of the Jews as small and physically weak, averse to labor and 'sensitive to pain,' was the opposite of the racial image of the American Negro, who was represented as oversized, frighteningly strong, given over only to physical activities, and immune to pain" (Hart 2002: 117). In this anti-immigrant rhetoric, the Jewish threat was thought to be inadvertent, unlike the plots for world conquest outlined in I he *Protocols,* but physical weakness contrasts with the hardiness of "our pioneer breed" (and with the robust, individualistic Indians the pioneers succeeded).

Physically smaller than European Americans, East Asians, too, whether as immigrants or military adversaries, became associated with weakness, passivity and a submergence of individuality in the service of a collective ideology that itself constituted the threat - a tendency associated with Confucianism, with Japanese honor and the blindly loyal kamikaze pilot, and then with communism and a manufacturing sector based on fascist-style corporate loyalty. Popular imagery of inscrutability, unthinking devotion, and bloodlust dominated anti-Japanese propaganda in the 1940s. In the late twentieth century, the Oriental came also to be associated with technological wizardry, in this case as an economic threat. Arguably, East Asians for Americans fill the role Jews have traditionally had in Europe — economically successful Orientals suspected of being in league with shadowy, foreign, global agendas. In the twentieth century, fears of Japanese and then communist fifth columns in the United States led to popular stereotypes of short, foreign, emotionless Others as merciless, conspiratorial, and beholden to collectivism and authoritarianism—the very opposite of the free, individualistic American Indian and, by extension, of what European Americans see themselves as having become.

As in much anti-immigrant rhetoric, it is significant that the immigrant's homeland be seen as inhospitable, hence the reason for emigrating. This sets up a contrast between an overfarmed, overcrowded, used-up "old country" —often with a dysfunctional or stifling political life—on the one hand and, on the other, the unspoiled wide-open spaces and rich soil of America. One need only think of the Founding Fathers' sense of the decadent European aristocracy or the whole notion of the refugee, either economic or political. Here the East-West landscape itself maps a distinction between health and frailty that is also inscribed on racialized bodies.

Surely, Greys are not always metaphoric Orientals, either East Asian or Jewish, though it is hard to ignore the convergence in abduction reports with stereotypical East Asian physiognomic and characterological stereotypes. Betty Andreasson described one of her abductors as Chinese looking (Fowler 1990: 304), and the Hills, as we have seen, also compared their abductors to East Asians. Lyssa Royal, a channeler who works with abductees, is perhaps atypical in her (in its way Blavatskian) assertion that the extraterrestrials who originally seeded the Earth and manipulated human genetic history created "the Asian races on Earth" to give humans an evolutionary jump start. She writes, "If you look at the characteristics f the Asian races, you will find that there is a smaller amount of diversity. The concentration on individuality is not there. . . . [A] person . . . can he sacrificed for the good of the whole. These [are] the key elements needed to bring, about the probable reality 0n Earth that was desired" (Royal and Priest 1992: 132-33). Nonetheless, such a view picks up not only on racist stereotypes at large in American popular culture but on currents of ufological thought as well. The abduction mythos, like Shaver's and Williamson's writings before it, extends the structure of this orientalist logic —of the physically weak, shrewd, elite outsider whose threat stems from a need to prey on his or her physical and moral superiors through conspiratorial behavior and technological advantage.

### Hysteria over alien threats is an expression of our displaced racial anxieties—the 1AC’s analysis is key.

Christopher F. Roth, Anthropology—University of Northern Illinois, DeKalb, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 91-2

An occasional hope expressed by ufo enthusiasts is that encounters with extraterrestrial intelligence will somehow act as a catalyst that will lead to world peace or the bridging of differences among human groups. (The dark side of this is the common conspiracy theory that, for example, a faked alien invasion by global elites will be used as the excuse to impose a mono­lithic New World Order on humanity; see, e.g., Hayakawa 1993) But, as we have seen, differences, the very idea of ethnicity and race, are part of American cultural conceptions of what it is to be human. Insofar as aliens are incorporated into preconceived notions of humanity, they will be ac­commodated as a part of—not a transcendence of—existing evolutionary, racial, and ethnic dimensions on which our conceptions of human diver­sity are already arranged. This is what gives us George Hunt Williamson projecting anti-Semitic fears onto an alien infiltration of our social institutions; Betty and Barney Hill abducted and probed by "men" who morph from Irishmen to Chinese to specimens from an ethnological slide show; thousands of white middle-class Americans reporting that they have been kidnapped and raped by high evolutionaries trying to save their race and ours simultaneously; nightmare fantasies of genocide, for which we can blame the aliens, not whites; and a growing number of abductees and their children believing that they themselves are downtrodden immigrants, adding grey or green to the palette of white, brown, red, black, and yellow Americans.

I have tried to leave aside here the question of what, if anything, abductees and contactees are really experiencing, which may or may not be a phenomenon better categorized as neurological, spiritual, or something else. But the narratives and imagery they employ are immediately woven into an existing coherent and evolving folk anthropology that is already structuring most thinking about race and difference, a folk anthropology that dips into and out of academic anthropology at surprising junctures. Academic anthropologists, after all, have (for good scientific and political reasons) stopped making pronouncements on racial difference, but, since most Americans "know" that race is real and must mean something, some­one has to be providing some answers.

### Racialized views of alien others authorizes mass racial genocide.

Christopher F. Roth, Anthropology—University of Northern Illinois, DeKalb, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 86-8

In sum, the progression of logic runs roughly as follows. Aliens are cur­rently abducting humans and interbreeding with them, as evidenced by abduction reports. This interbreeding program seems to be multigenerational, and it is unclear when it began. Therefore, one can guess that it might be a permanent part of human genetic history and that humans themselves might originally have been the product of this interbreeding. (Once this conclusion is reached, a whole literature from Blavatsky to Zechariah Sitchin is immediately made comprehensible and relevant.) Human physical variation, then, like all facts about human physiology, must be the product of this alien interbreeding. Finally, it can then be assumed that some human ethnic groups are more purely alien in their ancestry than others and that different groups might be traceable to differ­ent alien groups. Once one has accepted the American cultural concept of race, the racial order becomes, for a UFO believer following this logic, a reflection of a cosmic hierarchy. The millennial themes so common in the abduction scenario, involving environmental and other cataclysms that the aliens can foresee and that justify the hybridization program, inevitably begin to take on racial themes. Who will be saved? And, if it is the hybridized human families that will be saved—the abductee families—who, exactly, are they? Despite common claims by abduction researchers hankering for legitimacy to the effect that abductees come from "all walks of life," it is abundantly clear both anecdotally and in the opinions of many abduction researchers I have interviewed that, although there have been, for example, a few prominent African American contactees, the abductee population is overwhelmingly white. Barney Hill stands almost alone. Investigators tend to try to account for this as a problem of reporting, which can be attributed to cultural and social factors. Whatever the reason, the fact remains. Although it is a topic most researchers avoid, several abductees have told me that they were told or feel that the dearth of nonwhite abductees is no accident. One told me that, although she has encountered African American abductees on board ships during abductions, she has gleaned from her interactions with aliens that the coming winnowing of humanity will deplete the nonwhite populations of the earth most heavily. Another abductee, one with a leftist, countercultural orientation, told me that he has come to feel that the reason blacks are abducted less frequently is be­cause the aliens are less able to "deal with" the bodily, physical —as op­posed to cerebral or spiritual —predisposition of black people. Donna Bassett, the journalist who infiltrated John Mack's abductee support group for *Time* magazine (Willwerth 1994) and subsequently led an investigation of Mack, told me in 1994 that Mack's circle of abductees was also foretelling the decimation of nonwhite races. Abductees have expressed to me sadness and anger over this scenario, but, once they have interpreted their own experiences in a certain way, the conclusions seem for them inevitable. Here, of course, there are strong parallels with scenarios for the emergence of the Sixth Root-Race in early-twentieth-century Theosophist writings (besant 1910; Besant and Leadbeater 1947), which also suggest that natural disasters will wipe out portions of humanity, followed by the emergence of a future race from the remaining, largely white, mostly American population. With the Theosophists, too, divinely ordained racial extinctions sit awkwardly alongside sincerely held egalitarian and antiracist views. The submersion and disappearance of races whose time has passed are simply part of the natural order of things In ufological discourse, however, these racial themes, which most abductees and researchers struggle to repress, sometimes do erupt in fully formed racist ideologies, as is the case with Robert Girard, whose self-published book Futureman*: A Synthesis of Missing Links, the Human In­festation of Earth, and the Alien Abduction Epidemic* (1993) does not flinch from racist conclusions. He follows the ancient astronaut view of human evolution, including his own theory that the black, red, and yellow races represent earlier, imperfect attempts by aliens at genetic engineering, while the white race ("Self-Aware" man) represents a spiritually superior prod­uct of the alien-bred Cro-Magnon lineage destined to rule the other races. Alien abductions, he claims, are recent and part of a fresh attempt to pre­serve these superior genetic strains when the great mass of overbreeding brown-skinned humanity is exterminated in the near future (1993; Kossy 2001: 38-40). Girard, who is also a prominent ufo bookseller, veered from his usual titles by offering the controversial racist, pseudo-scientific best­seller The Bell Curve(Herrnstein and Murray 1994) in his Christmas 1994 catalogue, adding in a capsule review that the book will provide information to anyone reading or contemplating the ideas expressed in . . . Futureman. Whether you want it, like it or believe in it or not . . . the only (and last) workable solution to catastrophic overpopulation will be the outright extermination of vast numbers of humans who are incapable of making any meaningful contribution to that civilization. These number well into the billions among us now: humans who have absolutely no purpose or justification for being here. . . . Given the enormity of the crisis facing our species, and by extension, all of earth's living species, there must someday come the deliber­ate elimination of (hopefully) the vast majority of humans now living. (Arcturus Books 1994: 3) Most ufo believers have no sympathy with such a view, but Girard's genocidal rage is in one sense only a logical progression from the millennial visions many abductees are reporting and the fact that those who claim they are part of the breeding project are almost all white Americans.

### Modern governmentality makes mass killing inevitable—the commandment to “make live” ensures that all life can be destroyed in order to protect the populace.

Mitchell Dean, Professor of Sociology at Macquarie University, 2k1 (“Demonic Societies: Liberalism, biopolitics, and sovereignty.” Ethnographic Explorations of the Postcolonial State, ed. Hanson and Stepputat, p. 55-58)

Consider again the contrastive terms in which it is possible to view biopolitics and sovereignty. The final chapter in the first volume of the History of Sexuality that contrasts sovereignty and biopolitics is titled "Right of Death and Power over Life." The initial terms of the contrast between the two registers of government is thus between one that could employ power to put subjects to death, even if this right to kill was conditioned by the defense of the sovereign, and one that was concerned with the fostering of life. Nevertheless, each part of the contrast can be further broken down. The right of death can also be understood as "the right to take life or let live"; the power over life as the power "to foster life or disallow it." Sovereign power is a power that distinguishes between political life (bios) and mere existence or bare life (zoe). Bare life is included in the constitution of sovereign power by Its very exclusion from political life. In contrast, biopolitics might be thought to include zoe in bios: stripped down mere existence becomes a matter of political reality. Thus, the contrast between biopolitics and sovereignty is not one of a power of life versus a power of death but concerns the way the different forms of power treat matters of life and death and entail different conceptions of life. Thus, biopolitics reinscribes the earlier right of death and power over life and places it within a new and different form that attempts to include what had earlier been sacred and taboo, bare life, in political existence. It is no longer so much the right of the sovereign to put to death his enemies but to disqualify the life—the mere existence—of those who are a threat to the life of the population, to disallow those deemed "unworthy of life," those whose bare life is not worth living. This allows us, first, to consider what might be thought of as the dark side of biopolitics (Foucault 1979a: 136—37). In Foucault's account, biopolitics does not put an end to the practice of war: it provides it with new and more sophisticated killing machines. These machines allow killing itself to be reposed at the level of entire populations. Wars become genocidal in the twentieth century. The same state that takes on the duty to enhance the life of the population also exercises the power of death over whole populations. Atomic weapons are the key weapons of this process of the power to put whole populations to death. We might also consider here the aptly named biological and chemical weapons that seek an extermination of populations by visiting plagues upon them or polluting the biosphere in which they live to the point at which bare life is no longer sustainable. Nor does the birth of biopolitics put an end to the killing of one's own populations. Rather, it intensifies that killing—whether by an "ethnic cleansing" that visits holocausts upon whole groups or by the mass slaughters of classes and groups conducted in the name of the Utopia to be achieved. There is a certain restraint in sovereign power. The right of death is only occasionally exercised as the right to kill and then often in a ritual fashion that suggests a relation to the sacred. More often, sovereign power is manifest in the refraining from the right to kill. The biopolitical imperative knows no such restraint. Power is exercised at the level of populations and hence wars will be waged at that level, on behalf of everyone and their lives. This point brings us to the heart of Foucault's provocative thesis about biopolitics: that there is an intimate connection between the exercise of a life-administering power and the commission of genocide: "If genocide is indeed the dream of modern powers, this is not because of a recent return of the ancient right to kill: it is because power is situated and exercised at the level of life, the species, the race, and the large-scale phenomena of population" (1979a: 137). Foucault completes this same passage with an expression that deserves more notice: "massacres become vital." There is thus a kind of perverse homogeneity between the power over life and the power to take life characteristic of biopower. The emergence of a biopolitical racism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries can be approached as a trajectory in which this homogeneity always threatened to tip over into a dreadful necessity. This racism can be approached as a fundamental mechanism of power that is inscribed in the biopolitical domain (Stoler 1995: 84—85). For Foucault, the primary function of this form of racism is to establish a division between those who must live and those who must die, and to distinguish the superior from the inferior, the fit from the unfit. The notion and techniques of population had given rise, at the end of the nineteenth century, to a new linkage among population, the internal organization of states, and the competition between states. Darwinism, as an imperial social and political program, would plot the ranking of individuals, populations, and nations along the common gradient of fitness and thus measure eflicienqp6 However, the series "population, evolution, and race" is not simply a way of thinking about the superiority of the "white races" or of justifying colonialism, but also of thinking about how to treat the degenerates and the abnormals in one's own population and prevent the further degeneration of the race. The second and most important function for Foucault of this biopolitical racism in the nineteenth century is that "it establishes a positive

relation between the right to kill and the assurance of life" (Stoler 1995: 84). The life of the population, its vigor, its health, its capacities to survive, becomes necessarily linked to the elimination of internal and external threats. This power to disallow life is perhaps best encapsulated in the injunctions of the eugenic project: identify those who are degenerate, abnormal, feeble\*minded, or of an inferior race and subject them to forced sterilization: encourage those who are superior, fit, and intelligent to propagate. Identify those whose life is but mere existence and disqualify their propagation: encourage those who can partake of a sovereign existence and of moral and political life. But this last example does not necessarily establish a positive justification for the right to kill, only the right to disallow life. If we are to begin to understand the type of racism engaged in by Nazism, however, we need to take into account another kind of denouement between the biopolitical management of population and the exercise of sovereignty. This version of sovereignty is no longer the transformed and democratized form founded on the liberty of the juridical subject, as it is for liberalism, but a sovereignty that takes up and transforms a further element of sovereignty, its "symbolics of blood" (Foucault 1979a: 148). For Foucault, sovereignty is grounded in blood—as a reality and as a symbol—just as one might say that sexuality becomes the key field on which biopolitical management of populations is articulated. When power is exercised through repression and deduction, through a law over which hangs the sword, when it is exercised on the scaffold by the torturer and the executioner, and when relations between households and families were forged through alliance, "blood was a reality with a symbolic function." By contrast, for biopolitics with its themes of health, vigor, fitness, vitality, progeny, survival, and race, "power spoke of sexuality and to sexuality" (Foucault 1979a: 147). For Foucault (1979a: 149—50), the novelty of National Socialism was the way it articulated "the oneiric exaltation of blood," of fatherland, and of the triumph of the race in an immensely cynical and naive fashion, with the paroxysms of a disciplinary and biopolitical power concerned with the detailed administration of the life of the population and the regulation of sexuality, family, marriage, and education.'Nazism generalized biopower without the limit-critique posed by the juridical subject of right, but it could not do away with sovereignty. Instead, it established a set of permanent interventions into the conduct of the individual within the population and articulated this with the "mythical concern for blood and the triumph of the race." Thus, the shepherd-flock game and the city-citizen game are transmuted into the eugenic ordering of biological existence (of mere living and subsistence) and articulated on the themes of the purity of blood and the myth of the fatherland. In such an articulation of these elements of sovereign and biopolitical forms of power, the relation between the administration of life and the right to kill entire populations is no longer simply one of a dreadful homogeneity. It has become a necessary relation. The administration of life comes to require a bloodbath. It is not simply that power, and therefore war, will be exercised at the level of an entire population. It is that the act of disqualifying the right to life of other races becomes necessary for the fostering of the life of the race. Moreover, the elimination of other races is only one face of the purification of one's own race (Foucault 1997b: 231). The other part is to expose the latter to a universal and absolute danger, to expose it to the risk of death and total destruction. For Foucault, with the Nazi state we have an "absolutely racist state, an absolutely murderous state and an absolutely suicidal state" (232), all of which are superimposed and converge on the Final Solution. With the Final Solution, the state tries to eliminate, through the Jews, all the other races, for whom the Jews were the symbol and the manifestation. This includes, in one of Hitler's last acts, the order to destroy the bases of bare life for the German people itself "Final Solution for other races, the absolute suicide of the German race" is inscribed, according to Foucault. in the functioning of the modern state (232).

## Contention Two—Anthropocentrism:

### Additionally, The status quo approach to space is steeped in anthropocentric ideology—the government seeks to demonize the study of extraterrestrials because the possibility of more intelligent life is threatening to their sovereignty—to prove the existence of aliens would be to shatter the humanist metaphysics that has dominated recent history and inevitably culminates in violence against demonized

Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall, ‘8 (“Sovereignty and the UFO”, Profs at OSU and U of Minnesota, Political Theory)

Few ideas today are as contested as sovereignty, in theory or in practice. In sovereignty theory scholars disagree about almost everything—what sovereignty is and where it resides, how it relates to law, whether it is divisible, how its subjects and objects are constituted, and whether it is being transformed in late modernity. These debates are mirrored in contemporary practice, where struggles for self-determination and territorial revisionism have generated among the bitterest conflicts in modern times. Throughout this contestation, however, one thing is taken for granted: sovereignty is the province of humans alone. Animals and Nature are assumed to lack the cognitive capacity and/or subjectivity to be sovereign; and while God might have ultimate sovereignty, even most religious fundamentalists grant that it is not exercised directly in the temporal world. When sovereignty is contested today, therefore, it is always and only among humans, horizontally so to speak, rather than vertically with Nature or God. In this way modern sovereignty is anthropocentric, or constituted and organized by reference to human beings alone.1 Humans live within physical constraints, but are solely responsible for deciding their norms and practices under those constraints. Despite the wide variety of institutional forms taken by sovereignty today, they are homologous in this fundamental respect.

Anthropocentric sovereignty might seem necessary; after all, who else, besides humans, might rule? Nevertheless, historically sovereignty was less anthropocentric. For millennia Nature and the gods were thought to have causal powers and subjectivities that enabled them to share sovereignty with humans, if not exercise dominion outright.2 Authoritative belief in non-human sovereignties was given up only after long and bitter struggle about the “borders of the social world,” in which who/what could be sovereign depends on who/what should be included in society.3 In modernity God and Nature are excluded, although in this exclusion they are also reincluded as the domesticated Other. Thus, while no longer temporally sovereign, God is included today through people who are seen to speak on Her behalf. And while Nature has been disenchanted, stripped of its subjectivity, it is re-included as object in the human world. These inclusive exclusions, however, reinforce the assumption that humans alone can be sovereign. In this light anthropocentric sovereignty must be seen as a contingent historical achievement, not just a requirement of common sense. Indeed, it is a metaphysical achievement, since it is in anthropocentric terms that humans today understand their place in the physical world. Thus operates what Giorgio Agamben calls the “anthropological machine.”4 In some areas this metaphysics admittedly is contested. Suggestions of animal consciousness fuel calls for animal rights, for example, and advocates of “Intelligent Design” think God is necessary to explain Nature’s complexity. Yet, such challenges do not threaten the principle that sovereignty, the capacity to decide the norm and exception to it, must necessarily be human. Animals or Nature might deserve rights, but humans will decide that; and even Intelligent Designers do not claim that God exercises temporal sovereignty. With respect to sovereignty, at least, anthropocentrism is taken to be common sense, even in political theory, where it is rarely problematized.5

This “common sense” is nevertheless of immense practical significance in the mobilization of power and violence for political projects. Modern systems of rule are able to command exceptional loyalty and resources from their subjects on the shared assumption that the only potential sovereigns are human. Imagine a counterfactual world in which God visibly materialized (as in the Christians’ “Second Coming,” for example): to whom would people give their loyalty, and could states in their present form survive were such a question politically salient? Anything that challenged anthropocentric sovereignty, it seems, would challenge the foundations of modern rule.

In this article we develop this point and explore its implications for political theory. Specifically, our intent is to highlight and engage critically the limits of anthropocentric sovereignty. In doing so, we seek to contribute to an eclectic line of critical theory of modern rule—if not sovereignty per se—which problematizes its anthropocentrism, a line that connects (however awkwardly and indirectly) Spinozan studies (including Donna Haraway and Gilles Deleuze) to Michel Foucault, Giorgio Agamben, Jane Bennett, and others.6We do so through the phenomenon of the Unidentified Flying Object, or “UFO,”7 the authoritative disregard for which brings clearly into view the limits of anthropocentric metaphysics. We proceed in four sections. In the first, we describe an animating puzzle—the “UFO taboo”—in order to set the empirical basis for our theoretical intervention. In the next we make this taboo puzzling through an immanent critique of the authoritative claim that UFOs are not extraterrestrial (ET). Then, in the third section, we solve the puzzle through a theoretical analysis of the metaphysical threat that the UFO poses to anthropocentric sovereignty. We conclude with some implications for theory and practice.

### Only through the pursuit of ET exploration can we hope to shatter the anthropocentric metaphysics that dictates current space politics—failure to open up to the possibility of ET life guarantees our fears and anxieties manifest in violence against demonized alien others

Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall, ‘8 (“Sovereignty and the UFO”, Profs at OSU and U of Minnesota, Political Theory)

Anthropocentrism and UFO Ignorance Authoritative insistence on knowing the UFO only through ignorance is necessitated by the threat it poses to the anthropocentric metaphysics of modern rule. Within modern rule we focus specifically on sovereignty, but in our conceptualization sovereignty cannot be understood without reference to governmentality, which sets the normative context of sovereign decision. Thus, in what follows we both begin and end with governmentality, while keeping our remarks to a minimum in order to focus on the metaphysics of sovereignty per se. In doing so we recognize that the relationship between governmentality and sovereignty is contested among political theorists. Focused on the specific problem of the UFO taboo, we do not take sides in this debate except to accept the view that the two aspects of modern rule are intertwined.

Governmentality, Sovereignty, and the Exception In thinking about the problem of rule, political scientists have traditionally focused on either individual agents or institutional structures, in both cases treating government as a given object. In contrast, Foucault’s concept of governmentality is focused on the “art of governing,” understood as the biopolitical “conduct of conduct” for a population of subjects.45 Thus, governmentality concerns the specific regime of practices through which the population is constituted and (self-)regularized. “Modern” governmentality marks a shift in discourses of rule away from the state’s sovereign power— its ability to take life and/or render it bare—and toward its fostering and regularizing of life in biopolitics. The object of government is no longer simply obedience to the king, but regulating the conditions of life for subjects. To this end biopolitics requires that the conditions of life of the population be made visible and assayed, and practical knowledge be made available to improve them. As a result, with modern governmentality we see the emergence of both panoptic surveillance and numerous specialized discourses—of education, political economy, demography, health, morality, and others—the effect of which is to make populations knowable and subject to the regularization that will make for the “happy life.” A constitutive feature of modern governmentality is that its discourses are scientific, which means that science and the state are today deeply intermeshed. Through science the state makes its subjects and objects known, lending them a facticity that facilitates their regularization, and through the state science acquires institutional support and prestige. Despite this symbiosis, however, there is also an important epistemological difference between the two. Science seeks, but knows it can never fully achieve, “the” truth, defined as an apolitical, objective representation of the world. To this end it relies on norms and practices that produce an evolving, always potentially contested body of knowledge. The state, in contrast, seeks a regime of truth to which its population will reliably adhere. Standards for knowledge in that context privilege stability and normalization over the uncertain path of scientific truth. Although science and the state are allied in the modern UFO regime, we suggest in conclusion that this difference opens space for critical theory and resistance.

Modern governmentality directs attention away from sovereign power and toward the socially diffuse practices by which it is sustained. Yet as Agamben reminds us,46 sovereignty remains important, because every regime of governmentality has outsides, even while exceeding the capacity for regularization. This outside is both external, in the form of actors not subject to normalization, and internal, in the form of people’s capacity to do otherwise (hence their need to be “governed”). Ordinarily these limits do not severely threaten modern rule, but some exceed the capacity for regularization.

Schmitt calls such situations “states of exception”: “any severe economic or political disturbance requiring the application of extraordinary measures,” including abrogation of law by those who govern in its name.47 Extending and modifying Schmitt’s analysis, Agamben emphasizes a “zone of indistinction” between the juridical order and the state of exception, which is neither fully in nor outside the law. Thus, while sometimes constitutionally recognized, the state of exception is “not a special kind of law,” but necessarily transcends the law.48 In Sergei Prozorov’s terms, the state of exception is a “constitutive outside” or “excess” to law that is the latter’s condition of possibility.49 As such, for Agamben (if not for Schmitt) a state of exception is always potentially there, even when not actually in force, permanently contaminating the law. On the other hand, the state of exception also belongs to the law, since it is by the latter’s limits and/or failure that it is known. States of exception cannot be declared willy-nilly, but must make sense within the regime of truth they would uphold. Thus, law and the exception are co-constitutive rather than mutually exclusive.

“Sovereign is he who decides the exception.”50 Like the state of exception it decides, sovereignty is both outside and inside law. On the one hand, it is the ability to found and suspend a juridical order. To that extent sovereignty transcends the law, its decisions seeming to come out of nowhere, like a “miracle.”51 In saying this Schmitt emphasizes sovereignty’s omnipotence, if not to realize its intentions then at least to decide them. However, even Schmitt recognizes that sovereign decision is not literally a miracle, but has conditions of possibility. Among Agamben’s contributions is in showing that those conditions include the very corpus of law that is to be suspended in the decision of the exception. In this way sovereignty is also inside and limited by law.

Anthropocentrism and the Undecidability of the UFO

If the limits of the governmental regime are exposed, the sovereign generally can be counted on to survey and to securitize the threat; that is after all what its sovereignty is for. In this light the UFO is the proverbial dog that didn’t bark, a potential threat not only un-securitized but never even properly surveyed. About the UFO, in short, there has been no decision as to its status as exception, only an ignoring. The reason, we argue, lies in the triple threat that the UFO poses to modern rule, at once physical, ontological, and metaphysical.

Exceptions presuppose an exterior. Because modern rule is grounded in a scientific worldview that does not recognize the existence of supernatural phenomena, this exterior is normally understood today in purely spatiotemporal terms.52 Threats can then take two forms, physical threats to life and ontological threats to identity or social being.53 Given sovereignty’s need to transform the contingency of decision into taken-for-granted authority, it is only by reference to the intrusion of such threats into its field of visibility that the state of exception can be justified. Importantly, the sovereign cannot decide the terms of its encounters with these intrusions, only their status as exception.

On one level the UFO is a traditional spatio-temporal threat, because one of the possibilities that we must countenance if we accept that the UFO is truly unidentified is that its occupants are ETs—and that threatens both the physical and ontological security of modern rule. The physical threat, of course, is that ET presence in “our” solar system would indicate a vastly superior technology to human beings’, raising the possibility of conquest and even extermination. (In this respect it matters greatly that They might be Here, rather than far away as in the SETI scenario.) The ontological threat is that even if the ETs were benign, their confirmed presence would create tremendous pressure for a unified human response, or world government. The sovereign identity of the modern state is partly constituted in and through its difference from other such states, which gives modern sovereignty its plural character. Any exteriority that required subsuming this difference into a global sovereignty would threaten what the modern state is, quite apart from the risk of physical destruction.

It might be argued that these spatio-temporal threats alone can explain the UFO taboo. On this view, by virtue of the possibility that UFOs are ETs, the UFO calls into question the state’s claim to protect its citizens, which it would be unwilling to admit. Because the threat is so grave, the only rational response is to ignore the UFO. States are enabled in this policy by the fact that UFOs do not (yet) interfere with the conditions of life of human populations, and as such have not compelled recognition.

However, at least two considerations militate against reducing the UFO threat to spatio-temporal terms. First, states show little reluctance to ignore other existential threats; if immigrants, pandemics, and terrorists are readily securitized, despite states’ inability to secure their populations from them, then why are not UFOs? Second, given that UFOs do not interfere with modern governance, and with no indication that states actually believe the ETH, the UFO would seem cynically to be an ideal securitization issue. Because it leaves physical traces it can be represented as if it were real, justifying the growth of state power, even as states know the threat is imaginary. To be sure states may have other worries—but then all the more reason to stage a UFO threat to bolster their capacities. Thus, Hollywood notwithstanding, in our view the threat of the UFO is not primarily alien invasion or the black helicopters of world government. Challenges to the “physics” of modern sovereignty are necessary conditions for the UFO taboo, but they are not sufficient.

The UFO threat is different in the challenge it poses to the metaphysics of modern sovereignty, which are fundamentally anthropocentric.54 Because the contemporary capacity to command political loyalty and resources depends upon it, the assumption of anthropocentrism must be unquestioned if modern rule is to be sustained as a political project. As a condition of their own sovereignty, therefore, before modern states can deal with threats to their physical and ontological security, they must first secure this metaphysic.

How is this done? Sovereign decision is no help, since modern sovereignty can only instantiate an anthropocentric metaphysic, not step outside to decide the exception to it. So here modern sovereignty must give way to governmentality, or authoritative procedures to make anthropocentrism “known” as fact. In contrast to past processes of normalization in which the visions of shamans or seers were taken to be authoritative, the standards of knowledge in modern governmentality are primarily scientific. Thus, since there is no scientific evidence for miracles, it is known that God does not intervene in the material world. Similarly, since there is no evidence Nature has subjectivity, it is known not to. Anthropocentrism will be secure until scientific evidence to the contrary comes along.

An unknown that incorporates the possibility of ETs confounds this metaphysical certainty, creating a situation in which its status as exception cannot be decided. We develop this suggestion using Derrida’s concept of “undecidability,”55 while arguing that the particular form undecidability takes in the UFO case disrupts its usual operation.

Something is undecidable when it “does not conform to either polarity of a dichotomy, (for example, present/absent, cure/poison, and inside/outside),” but is both at once.56 Perhaps confusingly, undecidability does not mean a decision cannot be made, but that a decision on which side of the binary an undecidable belongs is compelled. Undecidability is a “condition from which no course of action necessarily follows,”57 yet which requires a decision to resolve oscillation between dichotomous poles. The UFO is undecidable in this sense, and thus compels decision.

However, to “decide” an exception it would seem necessary for the sovereign first to acknowledge the existence of a disturbance in its field of visibility and try to determine what the disturbance is. “Decision,” in other words, suggests an effort to know potential threats rather than merely reenact the norm, if only to make better decisions—yet states have made no meaningful effort to know the UFO. Disturbances may be acknowledged, but then states have mostly abjured a scientific standpoint in favor of public relations on behalf of the established regime of truth, re-affirming that We already know what these (unidentified) objects are (not). The effect is to constitute the UFO as un-exceptional, but not by “deciding.”58 This suggests that we need to look more closely at the moment of transition from undecidability to the decision, or what Derrida calls the “logic of the palisade,”59 which in this case does not seem to be automatic. More specifically, we propose that the UFO compels a decision that, by the modern sovereign at least, cannot be made. The reason is the particular character of the UFO’s undecidability, at once potentially objective and subjective, each pole of which poses a metaphysical challenge to anthropocentric rule.

On the one hand, UFOs appear indeed to be objects, not necessarily in the narrow sense of something hard and tangible, but in the broader sense of natural processes that produce physical effects. The effects are subtle and elusive, which means that UFOs are not unambiguously objects, but radar anomalies and other physical traces suggest something objective is going on. As unidentified object the UFO poses a threat of unknowability to science, upon which modern sovereignty depends. Of course, there are many things science does not know, like the cure for cancer, but its authority rests on the assumption that nothing in Nature is in principle unknowable. UFOs challenge modern science in two ways: (1) they appear random and unsystematic, making them difficult to grasp objectively; and (2) some appear to violate the laws of physics (like the 40g turns in the Belgian F-16 case). This does not mean that UFOs are in fact humanly unknowable, but they might be, and in that respect they haunt modern sovereignty with the possibility of epistemic failure. To see how this might be uniquely threatening it is useful to compare the UFO to three other cases of what might be seen as unknowability.

One is the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle in quantum theory, which acknowledges inherent limits on the ability to know sub-atomic reality. Since the Uncertainty Principle has not stopped physicists from doing physics, this might seem to undermine our claim that potential unknowability precludes a decision on the UFO as object. Yet, there are known unknowns and unknown unknowns, and here the two cases differ. Quantum mechanics emerged in a highly structured context of extant theory and established experimental results, and is a systematic body of knowledge that enables physicists to manipulate reality with extraordinary precision. With quantum theory we know exactly what we cannot know, enabling it to be safely incorporated into modern science. The UFO, in contrast, emerges in a context free of extant theory and empirical research, and raises fundamental questions about the place of human beings in the universe. That we might never know what we cannot know about UFOs makes their potential objectivity more problematic for the modern project.

A different problem is presented by God, whose existence science also declaims ability to know. Once fiercely contested, the notion that God can be known only through faith not reason is today accepted by religious and secular authorities alike. Since God is not potentially a scientific object, science does not consider the question to be within its purview. Miracles are recognized by the Church, but the criteria by which they are made authoritative are not primarily scientific. UFOs, in contrast, leave unexplained physical traces and as such fall directly within the purview of modern science.60 It is one of the ironies of modern rule that it is far more acceptable today to affirm publicly one’s belief in God, for whose existence there is no scientific evidence, than UFOs, the existence of which—whatever they might be—is physically documented.

Perhaps the best analogue to the epistemic threat posed by UFO objectivity is extra-sensory perception or “psi.” Here we have a subtle and elusive phenomenon that might be objective, and which raises similar worries about unknowability for the modern episteme.61 And here too we see tremendous resistance from the scientific community to taking it seriously. Nevertheless, and interestingly, psi research has been undertaken by states,62 suggesting that potential unknowability by itself does not preclude sovereign decision, if, were the phenomenon to become known, it could serve human purposes.

Indeed, were the UFO merely an object, it is hard to see that its potential unknowability would preclude a decision on its status as exception. Qua object, and only object, the UFO threatens neither the physical nor the ontological security of modern rule, which we have argued are necessary conditions for the metaphysical threat from UFOs to be realized. (In this respect the UFO contrasts interestingly with the possibility of catastrophic asteroid impacts, which in fact has been recently constituted as a physical threat.)63 As with other anomalies there might be sociological resistance to seeing UFOs, but if science does its job properly, the resistance should break down and a serious effort to identify UFOs eventually undertaken. Unlike some objects, however, the UFO might also have subjectivity (ETs). In itself non-human subjectivity need not be a problem for anthropocentric sovereignty. Although modernity is constituted by a general de-animation of Nature, debates about animal consciousness raise anew the possibility that subjectivity is not limited to humans.64 However, while it may generate anxiety, 65 animal subjectivity does not threaten modern rule either physically or ontologically. Superior intelligence enabled humans long ago to domesticate animals, ensuring that any subjectivity they might have will lie safely “beneath” human rule. By virtue of being in the solar system, in contrast, ETs might have vastly superior intelligence, literally “above” human rule, and thus be sovereign deciders in their own right. To our knowledge no ETs have shown themselves, which means the UFO is not unambiguously subjective (either), but the failure of science to justify ruling out the ETH leaves open the possibility, and that clearly does threaten anthropocentrism. As potential subject, then, the UFO radically relativizes modern sovereignty, disturbing its homologous character with the threat of unimagined heterogeneity, the sovereignty of the fully alien (non-human) Other.

In short, the UFO poses threats to modern rule on both poles of the object–subject dichotomy that constitutes its undecidability, making a decision in favor of one or the other intrinsically problematic. These threats are metaphysical in the sense of raising epistemological and ontological doubts about the whole anthropocentric idea of modern rule, not just its realizations in actually existing states—and it is the absolute taken-forgrantedness of that idea upon which the ability to mobilize modern power depends. From the standpoint of modern rule, therefore, the threat of the UFO is not unlike that of the Christian’s Second Coming, a potential materialization of the metaphysical.

It is the triple threat of the UFO that explains states’ very different response to it compared to other disruptions of modern norms. By calling into question the very basis of the modern sovereign’s capacity to decide its status as exception, the UFO cannot be acknowledged as truly unidentified— which is to say potentially ET—without calling into question modern sovereignty itself. Thus, far from being a deus ex machina that, through the decision, intervenes miraculously to safeguard the norm, modern sovereignty is shown by the UFO to be itself a norm, of anthropocentrism—and behind this norm no further agency stands. In this way the UFO exhibits not the standard undecidability that compels a decision, but what might be called a “meta”-undecidability which precludes it. The UFO is both exceptional and not decidable as exception, and as a result with respect to it the modern sovereign is performatively insecure. The insecurity is not conscious, but operates at the deeper level of a taboo, in which certain possibilities are unthinkable because of their inherent danger. In this respect UFO skepticism is akin to denial in psychoanalysis: the sovereign represses the UFO out of fear of what it would reveal about itself.66 There is therefore nothing for the sovereign to do but turn away its gaze from—to ignore, and hence be ignorant of—the UFO, making no decision at all. Just when needed most, on the palisades, the sovereign is nowhere to be found.

Governmentality and the UFO Taboo

To this point we have concentrated on the question of “why?” the UFO taboo, in response to which we have offered a structural answer about the logic of anthropocentric sovereignty. However, there is a separate question of “how?” the taboo is produced and reproduced, since structural necessity alone does not make it happen. It takes work—not the conscious work of a vast conspiracy seeking to suppress the truth about UFOs, but the work of countless undirected practices that in the modern world make the UFO “known” as not-ET. Bringing our argument full circle, this is the work of modern governmentality, upon which the normalization of the UFO is thrown back by the absent sovereign. Yet this work too is problematic, because modern governmentality usually proceeds by making objects visible so they can be known and regularized, which in the UFO case would be self-subverting. Thus, what are needed are techniques for making UFOs known without actually trying to find out what they are.

One might distinguish at least four such techniques: (1) authoritative representations, like the U.S. Air Force’s claim that UFOs are “not a national security threat,”67 the portrayal of ufology as pseudo-science, and the science fictionalization of UFOs in the media; (2) official inquiries, like the 1969 Condon Report, which have the appearance of being scientific but are essentially “show trials” systematically deformed by a priori rejection of the ETH;68 (3) official secrecy, which “removes knowledge” from the system;69 and finally (4) discipline in the Foucauldian sense, ranging from formal attacks on the “paranoid style” of UFO believers as a threat to modern rationality,70 to everyday dismissal of those who express public interest in UFOs, which generates a “spiral of silence” in which individuals engage in self-censorship instead.71

Much could be said from a governmentality perspective about these techniques, which are amply documented in the ufological literature, but we lack the space to do so here. Instead, we have focused on explaining why all this anti-UFO work is necessary in the first place, which goes to the fundamental puzzle with which we began our argument: given the many reasons to study UFOs, why aren’t they taken seriously? To answer this question the specific techniques by which the UFO is normalized can be a distraction, since ignorance is multiply realizable at the micro-level. Notwithstanding the importance of governmentality to a critical theory of anthropocentric rule, it is to the performative insecurity of modern sovereignty that one must look first.

Resistance

We have called ours a “critical” theory, in that it rests on a normative assumption that the limits of modern rule should be exposed. In the present context this means that human beings should try to know the UFO. Although we believe the case for this presumption is over-determined and overwhelming, it is not a case we can make here. Nevertheless, it seems incumbent upon us to follow through on the practical logic of our theory, so taking its desirability as given, in conclusion we address the question of resistance to the UFO taboo.

The structuralism of our argument might suggest that resistance is futile. However, the structure of the UFO taboo also has aporias and fissures that make it—and the anthropocentric structure of rule that it sustains—potentially unstable.

One is the UFO itself, which in its persistent recurrence generates an ongoing need for its normalization. Modern rule might not recognize the UFO, but in the face of continuing anomalies maintaining such nonrecognition requires work. In that respect the UFO is part of the constitutive, unnormalized outside of modern sovereignty, which can be included in authoritative discourse only through its exclusion.

Within the structure of modern rule there are also at least two fissures that complicate maintaining UFO ignorance. One is the different knowledge interests of science and the state. While the two are aligned in authoritative UFO discourse, the state is ultimately interested in maintaining a certain regime of truth (particularly in the face of metaphysical insecurity), whereas science recognizes that its truths can only be tentative. Theory may be stubborn, but the presumption in science is that reality has the last word, which creates the possibility of scientific knowledge countering the state’s dogma. The other fissure is within liberalism, the constitutive core of modern governmentality. Even as it produces normalized subjects who know that “belief” in UFOs is absurd, liberal governmentality justifies itself as a discourse that produces free-thinking subjects who might doubt it.72 It is in this context that we would place the recent disclosure by the French government (and at press time the British too) of its long-secret UFO files (1,600 reports), including its investigations of selected cases, of which the French acknowledge 25 percent as unexplained.73 Given that secrecy is only a contingent feature of the UFO taboo, and that even the French are still far from seeking systematic knowledge of UFOs, this disclosure is not in itself a serious challenge to our argument. However, the French action does illustrate a potential within liberalism to break with authoritative common sense,74 even at the risk of exposing the foundations of modern sovereignty to insecurity.

The kind of resistance that can best exploit these fissures might be called militant agnosticism. Resistance must be agnostic because by the realist standards of modernity, regarding the UFO/ET question neither atheism nor belief is epistemically justified; we simply do not know. Concretely, agnosticism means “seeing” rather than ignoring the UFO, taking it seriously as a truly unidentified object. Since it is precisely such seeing that the UFO taboo forbids, in this context seeing is resistance. However, resistance must also be militant, by which we mean public and strategic, or else it will indeed be futile. The reproduction of UFO ignorance depends crucially on those in positions of epistemic authority observing the UFO taboo. Thus, private agnosticism—of the kind moderns might have about God, for example—is itself part of the problem. Only breaking the taboo in public constitutes genuine resistance.

Even that is not enough, however, as attested by the long history of unsuccessful resistance to the UFO taboo to date.75 The problem is that agnosticism alone does not produce knowledge, and thus reduce the ignorance upon which modern sovereignty depends. For a critical theory of anthropocentric rule, therefore, a science of UFOs ironically is required, and not just a science of individual cases after the fact, which can tell us only that some UFOs lack apparent conventional explanations. Rather, in this domain what is needed is paradoxically a systematic science, in which observations are actively sought in order to analyze patterns from which an intelligent presence might be inferred.76 That would require money, infrastructure, and a long-term commitment of the kind that to date has been possible only for epistemic authorities, or precisely those actors most resistant to taking UFOs seriously. Still, given the potential disjunction of interest between science and the state, it is possible here for science to play a key role for critical theory. Whether such a science would actually overcome UFO ignorance is unknowable today, but it is only through it that We might move beyond the essentially theological discourse of belief and denial to a truly critical posture.

Modern rule and its metaphysics are extraordinarily resilient, so the difficulties of such resistance cannot be overstated. Those who attempt it will have difficulty funding and publishing their work, and their reputations will suffer. UFO resistance might not be futile but it is certainly dangerous, because it is resistance to modern sovereignty itself. In this respect militant UFO agnosticism is akin to other forms of resistance to governmentality; however, whereas sovereignty has found ways of dealing with them, the UFO may reveal an Achilles heel. Like Achilles, the modern sovereign is a warrior whose function is to protect—in this case, from threats to the norm. Unlike conventional threats, however, the UFO threatens humans’ capacity to decide those threats, and so cannot be acknowledged without calling modern sovereignty itself into question. To what extent that would be desirable is a large normative question which we have bracketed here.77 But taking UFOs seriously would certainly embody the spirit of self-criticism that infuses liberal governmentality and academia in particular, and it would, thereby, foster critical theory. And indeed, if academics’ first responsibility is to tell the truth, then the truth is that after sixty years of modern UFOs, human beings still have no idea what they are, and are not even trying to find out. That should surprise and disturb us all, and cast doubt on the structure of rule that requires and sustains it.

## Contention Three—Solvency:

### Affirmation of the extraterrestrial is key to open up a distance on the self that permits a way out of the inexorable drive towards planetary destruction and mechanistic subjectivity that predominates in the status quo—our hope in the face of an uncertain future is essential to combat humanism’s most violent impulses.
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Human creativity displaced to realms of the extraterrestrial opens up a distance on the self that permits for some believers "ways out" of hu­manity's seemingly inexorable drive toward self-destruction. To the extent that we keep faith in the inherent creativity of action, as Hans Joas (1996) his argued, the critical distance on the self in postmodernity and the "alien self" (or its counterpart, the "alien within") resist the abdication of agency and the "suggestive apparatus" of a mechanistic society that renders the Individual "an extension of itself" (Melley 2000: 31, citing Ellus). As we remind ourselves over and over again in our popular films, for example, machines, alien or otherwise, cannot know the desire for a fully engaged relationality, even accepting that human and nonhuman agency "can be continuously transformed into one another... and emergently productive of one another" (Pickering 1999: 374).

It is at this juncture that we as anthropologists must scrutinize the notion of the "soul in the machine" or, to spin a phrase from Brown's ethnogra­phy of "pseudo-science" healers, the "technomancer of the soul" (1999: 151). For subjects, cyborg relationality is conducive to social flourishing only within a situated ethics of human relationality and humane action. Currently, machines do not have a plan for humans independent of the plans the species devises for itself. Turn the tables and ascribe intentionality to machines or their programs and we are left with a circumscribed, mechanical, goal-oriented network model of social life—again connection passing for relationality.

This is the problematic that the film version of *Contact* would seek to transcend in a kind of e.t. coming of age story for *technoscience spiritu­ality—by* which I mean hard faith in technoscience future (see my essay in this volume). The film climaxes with the partnership of former enemies: a (cross-gendered and, in the case of the characters representing them, cross-dressed) science and religion, reconciled to their differences by a technoscientific "miracle." In the final scene, we see the female rocket scientist and the humanistic male evangelist holding hands on the steps of the U.S. Capitol Building before throngs of the grateful.

Of course, long before *Contact* (1997), the imagined consequences of intimate faith-science and human-machine articulations were docu­mented as public issues in an impressive genealogy of artificial intelligence and cyborg films, ranging from the sad to the catastrophic. One "apical an­cestor" is certainly the rogue computer Hal, whose independent agenda in 2001: *A Space Odyssey* left humanity lost in space or, if you will, "lost in translation" (as Geertz phrases the hazards for anthropological practice). Hal spawned a seemingly inexhaustible line of box office descendants— morphing into machines and programs that give the appearance or even evidence of being (to cite the corporate slogan of *Blade-Runner's* replicant manufacturers) "more human than humans" (see Bukatman 1997; and Battaglia 2001) in their complementary capacities as agents, both moral *(The Terminator) and* utterly amoral (Agent Smith of *The* Matrix) Both Bi*centennial Man* and A.I.: *Artificial Intelligence* put the matter plainly (the latter is recognized by the Raelian movement as the first popular film to more 0r less "get" the alien-human ancestral connection) what machines want is an "author function" or, in films that place the emphasis less on human consciousness and more on meaningful social relationships, a "coauthor function."

As I have indicated, these scenarios exist only in our dreams and night­mares, however intentionally or accidentally the author function may land on machines' creators or controllers. Neither do machines seek an identity and life trajectory distinct from those of the humans they might otherwise resemble (though such is certainly part of our cultural imaginary). It is intriguing to recognize the possibility of a role for a temporally emergent material agency (Pickering 1999: 374) —say, the "free spirited" UFOs be­held by Susan Lepselter in the company of her traveling companions as they look toward a previously familiar horizon in Nevada (in this volume). However, even the mit robots that as I write are entering into haptic exchanges with humans, responding not only to the voices but to the touch of human dance partners, do not as yet take the lead. The machine emerges in the "real time" of the scientist; the reverse is not the case.

The situation becomes significantly more complicated, however, when the ego-based criterion of intentionality is replaced with the criterion of interrelationality. Among "alien/UFO believers," to travel life's "-scapes" in a state of legitimacy and in "real time" has a felt urgency precisely because a shared social reality cannot, in their terms, be taken for granted. What Foucault, in his role of futurologist, grasped as the problem of a social context in which "The Death of the Author" is even imaginable is a context many UFO believers (not unlike other alternative spiritualists) call home — here, now: "I think that, as our society changes, the author-function will disappear.... All discourses, whatever their status, form, value and whatever the treatment to which they will be subjected, would then develop in the anonymity of a murmur.... The result will be an indifference: 'What difference does it make who is speaking?'" (Foucault 1979: 160, quoted in Gusterson 2003: 302). It is proper that I should lift this quotation not from the "original source" but from Hugh Custerson's important study of authorship's official erasure in the mazes of the Livermore laboratory, a site of the birth of the nuclear age. for arguably more significant than a lifetime of scientific work vanished In authorities without trace ol author's identities, is the U.S. government's denial of license to circulate scientific knowledge, credited 0r otherwise, in the public sphere - as Gusterson appreciates, to "disappear" such knowledge from the historical record.

This scenario resonates to ethnographies that show how actors recover their agency—and resist erasure of the official record —in the wake of programmatic nuclear displacement. Lawrence Carucci's *Nuclear Nativity* (1997), for example, analyzes rituals that enact an inversion of Harding's and Stewart's "optimistic apocalypticism" in the ethnographic thick de­scription of displaced Micronesians' complex scripts of cultural renewal, reinvention, and Christian/traditional religious hybridization *in the wake of* the holocaust of the U.S. program of nuclear testing in the Pacific.

The theme of hope as an experiential and analytic category, both situ­ated and contingent, is theorized in a reflexive anthropological thought piece by Vincent Crapanzano (2003: 3-32) that could have been a post­script to Carucci's ethnography. While optimism and faith in the creativity of action are currently less evident in popular culture e.t. imagery and texts than are horror stories (even while characters such as Agent Mulder *of The x-Files* claim a place for them in televisual history), we have ample evidence that alongside a "healthy paranoia" hope has a value for human sociality that the discourse of extraterrestriality locates—and may even activate.

Overall, the articulation of anxiety and optimism in the social discourse of technoscience spirituality puts a restraining order both on scenarios of technology-produced alienation and of transcendental humanism. Sven Birkets writes that "One day soon we will conduct our public and private lives within networks so dense, among so many channels of instantaneous information, that it will make almost no sense to speak of the differentiated self" (quoted in Melley 2000: 31). What Birkets imagines is a process of connecting across contexts so intense and time warped that it covers for the work of relationality. The cart of connection *becomes* the horse of social relating; singular acts of connection are taken for social exchange. This is "endgame" insofar as subjectivity becomes so absorbed in technoscience that its difference from information is a matter of indifference to subjects. The danger from this perspective is of ceding human agency to nonvisible forces as the body's heterogeneous material enmeshments are given over to commodifying forces, for the greater benefit of the few. (Clonaid's Internet enterprise fulfills the promise of network in these terms.) In contrast, technoscience spirituality can be reduced neither to commerce nor to negative applications, since in a larger sense it embraces both "life as we know it" and "life as it could he" (Christopher Langton, cited in Helmreich 2001: 612). If, as Sun Ra's reviewer stated it, "future talk is ordering talk," then we can expect more artistic genre fusions and hybrid cult reli­gions, "not without a note of optimism." In his illuminating ethnography of artificial life scientists in New Mexico (2001), Stefan Helmreich notes that just as scientists have come to appreciate the "third culture" of public cul­ture that crosscuts science and humanities discourses, new bridges can be imagined from here to realms of the spiritual, and from these bridges leaps of faith across all these chasms. Such leaps are risky, of course. But they also enliven a situated futurology and humanistic hypothesis making in a "secular modernity" that is showing itself to be less secular by the moment (see especially de Vries 2001).

In all of the scenarios just considered, failure of critical models to "mind the gap" (Baudrillard 1988) between what we can imagine doing and making and being and what we do, make, or are in the material world can lead to underappreciation of human capacities for constructive and destructive action. This is precisely what the messages of benevolent aliens since the dawn of the nuclear age have been credited with calling to our attention. As David Samuels's and my own essay on Raelians note in this volume, it is no historical accident that in The Day the Earth Stood StillKlaatu, the first alien undercover agent/ethnographer in popular cinematic history, sets about saving humans from themselves by "passing" among them and observing with growing alarm their irrational, belligerent tendencies. It is not until he sheds his human guise to emerge as an alien prophet from his gleaming flying saucer—dressed in the same formal white suit that the contemporary prophet Rael dons for publicity photos against the backdrop of an exact replica of Klaatu's flying saucer, which is also an exact replica of the saucer that transported Rael to higher consciousness and other planets—that Klaatu's warning is taken seriously by a select audience of "the greatest scientists on Earth."

The nuclear nightmare Klaatu envisions has a corollary in the horror of *The* Matrix*.* In the wake of apocalypse, sentient human bodies imagine themselves to be free agents, while in physical reality they exist as living food for an alien intelligence that controls the apparatuses of their delusional contentment within a corporate, "cubicled" habitus. Humans, as any cult site on the Internet will tell you with or without reference to Baudrillard. have become "simulacra" of themselves. But T*he Matrix's* heroic Neo is guided in "hacking into" this condition. And the fact that he can arrive at consciousness of his alienated situation of false security offers hope that he will be able to recognize the possibility of experiencing the real thing: meaningful relationships with others similarly awakened to the consequences of their desubjectification and what Heidegger terms the "enframement" of Earth's resources as consumables. In this scenario of recovering self-authorship through the agency of relations with others similarly disabled and struggling toward social engagement, acts of liberation are their own reward, recognition aside. But the reward is not sufficient as such until it is supplemented by a sense of mission and the salvation that comes from freeing others similarly trapped in postmodernity's imaginary of fulfillment (cf. Biagioli 2003).

### Voting AFF is decision to embrace a de-exoticized understanding of aliens and alien-ness—our foregrounding of the socio-cultural role of the extraterrestrial in the American imaginary is key to subvert the us/them thinking which pervades our current conceptions of space politics.
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In these pages you are invited to enter the outerspaces of extraterrestrial culture, as a realm of social inquiry. Where this journey leads is perhaps unexpected, especially for the discourse of alien beings and unidentified flying objects. For the fact is that, far from fields of exotic Otherness — the space of technomarvels and weird entities, epic enterprises, and terrors unrecognizable in their "structures of feeling"—we find ourselves instead in the presence of an extraterrestrial uncannily familiar and concrete.1 It is the image on a cell phone or a backpack, the toy in the window that glows in a child's room, the lead character of a blockbuster film, a teen-ager dressed for Halloween, the saucer-shaped cafe on a desert skyline. This deep familiarity is, to quote Gregory Bateson's definition of *information*, the "difference that makes a difference" to how we approach extra-terrestrial (E.T.) culture as lived experience. For it connects us to sci-fi as sci-fact and reveals factuality itself to be cultural at the core —and some-thing we may-opt to take on faith. Particularly in these insecure times, when information of unknown origin enters our living spaces as a matter of course, and often unbidden, the idea that diversely inhabited worlds contribute in mysterious ways to life's ambiguous messages and contingencies is not so strange. That extraterrestrial life could figure in this socially cosmic mix is something that a third of North Americans believe (Gallop Poll 2000). Thus, the National Geographic Channel can broadcast *Alien Contact* (2004) to a mainstream television audience already primed to hear that "astronomers and astrophysicists and other real scientists —not just nut cases—believe that extraterrestrial life is not preposterous, not possible, but *probable"* (Heffernan 2004). Notable aerospace engineers, among them the director of the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phe­nomena (nicap Unit-3) and the director of the Mutual ufo Network (mufon), can produce book-length manuscripts about the close encoun­ters of astronauts and others claiming that "ETs are here! and have been for thousands of years" (personal communication). While it is not the pur­pose of this book's contributors to interrogate the truth value of such claims or of the documents circulating as evidence in spheres of public culture, we hope to show that there is much to be learned about what it means to be human at particular historical moments by admitting a de-exoticized alien into our ethnoscapes and into the light of anthropology's most searching disciplinary questions.

Galaxies of Discourse

A striking feature of the idea of the extraterrestrial is the extent to which conventionally distinct fields of knowledge cross-connect, collide, or pass through one another under its influence. For "insider" and more detached researchers alike, these galaxies of discourse reconfigure how we relate magic, science, and religion in contemporary practice and, often to actors unaware of this, in terms recalling the science spirituality of times putatively more mystical. The "e.t. effect" of social discourse is in this sense deeply cultural and explicitly historical but also intersubjective. Emanat­ing from the outerspaces of cultural imaginaries, it draws us to the horizons of subjects' innerspaces. Whether we train our attention on the idea of the extraterrestrial (aliens) or alien technologies (ufology), on mystical "chan­nels" of communication or "saucerian" visions (as Ryan Cook writes on his AnthroUfology website), each of these homes to places and times right here on Terra (ef. Melueci 1996).

It follows that the extraterrestrial tests anthropology's methodological grounds as well as its reach, requiring a wide variety of available approaches that present "an opportunity to phenomena that. . . would not be 'given a chance' [to appear]" if they were subjected only to the scientific gaze (Latour 2000: 368). "From the Earth native's point of view," as Susan Lepselter cleverly puts it (1997), alien/UFO religions and online and offline communities, and individual seekers of a "truth that is out there," reveal the inner workings of relations enabled, and disabled, by prospecting starward for social connection, with the expectation that this action is reciprocal.

Our methods bear witness to this reality for seekers of reflexive contact, and take this as a process worthy of investigating.

Since all of us writing in this volume are anthropologists and/or sea­soned ethnographers, our work in one sense or another carries with it the notion of "the field." Classically, this notion calls up images of ethno­graphic fieldwork and representations of unified "societies" and "cultures," and their "institutions" and "customs" in "out-of-the-way places" (as Anna Tsing has put it [1993]). And, indeed, all of these categorical units of analy­sis can lend themselves productively to cross-cultural comparison. In the late nineteenth century's Age of Empire, they aided the young field of anthropology in defining itself as a coherent discipline, distinctively posi­tioned to gain new knowledge of complex alien lives—knowledge of its "Others." More to the point, the subjects themselves participated in this, creating their own Others in their self-definitional identity politics.

Yet e.t. culture —being both of this world and out of it, and, more importantly, being shaped in respect of alien "differences not yet otherness" (Agamben 1999: 126)—subverts us/them categories. To the extent that alternative knowledge networks and communities chart their life courses by means of the occlusions and silences of dominant culture authorities and gaps in walls of knowledge, forming identity by contrast to official culture produces social entities that are inherently "spacey." It follows that any anthropological project that orients itself to local "models of and models for" the social actions of coherent cultures and bounded societies —Clifford Geertz's profound formulation — is unlikely to hold for the subjectivities we encounter here. For theirs is a fluid sociality of contact consciousness in an alien key*;4* making and finding rules of order wherever they find themselves mutually engaged —in, say, conspiracy theories or science Futurism 01 abduction scenarios 01 plans to build an embassy for welcoming E.T. Taken together such sites of social action do not require the encompassing value of a coherent cultural system of belief in order to do the work subjects ask of them. Such subjects abide, suffer, and thrive in a historically contingent social. They orient themselves to the nickering light of mortal prophets, social gatherings of shifting membership, and an eclectic range of material touchstones. One might say that they markedly anticipated anthropology's move out of Empire's shadow, and into critical perspective on Empire's master narratives.

Wherever we turn in history, the movements of these seekers across their distinctive ethnoscapes show the traces of the social insecurity that we as­sociate with "liquid modernity" (to borrow Zygmunt Bauman's phrase) but also traces of hope for a brighter future for humanity than it is managing to produce on its own. A requirement of writing culture in congruence with such space-time topologies, which are from the start complexly, even holographically multisited, is that we keep sight of the fact that for subjects the validity of being "elsewhere" is a given.5 So, too, is the validity of being "elsewhen," whether in the "lost time" of an abduction experience, "in the beginning" of a religious philosophy of alien Creationism, or in the event time of a pilgrimage to the historical *faith sites* of contact and exchange: to Roswell, New Mexico, where *everyone knows* that the first "flying saucer" crashed on an Independence Day weekend in 1947; or to the "mother of all crop circles," created by unidentified artists in the grain fields of south­ern England in 2001. The diversity and numerical growth in the "contact zones" of e.t. culture, which include ufo theme museums, archives and collections of ufological artifacts, talk radio airspace, archaeological sites, television documentaries, Web logs, and so forth, defy us to ignore — as Jodi Dean has observed—that we are living in an "alien age" wherein "the ideal and the material repeatedly cross-cut their separation" (Karen Sykes's com­ment on the network theory of Bruno Latour [2003:157] ).6 As indicated by the limits of our disciplinary technologies, and by our many anthropologi­cal approach routes, out of literary, linguistic, social and cultural theory, history, and science studies, it is our willingness to observe an "ethics of dissensus" (Ziarek 2001) that in the end will determine how successful we are in writing e.t. culture and, too, in realizing our potential for discursive articulation among ourselves as scholars.7

### Our aff criticizes the popular notion of space exploration—what we mean when we say the USfG should explore space is not simply a literal exploration of space, but an ethical criticism that analyses the role that ET plays in the social imagination—this is vital to break down host visitor binaries that only result in violence—the 1AC opens up space for new critical and ethical inquiries
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Overall, then, this volume might be understood as an exploratory project in two registers: a project of reflexive contact involving subjects and alien entities and subjects and cultural researchers in boundary negotiations and exchanges at the sites of e.t. culture. Partly because of this structural af­finity, the two sets of relations can productively engage one another in their departures from the more usual grounds of authority for recognizing mo­dalities of humanness. But, too, since the metaphysical is not essential to such mutually supplemental acts of reflexivity,9 they can, taken together, raise a common, and profound, question regarding who claims the status of "host" and who "visitor" in this discursive realm.10 In this matter, which is centrally about where, how, and when "home" might be found, anthro­pology can pose useful questions in the company of scholars who have engaged alien/UFO beliefs out of religion, political theory, and science cul­ture.11 We do so in anticipation that our questions will yield new knowledge that will supplement and destabilize prior knowledge, acting back on this, and constructively reveal gaps and insufficiencies (see Battaglia 1995; and "For Those Who Are Not Afraid of the Future" in this volume), and new itineraries of critical inquiry.

But fundamentally, if we are doing our work properly, our questions in this volume will acknowledge subjects' own concerning what it is to be human. They will consider, on the one hand, our openness to foreignness within the social spaces we know or have thought we understood as home and, on the other hand, our ability to make sense of everyday lives in which we sometimes seem foreign to ourselves. They will ask who our ancestors are and where they came from; who we are and are not; what throws this knowledge into doubt; and who or what moves us to act, to make choices — that is, where agency is located.

Indeed, agency as an anthropological issue is vastly complexified by e.t. culture. Is it located within us as individual or relational persons or in the space between us? Or in an author or a figure of authority, such as the prophet of a ufo religion or a charismatic writer or interpreter of theosophical texts? Is it contained in a shamanic healer's body or in whomever or whatever possesses it? Or an extraterrestrial scientist/creator's experiment of life on Earth? Or alien technologies: spacecraft, robotic entities, computers that have arrived at their own agendas? Or is agency in the images that act on us? In the popular scenarios of cultural imaginaries of con- 7 tact, abduction, or colonization and invasion and their imaging technolo- Insiders' gies: cameras, sonar, flir sensors, telepathy? In a Web master's vision or Voices in the ether of online chats between ufological researchers or members of Outer-spaces "plugged in" cult religions and fan culture networks? Perhaps agency re­sides in the events that give rise to dissociative states. For that matter, who or what dictates what counts as evidence, and truth, and for whom?

The essays in this volume suggest all of these and also make the argu­ment that extraterrestrial discourse cannot be dismissed as pseudoscience before we know precisely what of social and material consequence to a heterogeneous life on Earth we are dismissing: what the extra in extrater­restrial is and what a view of globalization as planetization is doing for and to the creativity of social life.12

# \*\*Impacts\*\*

## Security Impact (Der Derian)

### Anthropocentricity triggers a futile cycle of resentment towards difference. Self Preservation is the result.

Der Derian, Professor of political science at Brown U, 1995 [James, On Security]

In the last analysis, "love of the neighbor" is always something secondary, partly conventional and arbitrary--illusory in relation to *fear of the neighbor* . After the structure of society is fixed on the whole and seems secure against external dangers**,** it is this fear of the neighbor that again creates new perspectives of moral valuation.

--Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*

Nietzsche transvalues both Hobbes's and Marx's interpretations of security through a genealogy of modes of being. His method is not to uncover some deep meaning or value for security, but to destabilize the intolerable fictional identities of the past which have been created out of fear, and to affirm the creative differences which might yield new values for the future.[33](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note33#note33) Originating in the paradoxical relationship of a contingent life and a certain death, the history of security reads for Nietzsche as an abnegation, a resentment and, finally, a transcendence of this paradox. In brief, the history is one of individuals seeking an impossible security from the most radical "other" of life, the terror of death which**,** once generalized and nationalized, triggers a futile cycle of collective identities seeking security from alien others--who are seeking similarly impossible guarantees. It is a story of differences taking on the otherness of death, and identities calcifying into a fearful sameness. Since Nietzsche has suffered the greatest neglect in international theory, his reinterpretation of security will receive a more extensive treatment here.

One must begin with Nietzsche's idea of the will to power, which he clearly believed to be prior to and generative of all considerations of security. In *Beyond Good and Evil* , he emphatically establishes the primacy of the will to power: "Physiologists should think before putting down the instinct of self-preservation as the cardinal instinct of an organic being.A living thing seeks above all to ***discharge***  its strength--life itself is will to power; self-preservation is only one of the most frequent results."[34](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note34#note34)

The will to power, then, should not be confused with a Hobbesian perpetual *desire*  for power. It can, in its negative form, produce a reactive and resentful longing for *only*  power, leading, in Nietzsche's view, to a triumph of nihilism. But Nietzsche refers to a *positive*  will to power, an active and affective force of becoming, from which values and meanings--including self-preservation--are produced which affirm life. Conventions of security act to suppress rather than confront the fears endemic to life, for ". . . life itself is *essentially*  appropriation, injury, overpowering of what is alien and weaker; suppression, hardness, imposition of one's own forms, incorporation and at least, at its mildest, exploitation--but why should one always use those words in which slanderous intent has been imprinted for ages."[35](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note35#note35) Elsewhere Nietzsche establishes the pervasiveness of agonism in life: "life is a consequence of war, society itself a means to war."**[36](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note36#note36)** But the denial of this permanent condition, the effort to disguise it with a consensual rationality or to hide from it with a fictional sovereignty, are all effects of this suppression of fear.

The desire for security is manifested as a collective resentment of difference**--**that which is not us, not certain, not predictable.Complicit with a negative will to power is the fear-driven desire for protection from the unknown. Unlike the positive will to power, which produces an aesthetic affirmation of difference, the search for truth produces a truncated life which conforms to the rationally knowable, to the causally sustainable. In *The Gay Science* , Nietzsche asks of the reader: "Look, isn't our need for knowledge precisely this need for the familiar, the will to uncover everything strange, unusual, and questionable, something that no longer disturbs us? Is it not the *instinct of fear* that bids us to know? And is the jubilation of those who obtain knowledge not the jubilation over the restoration of a sense of security?"[37](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note37#note37)

The fear of the unknown and the desire for certainty combine to produce a domesticated life, in which causality and rationality become the highest sign of a sovereign self, the surest protection against contingent forces. The fear of fate assures a belief that everything reasonable is true, and everything true, reasonable. In short, the security imperative produces, and is sustained by, the strategies of knowledge which seek to explain it. Nietazsche elucidates the nature of this generative relationship in *The Twilight of the Idols* :

The causal instinct is thus conditional upon, and excited by, the feeling of fear. The "why?" shall, if at all possible, not give the cause for its own sake so much as for a *particular kind of cause* --a cause that is comforting, liberating and relieving. . . . That which is new and strange and has not been experienced before, is excluded as a cause. Thus one not only searches for some kind of explanation, to serve as a cause, but for a particularly selected and preferred kind of explanation--that which most quickly and frequently abolished the feeling of the strange, new and hitherto unexperienced: the most *habitual*  explanations.[38](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note38#note38)

A safe life requires safe truths. The strange and the alien remain unexamined**,** the unknown becomes identified as evil, and evil provokes hostility--recycling the desire for security. The "influence of timidity," as Nietzsche puts it, creates a people who are willing to subordinate affirmative values to the "necessities" of security: "they fear change, transitoriness: this expresses a straitened soul, full of mistrust and evil experiences."[39](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note39#note39)

The unknowable which cannot be contained by force or explained by reason is relegated to the off-world. "Trust," the "good," and other common values come to rely upon an "artificial strength": "the feeling of *security* such as the Christian possesses; he feels strong in being able to trust, to be patient and composed: he owes this artificial strength to the illusion of being protected by a god."[40](http://www.ciaonet.org/book/lipschutz/lipschutz12.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22note40#note40)

## Imperialism Impact

### “The strive for Occidental Conformity comes with a Fear of a Superior Being. The Occidental has never Encountered another Culture Superior to theirs. Alien Phenomena poses a Threat to Anthropocentricity.”

Michael E. Zimmerman I. Western Anthropocentrism and Radical Othernes, Encountering Alien Otherness, The Concept of the Foreign, ed. Rebecca Saunders (Lanham, Maryland: LexingtonBooks, 2002), 153-177 (PhD, Tulane, 1974) is Professor of Philosophy and former Director of the[Center for Humanities and the Arts](http://www.colorado.edu/ArtsSciences/CHA/) at CU Boulder.

In using hyberbolic doubt methodologically to establish an indubitable foundation for certainty, Descartes maintained that the doctrine of solipsism is difficult to refute. For all I know, so he argued in his Meditations, the "people" whom I encounter are really complex automata, lacking the self-consciousness that characterizes my own existence. Only the goodness of a non-deceiving and necessarily existing God justifies concluding that there are others who are endowed with rational intelligence similar to my own. Many of Descartes' contemporaries denied the validity of his proofs for the existence of God. Hence, they had to find different ways of overcoming skepticism in general and solipsism in particular, i.e., skepticism about the reality of minds other than one's own. Addressing the problems of skepticism and solipsism led many philosophers into an epistemological thicket, but others dealt with these problems either by arguing that individual mind cannot be understood apart from the social interaction that gives rise to it, or simply by assuming that other people do have minds of one sort or another. Some of the latter doubted, however, whether commoners, women, and New World natives possessed rational minds, that is to say, minds like those of modern, educated, male Europeans. Contemporary critics charge that those thinkers ratified an ethno-logo-theo-phallo-centrism that justified subordination of non-Western peoples, women, and lower class males, whose subjectivity allegedly lacks the rationality necessary for inclusion in the class of fully human beings. Here, it may be useful to remind ourselves that in seeking an indubitable basis for certainty, Descartes sought to overcome the skepticism generated by the discovery of New World peoples whose dramatically different cosmological framework, customs, and religious beliefs made them seem other than human: either noble savages or brutal beasts. In affirming the universal rationality of humankind, and in thus putting a particular spin on the Christian doctrine that all people are children of God, Descartes was attempting to do something besides privileging a certain kind of subjectivity. He was trying to restore8 coherence to a world shattered by contact with the other, even though in so doing he provided some other Europeans with a category--rationality--that was misused to marginalize non-Europeans and other social groups who were allegedly less than rational and thus not fully human. Extant firsthand accounts show a variety of native American responses to first encounters with the European others, who were often mounted on horseback, arrayed in metal armor, equipped with advanced technology, and often driven by goals (e.g., lust for gold) that the natives often either could not comprehend or regarded with contempt. Many native Americans, exhibiting a nearly universal human response, regarded the powerful aliens with a mixture of "hope and fear." 11 According to James Axtell, "The Indians regarded the Europeans' ability to fashion incredible objects and make them work less as mechanical aptitude than as spiritual power." 12 Many natives interpreted mass deaths in villages (unintentionally actually caused by diseases introduced by colonists) as a sign that Europeans had shamanic powers, capable of slaying from a distance without visible weapons. Though such apparently godlike powers led to worldview collapse for some native cultures, others remained convinced of their superiority in comparison with European greed and selfishness. 13 Since the voyages of Columbus, Westerners have never encountered a technologically more advanced culture. In view of the deleterious consequences that colonization had on New World cultures, some people are concerned about the potential repercussions of human contact with technologically superior aliens. Aware of the frequently deleterious consequences of Western colonization, contemporary science fiction writers often describe the "prime directive" of future interstellar exploration as noninterference in the development of technologically les­s-developed cultures. Although encountering morally and technically superior aliens might be a boon for humankind, many people are understandably concerned about the religious and political repercussion of such an encounter. Hence, in 1961, federally-funded researchers concluded that NASA should9 consider concealing from the public any discovery of non-human intelligent life, whether existing or extinct. 14 In fact, even though New World cultures were obviously profoundly influenced and often destroyed by contact, Old World civilization was hardly left unscathed. The discovery of alien cultures on continents that were not even supposed to be there posed an enormous challenge to Occidental self-understanding. Though conquests brought wealth, discovery of native others also caused Western man a narcissistic trauma perhaps even more serious than that brought about by the Copernican revolution, and later by those of Darwin and Freud. Far from being at the center of the universe and thus the main preoccupation of divine Providence, contact with New World peoples suggested that European civilization was simply one among many others. Cultural foundations tottered as the attention of Europeans was drawn to maps on which vast new lands were being inked in as fast as explorers could survey them. What critics of modernity describe as the West's hegemonic drive to transform the other into the same, to incorporate difference into self-identity, has complex roots. In part, however, it involves an obsessive attempt to digest what ethnocentric and anthropocentric Westerners could not assimilate: the possibility that Occidental culture is not the culmination of human life, not the goal of Creation, and not the source of all truth, value, and meaning.15

# \*\*Solvency\*\*

## Solvency—Community/Nationalism Kritik

### Our affirmation of E.T. culture deconstructs homogenizing and nationalistic conceptions of community in favor of community in disconnect which is appropriate to our de-centered and ever changing postmodern society.

Debbora Battaglia, Anthropology—Mounty Holyoke, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 31-3

Of course, it should come as no surprise that the notion of community cannot withstand its deconstruction by the online/offline networks of seekers defining themselves by their alien ability from orthodox science 0r religion or mainstream society. Whether in play or in religious or political action, or by more accidental convergences, the point of coming together — to play or watch Yugioh games, to speak Klingon, to perform their love of alien ancestors—is the sense they share that in any other terms the world eludes their secure purchase on it. Zygmund Bauman reminds us in more pragmatic language that the future is the "natural habitat" of the notion of community, not the present day. Furthermore, community brings in this futures "'feel' that is invariably good" (2002: 4-5), promising a security and serenity that is only knowable in contrast to friction and that only a fantasist could expect it to deliver without the sacrifice of freedom. So, while it is not beyond the capacity of the community ideal to extend an open invitation to its secure spaces—to present itself as host to those who would find themselves and one another in its terms—participants in e.t. culture who seek identity in such terms are central only to themselves. Functionally, they are communities in disconnect*.* It follows that their participants are often not beholden to any (other) nation or offer their uncritical allegiance to the rhetoric of nationness or any such persua­sion of belonging. Where outerspaces are places of both persecution and liberation, community becomes a project for the bricoleur (Barkun 1998: 442, crediting the anthropologist Richard Werbner [1989]).

This presents a real problem for the idea of a community "pragmati­cally constructed from many starting points" toward the goal of social equi­librium (Laclau 1996: 114) since "community" in such terms presumes a world system unbending to the e.t. effect, that is, it requires placing an impractical value on coherence.35 In this regard, e.t. "planetizers" are weirdly akin to Bauman's "new elite" and the "secession of the successful," whose world is not defined by any locality: it is truly and fully extraterrestrial. Extraterrestri-ality alone is guaranteed to be a community-free zone . . . where togetherness is understood as sameness. . . . There is a very narrow, if any interface between the "territory of extraterrestriality" and the lands in which its various outposts and half-way inns happen to be physically located. (2002: 54-58)

In short, the good faith notion of Bauman's "warm circle" of community, while in effect a "virtual actuality," may be the best that modernity can offer those who abide in alternative culture outerspaces.

## Solvency—Anxiety

### Our anxiety about aliens is a displacement and crystallization of our fears of otherness more generally—the AFF’s embrace of the fractured-ness of post-modern subject creation creates a culture of respect for difference across the board.

Debbora Battaglia, Anthropology—Mounty Holyoke, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 9-12

I have proposed that the idea of the extraterrestrial is shaped in response to inadequacies of cultural models for explaining lived experience or, more exactly, the parameters of lived experience. Where E.T. culture recognizes a marked ambiguity, contingency, and power structure of unknown origin and dimensions, other explanatory systems might find miracles, spirit possession, and the like. It is when attempts to comprehend social worlds draw us off our common maps of connection with other earthly beings, when we move out of sight of our internal and external structures for making sense of our relations, that we enter worlds apart. Entering these worlds is one thing when it is we who are going there, together, for example, as a mem­ber of a ufo movement or minority religious or therapeutic community or network. It is another thing when we are alone, in our own mortal skins. The "God of the Gaps,"18 as theologians derisively label divine intervention invoked to explain whatever science cannot, could be e.t. — a foreignness appropriate to lived experience beyond comprehension and our zones of comfort and visibility. Or, as put to me by John Mack, pioneering psychoanalyst of abduction experiencers, "Call it et or anything you like. What we are really dealing with is epistemological shock."

Virginia Aronson, a researcher of "celestial healing" experiences, relates the following observations of an e.t. believer, Connie Isele, who when she wrote them was a student of psychology in Colorado and a survivor of a serious car accident. While her car was sailing off a bridge, Isele experi­enced "a rip in time and space" in which extraterrestrials intervened to save her life and later watched over her recovery. Many years after the "little miracle" of waking from a coma and after extensive therapeutic bodywork, she describes herself as "living like a normal human being" except that:

Lately, I have noticed that E.T communication often comes through to my con­sciousness in the form of my own thoughts. With everything mingled together, I am not sure which thoughts are truly my own. I believe that all my thoughts are *mine,* but may be formed due to previous discussions and agreements that I am not aware of consciously. Occasionally, I find myself feeling very odd. I call this condition "la-la land," requiring much more concentration than normal. I may feel dizzy, my own voice sounding odd and distorted. Everything feels slower, my surroundings sharper and brighter, yet somehow distorted. *Reality* seems dis­torted, in sense and shape. I *feel as if I am inside a fish bowl, looking out at a world I don't quite understand.* (1999: 79, emphasis in final sentence mine)

Remove the reference to e.t. from Connie Isele's account and "la-la land" could as well be a description of intensive care unit psychosis from a patient's point of view, for that matter, many of us can relate to the fishbowl effect as a feature of the postmodern condition. There is no shortage in any earthly society of explanatory models for dissociative slates or unexplained phenomena and an array of sanctioned responses to them. For the devils within, or the malevolent effects of witches, sorcerers, or angry ancestors, we can turn to the exorcisms, offerings, and other sacrifices of spirit mediums and priests or to the healing hand of God or Jesus or the Virgin Mary. Connie Isele could have credited angels with saving her life or her doctors or nurses or an online religious community's prayers or the healing energy of her children's love and care. So, while we return to the question of what the extra in extraterrestrial is doing for and to her narrative, what it expresses, it is its social consequences we must determine.

I want to use this question to raise two significant problems we encounter in approaching the extraterrestrial as a matter of either "teratology" or "paranoia,"19 that is, an abomination of sociality or psychology, respec­tively.20 The first requires that Connie Isele's experience not be exiled to a discourse that is worlds apart from more commonplace expressions of help­lessness and absence of support. Subjects in an e.t. state of mind are not in the grip of some excessive knowledge that renders them monsters to them­selves. Neither are they wholly "mirroring" the social problems that gave rise to their precarious situation. Rather, la-la land—where one goes in a state of partial disconnect from oneself as others see one —is an uncanny realm of disturbance of a mirroring everyday habitus.21 The e.t. realm is not "other" than earthly but acts back on and unsettles assumptions about commonplace brands of knowledge.

A paradoxical consequence for subjects such as Connie Isele is a fresh appreciation of human life in an expanded sense of its possible affinities — frightening and/or fulfilling. Again, from this perspective, extraterrestrial encounters reveal themselves as ways of thinking about the unexpected or contingent rather than in and of themselves uncanny, which is my sec­ond point.

Julia Kristeva captures this "prospective, fragmentary, 'subjective'" everyday mode of being, which is "more than demonstrative or didactic" in describing how:

Foreignness, an uncanny one, creeps into the tranquility of reason itself, and, without being restricted to madness, beauty, or faith anymore than to ethnicity of race, irrigates our very speaking-being, estranged by other logics, including the heterogeneity of biology. ... Henceforth, we know that we are foreigners to ourselves, and it is with the help of that sole support that we can attempt to live with others. (1991: 169-70)

This creeping sense, this intimate foreignness "within reason" (as Marcus [1999] puts it) —in other terms, the idea of the extraterrestrial —can relieve us from the duty to maintain either homogeneity or connection across all our different contexts of social action, the freedom to part company with normative social structures. Further, it can support, strangely but quite pragmatically, our creative leaps into hypothesis—into the gaps of com­prehension that are requisite for imagining new forms of relationality and new ways of knowing—and thus of agency and empowerment.

## Solvency

### As technology advances it becomes more difficult to decide what is “reasonable” and “rational.” Ufology provides a window into what American culture will become.

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 9-10, book.

Such dismissals, handed out ever more frequently as science increas­ingly impacts on our lives, contribute to the mistrust that pervades con­temporary democracy. Those in positions of power deploy terms like "rea­sonable" and "rational." Previously, the victims of this deployment, the "unreasonable" and "irrational," remained isolated. They had difficulty getting attention and fighting back. Now, thanks to widespread develop­ments in communication networks, the "irrational" can get their message out. They can find and connect with those myriad others also dismissed by science. They can network and offer alternatives to official deployments or reason. They can reclaim their rationality on their own terms.

What happens when there is so much suspicion of terms like "reason­able" and "rational" that one can no longer tell what an informed decision on a matter like, say, partial-birth abortion or nuclear waste storage might look like? This is where America is today. We face a situation of profound blurring, of complex interconnection, that has profoundly altered the conditions we use to establish the intelligibility of an issue or judgment. We have permanent media. Although not yet seamless, as proponents of push technologies — which, like TV, deliver messages without the user having to search for them — advocate, the experience of media in millennial America smears lines between ad and information, product and producer, ad and product, entertainment and all of the above.23 The new communi­cation technologies make possible connections between persons and infor­mation that were once unimaginable. These include temporal and spatial connections: I can see images from Mars now, in real time. They include conceptual and visual connections, "special effects" no longer limited to Industrial Light and Magic but available from Photoshop for the splicer on a budget. How can we tell whether a person in a photo was inserted or really there?

Access to media and technology affects the practices of democracy. More opinions, more contestations are possible than before simply because of the ease of connection. Dismissing others' opinions is more likely to provoke outrage, to get some kind of response, even if only a few thousand people on the Internet are watching. The lines of thinking, the networks of discursive authority that had remained separate, are now more likely to blur as more people know more about what happens. Yet, they still may not know what it means or even if it *really* happened. How can I know which statement on partial abortion reflects "facts" the pro-life movement wants to disseminate? How can I know whether this is an issue on which I might change my mind or compromise?

UFOs, aliens, and abduction provide ideal vehicles for accessing the ef­fects of these changes on American society. America has a long history of contestations, fringe groups, and conspiracy theorists. Now, though, any contest, any group, any theory has more opportunity to acquire an audi­ence, to link into a network where it won't be obscured by those parts of our culture with claims to public or political status. Because of the perva­siveness of UFO belief and the ubiquity of alien imagery, ufology is an es­pecially revealing window into current American paranoia and distrust. We might say that it's "of the fringe" though no longer "on the fringe."

## Solvency

### The alien takes away our ability to tell friend from foe. But, it also shows us that the distinction between the two is an illusion. It takes down borders, and our ability to create boundaries.

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 175, book.

The alien steals a security we never had. Describing the complexity of abductees' emotional lives, Budd Hopkins explains:

We get through life partly by the fact that we can read another's face, we can read their body language, we can get some sense of emotion. All of those things are denied us during contact with aliens. There's really no way we can tell what they understand about us. Their understand­ing might be incredibly subtle in some ways, but miss on some other major things. There's no way to know. . . . One man I've worked with who is an abductee said to me, "Budd, when I was standing there with them, if I could have thought of them as enemies and cranked myself up with hate, I would have somehow handled the whole thing better. But," he said, "it was the ambivalence of not knowing what this is, the total confusion. This isn't an enemy, it isn't a friend, it's not like me. What is it? I can't read it." He said the confusion added to his sense of helplessness.40

The aliens steal our security, our ability to tell friend from enemy. They take away our capacity to establish borders, boundaries. Deep down, of course, these borders have been illusions. Some things never really fit. So, while it is often thought that the alien is that which is completely other, the abduction discourse exposes the alien as that which reminds us that noth­ing is completely other (and everything is somewhat other), that the very border between "like" and "unlike" is illusory.

### UFO confirmation will change Earth’s economic and political structures.

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 33, book.

With its "one world" outlook, chosen people, and mood of eminent ar­rival, the UFO discourse echoes key themes in American apocalypticism.23 Telling and retelling how in 1947 Kenneth Arnold saw "nine disks flying like a saucer skipped over the water" and how the media distorted this ac­count by coining the fanciful and dismissing phrase "flying saucers," ufology produces its originary moment. It does so in order to overcome it in the end: when the aliens come, the ufologists' careful perseverance will tri­umph over the scorn of ufology's critics as the truth is revealed and the credibility of witnesses and UFO researchers is restored. Relying on this future confirmation of the truth, ufology projects end-time scenarios based on the ontological shock we will face when the aliens come. The UFO re­searcher Stanton Friedman argues that government confirmation of con­tact with aliens and their superior technology will shatter earthly economic and political structures.24

## Solvency

### The plan is vital to change the culture of secrecy and paranoia that permeates current society—to be open to the idea that there could be more intelligent life besides humans shatters the violent anthropocentric metaphysics that currently dominates space politics

Michael E. Zimmerman Encountering Alien Otherness The Concept of the Foreign, ed. Rebecca Saunders (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2002), 153-177;

Obviously, alien abduction is usually not taken seriously in "better" academic neighborhoods. This is so partly because researchers fear being ridiculed for openly investigating the seemingly preposterous allegations that people are being abducted by nonhuman aliens, and partly because verifiable discovery of highly intelligent non-human beings—whether flesh-and-blood E.T.s or beings from other dimensions--could have a devastating effect on many people, perhaps especially on academics adhering to the view that humankind alone is the source of all meaning, purpose, and value. Academics concerned with the plight of immigrants and the consequences of colonialism, however, have4something to learn from examining the psychological consequences that occur when people experience abduction by apparently non-human others, whatever may be the nature or origin of such perceived others. In addition to helping to alleviate the suffering and isolation experienced by so many abductees, academic study of the abduction phenomenon would help to shed light on the universal human fear of and attraction to otherness. Finally, research needs to be done on the social, cultural, and political consequences of widespread public belief that the government knows far more about UFOs, E.T.s, and alien abduction than it is willing to admit. To what extent does official ignorance about the abduction phenomenon fuel the fires of right-wing paranoia about government support of and intrigue with "aliens" of all kinds? 9 Recently, concern about foreign immigrants has grown in Western countries to which people from poorer countries (including former colonies) are flocking to escape political oppression and to find work. For many tourists, encountering otherness-- distinctive clothing, different skin color, odd cultural practices, unusual cuisines--is the whole point of traveling. Having those exotic others immigrating to one's own country is another matter altogether, however. Politicians frequently try to gain political power by turning foreigners--and even citizens who can be portrayed as sufficiently other—into scapegoats for the country's woes**.** In the U.S., for example, immigrant-bashers play on the fears that some people have about losing their jobs to immigrants, even though job loss is more often due to decisions taken by powerful transnational economic interests. Evenpeople not immediately threatened by outsiders will often join in disparaging or expelling them. People tend to project mortality and evil onto outsiders, aliens, others. By dominating or even destroying the death- and evil-bearing other, the dominant group feels as if it has conquered death and evil. 10 Due to surging human populations, rapid shifts in capital investment and economic structures, environmental degradation, and greater ease of travel, mass migrations will only increase. Given the destructive capacity of current weapons, humanity may either have come to terms with otherness, or else risk destroying itself.5 Just as people have used differences in skin color, religion, gender, cultural practices, language, ideology, and economics to justify violence against other humans, people have also used differences between humans and other life forms to justify needless violence against plants, animals, and entire ecosystems. For centuries, people have claimed that one trait or another--from tool using to linguistic ability--demonstrates human superiority over other life. The nineteenth century doctrine of Manifest Destiny proclaimed that a united American people (white, of European descent) was bound to "develop" the continent's natural resources from coast to coast. Modernity’s ideology of anthropocentric humanism, which “others” nature by depicting it solely as an instrument for human ends, generates enormous ecological problems. In recent decades, the “dark side” of modernity has come in for deserved criticism. Despite its undeniable problems, however, modernity has also made possible great improvements in political freedom, material well-being, scientific knowledge, and human lifespan. Unfortunately, modernity’s efforts to elevate humankind to the top of the cosmic heap have generally come at the expense of other life forms. Even if humans are more fully conscious or intelligent than (most) other animals, this fact does not justify insensitive treatment of so-called "lower" species. The capacity for greater awareness brings with it an obligation to exhibit care and respect for all sentient life. Just as many religious and democratic traditions have called for an end to dehumanizing attitudes found in racism, sexism, and xenophobic nationalism, many environmentalists now urge humankind to acknowledge its kinship with and dependence on the rest of terrestrial life. Attempts to "dominate" both nature and other human beings remain attractive, however, partly because they alleviate anxiety about personal and social mortality and evil. *Success in curbing the**human urge to dominate domination hinges on increased psychological and social**integration, which leads individuals and groups to face up to, instead of projecting, their own mortality and proclivity toward evil.* A constructive postmodernity will make such integration a top priority.6 The first part of this essay briefly studies how colonial Westerners reacted to their encounter with technologically inferior non-Europeans, and how those non-Europeans reacted to their encounter with the technologically superior Europeans. We know that in non-Europeans often suffered from that encounter, but what is less well known is the extent to which European culture never quite recovered from the culturally decentering blow of contact with native peoples in the New World, even though those people were colonized and often enslaved. Descartes' search for an indubitable foundation for truth was motivated partly by the skepticism that arose after discovery of New World peoples. Arguably, the brutal cultural and ecological practices involved in Western colonialism reflects Western man's desperate effort to reassure himself about his own cultural centrality. Having treated allegedly inferior human others so ferociously a few centuries ago**,** how might Westerners expect to be treated if discovered and colonized by technologically superior others? The second part of the essay investigates the extent to which the phenomenon of alien abduction can shed light on human experience of the foreign, the other, the "alien." Temporarily bracketing the question of the ontological status of these aliens, I focus on the experience reported by abductees. Even if such experience is ultimately explicable in terms of complex psychological processes, and thus even if the aliens turn out not to be "objectively" present, much can be learned by examining the experience involved in encountering what at least seemed to be radically other. Moreover, study of such experience may suggest that mainstream views of "reality" may need to be expanded. Because the abduction experience is too complex to be studied exhaustively in an essay of this length, I will focus on one particular aspect of it: the experience of being apprehended by the alien gaze. Finally, I speculate briefly about possible parallels between how native American

cultures were affected by contact with technologically-advanced European others and how contemporary American culture might be affected by contact with technologically-advanced non-humans.7

## Solvency

### Reducing the amount of classified government information is key to keeping high relations between the government and the public.

Moynihan, American Politician and Sociologist. Et al ’97. (REPORT  of the  COMMISSION ON  PROTECTING AND REDUCING  GOVERNMENT SECRECY, SENATE DOCUMENT, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, 1997, http://www.gpo.gov/congress/commissions/secrecy/index.html)

In a democratic society, the citizens both choose their governors and are the governed. This dual role of the public has produced a tension between the need for secrecy and the need to keep government accountable. Broad access to information is critical for government officials to shape well-reasoned policies and for the public to monitor those it has elected to act on its behalf. However, expansion of the Government’s national security bureaucracy since the end of World War II and the closed environment in which it has operated have outpaced attempts by the Congress and the public to oversee that bureaucracy’s activities.

As Chapter II made clear, core secrets do exist that need the highest level of protection. There is widespread agreement, even by those who most vigorously support broad declassification, that there are many types of government information that will always require zealous protection—for example, sources whose exposure would jeopardize human life; signals intelligence or imagery, the loss of which would profoundly hinder the capability to collect data; information that would assist chemical, biological, or nuclear proliferators; and details about special military capabilities. However, these types of information are only a portion of the universe of information that now is classified. This chapter focuses on the rest of the classified world, including policy, analysis, factual, and historical data, and how to ensure its public availability when it no longer needs protection.

Ensuring public access to information that does not require protection is a key to striking the balance between secrecy and the openness that is central to the proper functioning of this country’s political institutions. There has been a gradual but encouraging shift in recent years on the part of many agencies that use classified information toward declassifying and releasing more of that information to the public. Some agencies realize that better relations with the public can grow from easier access to agency records that no longer need protection. Openness can also demonstrate to the world, especially newly-emerging democracies that are beginning to open their own countries’ archives, the strength of our free institutions.

Other benefits flow from moving information that no longer needs protection out of the classification system. Broad access to information promotes better decisions. It permits public understanding of the activities of government and promotes more informed debate and accountability. It increases the Government’s ability to respond to criticism and justify its actions to the public. It makes possible the free exchange of scientific information and encourages new discoveries that foster economic growth. By allowing a better understanding of our history, it provides opportunities to learn lessons from the past, and it makes it easier to quash unfounded speculation about the

Government’s past actions. Reducing the amount of information in the classification system allows for better management and cost controls of that system and increases respect for the information that needs to stay protected. Greater access thus provides ground in which the public’s faith in its government can flourish.

## Legal System

### People on Earth will eventually have to develop a system of law that can be used in space which takes into account species found living in space in any form

Billings ‘06 (Dr. Linda Billings PhD Communication Studies SETI Institute Volume 22 Issue 4) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964606000749

Whether the development model or the wilderness model prevails beyond Earth, space-based human communities will need to adopt some system of governance. The idea of space jurisprudence—the governance of “relations between earthkind and spacekind and among spacekind themselves”—has been explored. “First principles for the governance of space societies” and a “spacekind declaration of independence” have been proposed for future space migrants and space natives. It has been suggested that the key Outer Space Treaty concept of space as the common heritage of humankind could well serve as a keystone principle of future space law (or ‘astrolaw’) as well. It will doubtless be difficult for terrestrial experts to conceptualize social and legal structures for extraterrestrial human communities: “How do we design social structures and reflective legal regimes for human societies in space on the basis of empirical data generated by Earth-sitters?”.

# \*\*T\*\*

## 2AC T Space Exploration

### T\*\*\*

Reiman ’10 (Saara Reiman Department of Political and Economic Studies in the University of Helsinki.) On Sustainable Exploration of Space and Extraterrestrial Life

"Space junk" has already become a problem and poses dangerous and potentiality catastrophic risks to astronauts. Species destruction and environmental damage is also more or less uncontrolled (Ceballos et al., 2010; Cains 2010; Moriarty and Honnery 2010; Reese, 2010; Trainer 2010). Many believe we are facing a 6th extinction crisis (Ceballos et al., 2010; McKee 2010; Jones 2009; Tonn 2010). Clearly our existing moral principles when it comes to life and the environment are far from ideal. Perhaps we should be careful not to continue exploring space based on the same values we employ on Earth. One important benefit of space exploration could, therefore, be philosophical in nature: developing a sustainable model of exploration and exploitation of environments. Jacques Arnould and Andr� Debus have argued that ethics is in some sense the next frontier of space exploration (Arnould & Debus 2008).

Reiman ’10 (Saara Reiman Department of Political and Economic Studies in the University of Helsinki.) On Sustainable Exploration of Space and Extraterrestrial Life

Explorative science is characterized by the need to act in epistemically imperfect conditions, that is, in conditions characterized by uncertainty and ignorance about facts normally considered important for moral decision making. In a new environment, it is very difficult to properly anticipate all possible scenarios or weigh the actual risks attached to suggested actions. In a Mars mission, this condition is highlighted since communication to Earth will be slow. Astronauts will need to be able to make big moral decisions independently, without consultation with the mission control center on Earth. In making such decisions, there is great ignorance regarding important factors that might affect our decisionmaking. In risk theory, Aven and Renn (2009) have stated that "Risk refers to uncertainty about and severity of the events and consequences (or outcomes) of an activity with respect to something that humans value." Arnould and Debus (2008) have elegantly summed up the problem: in an ideal world, we would wait until we understood things before we did them. But in the actual world, we usually need to act in partial ignorance in order to gain understanding. Somewhere along the journey from ignorance to understanding, is experience. Science, by definition, is all about making that journey of discovery. The beginning of sustainability, then, is acknowledging this need to act in ignorance and adopting an ethic that can work under these conditions. In space exploration, the risks can not be reliably measured and all possible outcomes of actions can not be anticipated. For the purposes of moral decisionmaking, risk analysis does not work well in an exploration situation. Fortunately, there are better alternatives available.

## 2AC T/FW

### Our AFF is key topic education—debating the ethics of ET encounters is key to ethical decision-making about space exploration.

Seth D. Baum, Geography—Penn State, 2010

“Universalist Ethics in Extraterrestrial Encounter,” Acta Astronautica Volume 66, Issues 3-4 February-March 2010, p 617-23

To date, humanity has never encountered extraterrestrial life, let alone an extraterrestrial civilization. However, we can also not rule out the possibility that such an encounter will occur. Indeed, insights from the Drake equation (see e.g. [1]) suggest that such an encounter may be likely. As human exploration of space progresses, such an encounter may become increasingly likely. Thus analysis of what would happen in the event of an extraterrestrial encounter is of considerable significance. This analysis is particularly important for the astronautics community to consider given that it is on the leading edge of space exploration**.**

There is extensive debate on what would be the outcome of an encounter between humanity and an extraterrestrial civilization. This debate can also be extended to consider encounters between two extraterrestrial civilizations. Much of the debate centers on the moral character of the extraterrestrials and the significance of this for how humanity would fare in such an encounter. Several commentators have speculated that the extraterrestrials would be benevolent and thus safe to humans [2] and [3] while others have speculated that the extraterrestrials would be malicious and thus dangerous to humans [4] and [5]. For broad reviews of the debate, see [1] and [6].

This paper considers an important set of scenarios, largely overlooked by the existing literature, in which either humanity or the extraterrestrial civilization or both act according to a universalist ethical framework. Universalist ethics roughly refers to ethics where the two civilizations value specific aspects of each other equally, regardless of which civilization these aspects occur in. Universalist ethics is defined more precisely and elaborated in greater detail in Section 2. Meanwhile, for purposes of this article, civilization can be defined as a system of individuals working towards some common objective. Heterogeneity within a civilization, though undoubtedly important, is beyond the scope of this article.

Ethics in general, and universalist ethics in particular, are important in humanity–extraterrestrial encounters because the outcome of such an encounter will depend not only on the relative strengths of the civilizations (i.e. who would destroy the other in an inter-civilizational war) but also on some specifics of the ethics held by the civilizations. Encounters in which one or both civilizations act according to a universalist framework hold particularly interesting properties. For example, if each civilization acts according to a different universalist framework, then an encounter might lead to a race between the civilizations to be the first one to commit suicide. Section 3 discusses a broad range of encounter scenarios involving universalism.

The particular specifics of universalist ethics possibly held by humanity or extraterrestrials have important implications both for human civilization strategy and for contemporary ethics. The implications for civilizational strategy, discussed in Section 4, are important for humanity's planning for extraterrestrial encounters and its response should such an encounter occur. The basic message is that humanity would be wise to consider extraterrestrials’ ethics in addition to their war-fighting strengths, because the ethics can be as an important factor in the outcome of an encounter. The implications for contemporary ethics, discussed in Section 5, hold even if no encounter occurs. In particular, the possibility of extraterrestrial encounter challenges certain forms of anthropocentrism commonly found in contemporary human ethics because extraterrestrials might be superior to humans on the same grounds that humans consider ourselves to be superior to other Earth species.

# \*\*Sovereignty Adv\*\*

## Abductee Internal Link

### The same is true for the abductee phenomenon whereby individuals are demonized as irrational and crazy for voicing their experiences—the plan is key to a fundamental consciousness shift that changes the way beings relate to one another

Michael E. Zimmerman Encountering Alien Otherness The Concept of the Foreign, ed. Rebecca Saunders (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2002), 153-177;

As if the old struggle to respect all people regardless of differences, and the emerging endeavor to esteem all terrestrial life were not enough to occupy human attention, our species may eventually have to cope with the discovery of radically different others,7for example**,** extraterrestrials (E.T.’s) that may be mentally and technologically superior to humans. Ever since Galileo opened the closed medieval cosmos, people have been both attracted and repelled by the possibility that we not alone in the universe. Although scientists conclude that no reliable evidence has yet been found that E.T.s exist, many people believe that such evidence does exist, in the form of unidentified aircraft sighted by thousands of reliable observers since the 1940s. 1 More striking, however, is the astonishing claim made by thousands of contemporary people that they have been abducted by highly intelligent, non-human aliens. Accounts of alien abductions differ from one another in some respects, but they also reveal important similarities. 2 In a typical abduction, a person is (or persons are) taken from a bedroom, car, boat, or footpath, floated into a strange room (sometimes on board a hovering craft that resembles a classic flying saucer), frequently subjected to painful physical examinations, often told momentous information (whose details are usually forgotten) or shown scenes of an ecologically devastated planet, often informed that they will remember their abduction "when it is time," and in most cases returned to the point where the abduction began. 3 Though many abductees realize that a period of time is unaccountably missing from memory, they often cannot recall what has happened to them, though about one-fourth of abductees do have conscious memories of their abductions. Other abductees recover memories through hypnotic regression, the trustworthiness of which is the subject of considerable debate. Abduction is usually not a one-time affair, but2 begins early in childhood and continues through the reproductive years. A number of abductees report that the aliens remove sperm and egg samples, which are allegedly used to generate "hybrid" babies, half-human, half-alien. Speculation abounds about the possible significance of this bizarre practice, but no one really knows what is taking place. Sleep disorders, hallucinatory states, fantasy proneness, temporal lobe seizures, and other psychological and/or physiological disorders may shed light on certain aspects of the abduction experience, but no single explanation or group of explanations has yet been able to account for the full range of phenomena associated with it. 4 Abductees who have undergone psychologically evaluative testing usually score within the "normal" range. 5 My own discussions with more than two dozen abductees have revealed nothing unusual about their personalities, though tests indicate that some of them suffer both from post traumatic stress disorder, as well as from a measure of inexplicable fear--symptoms that might be expected from people who repeatedly experience being abducted by aliens. Having argued elsewhere that the abduction phenomenon does not seem to be explicable as psychopathology**,** I take seriously the possibility that the phenomenon is a new one, currently unknown to Western science.

6 According to the exclusionary either/or that prevails in modern Western thought, however, the abduction phenomenon must either be psychological in nature, and thus subjective, or physical in nature, and thus objective**.** 7 Even though conceding that most abductees are sincere in claiming that they had an abduction "experience," skeptics insist that this experience must be intrapsychic, i.e., the alleged aliens have no more independent otherness than do the figures encountered in dreams and hallucinations. In contrast, literalists believe that abductions are the work of real, flesh-and-blood extraterrestrials, whose intentions are either sinister or beneficent, depending in part on the projections the interpreters. Still other researchers, however, caution that abductees may be encountering a strange otherness that resists being adequately explained in terms of these mutually3 exclusive conceptual categories--either mental or physical. Such speculation disturbs defenders of modern rationalism, who fear that both the phenomenon itself and widespread interest in it are signs of an outbreak of irrationalism that threatens the hard-won achievements of science and democratic politics. Some abduction researchers, however, suggest that the phenomenon does not involve irrationalism and psychological-social regression, but instead is a process of psychic integration necessary for the evolution of consciousness. Understanding this process, should it in fact be taking place, would obviously alter prevailing views about the nature and meaning of human existence. What may be needed to understand the abduction phenomenon, then, is an expansion and transformation of current views about rationality, reality, and consciousness. Driven by complex motivations, including the desire to free inquiry from religious dogmatism and the urge to understand the world in terms of physical sciences that best promote prediction and control of nature, modern "man" has either denied altogether, or explained away as psychopathology, dimensions of consciousness, planes of reality, and spiritual (non-material and non-psychological) beings, that have long been taken for granted by the great majority of human cultures. 8 For these reasons, even more disturbing to modern thinking than the two possibilities that the aliens are either flesh-and-blood E.T.s or merely psychological phenomena is the possibility that they come from a different dimension than the space-time realm of modern science.

## Government Secrecy

### “Scientists” decide what is acceptable and what is not. Because of this, they try to label those who believe as “ignorant, distorted, or prejudice.”

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 8-9, book.

We have moved from consensus reality to virtual reality. Politics itself must now be theorized from within the widespread dispersion of paranoia that has supplanted focused targets such as "Jim Crow" laws, Richard Nixon, and the Vietnam War. Insofar as its practioners can link together varieties of disparate phenomena to find patterns of denial, occlusion, and manipulation, conspiracy theory, far from a label dismissively attached to the lunatic fringe, may well be an appropriate vehicle for political contestation.20 Some government agencies, as well as some researchers and jour­nalists, have already been thinking and acting in ways that might have been dismissed as "conspiratorial" under traditional politics. As Grant Kester explains in his compelling analysis of federal information policies during the Reagan administration:

With the growing use of computer networks the government is faced with the problem of an information blizzard — a lascivious and poten­tially threatening intermingling in which memos, affidavits, invoices, re­ceipts, bank statements, and other documents combine and recombine themselves to produce dangerous new constellations of meaning. In this scenario the threat doesn't lie with a single piece of damaging informa­tion that "leaks out" and exposes government malfeasance, but with the possible interconnections that might be made among dozens of differ­ent bits of information; bits that might mean little or nothing by them­selves, but that, when assembled by the researcher into a particular nar­rative form, could prove extremely damaging.21

To reiterate, my claim is not that people who think they have been ab­ducted by aliens threaten to destroy democracy. It is not that UFO believ­ers are irrational.22 Rather, being unable to judge their rationality points to the lack of widespread criteria for judgments about what is reasonable and what is not: ufological discourse upholds the very criteria for scientific ra­tionality that mainstream science uses to dismiss it. "Scientists" are the ones who have problems with the "rationality" of those in the UFO com­munity. "Scientists" are the ones who feel a need to explain why some people believe in flying saucers, or who dismiss those who do so as "dis­torted" or "prejudiced" or "ignorant."

## Government Secrecy

### UFO discourses bring up concern over whether confidence in the government is warranted. It creates mistrust and paranoia that threatens democratic politics.

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 17, book.

Accounts of space aliens and a long history of suspicions toward for­eigners, immigrants, and strangers both suppose a conspiracy undermining America's experiment in freedom and democracy.42 Voices in nativist and UFO discourses alike express anxiety **about breeding, miscegenation, and hybridity,** about the collapse of distinctions between the alien and ourselves. In each discourse appear concerns about governing, about whether confidence in those entrusted with the protection of democratic freedoms is warranted, or if, in fact, they too are corrupt, part of some covert plot that will bring us down. In each the fear of the hidden that is always part of any notion of publicity or publicness motivates a vigilance and paranoia in the very name of the American people—"if they only knew."43 Today's mistrust may be more indicative of a general suspicion of experts and politi­cians than of an actual supposition of conspiracy.44 Rather than pointing to the marginality of conspiracy theory, however, such a dispersion of mis­trust creates a particular problem for democratic politics. Specific networks of confidence become ever more fragile and tenuous. Ufology, then, is one version of larger cultural patterns of suspicion, conspiracy, and mistrust.

### UFO discourse is rarely discussed in public due to fear of ridicule…

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 18-19, book.

I have two motives for using this vague and dangerously inclusive "us." The first concerns the UFO community.46 Speakers and participants at UFO conventions and writers of books and articles about UFOs use the term "UFO community" loosely to refer to anyone with a strong interest in UFOs. Like notions of the academic community, "Hollywood," or the queer community, the term gets fuzzy around the edges and not everyone agrees who's in and who's out. Problems with the idea of a "UFO commu­nity" resemble problems of queer identity: not everyone who has seen a UFO identifies with the larger group. Usually, however, people in the UFO community have a general sense of what the term means. At any rate, what is interesting about the community is that it combines a reasonable replication of the demographics of the United States (tilted toward the white middle class) together with a self-perception of being an excluded minority.47

The UFO community's sense of exclusion stems from its perception that most people, especially scientists, the media, and government officials, ridicule belief in extraterrestrial contact with Earth. Many who think they have seen a UFO are reluctant to talk about it outside safe, supportive circles. I've been surprised at how many of my academic colleagues have come out to me with UFO stories of their own since I began this research.41 Abductees in particular say they are wary of talking about their experiences for fear that people will think they are crazy — a sentiment expressed by many women in consciousness-raising sessions during the 1970s. So when I ask what the UFO community reveals about "us," I'm seeing the commu­nity as a microcosm of some broader American public. "Us" refers to any­one. It signals a white middle class while acknowledging differences in sex, class, and ethnicity. Yet "us" problematizes the notion of a "center" and the possibility of generality by focusing on a set of experiences and beliefs with marginalizing effects. It gestures simultaneously toward strangers, toward those disdained by society at large. This book's title, *Aliens in America,* is linked to Tony Kushner's Pulitzer Prize-winning play, *Angels in America.* At the same time, it connects with the only singly authored book sympathetic to ufology that has been published by a university press: the Temple University historian David Jacobs's *The UFO Controversy in America.49*

By destabilizing ideas of us and them, center and margin, inside and out­side, I want to complicate theories of American culture and politics. Radical as well as traditional accounts of citizenship and collective identity attribute some coherence to the notion of a public sphere. Whether norms of public reason are considered oppressive and exclusionary or the pinnacle of the planet's expression of freedom, the idea that the mainstream, the general populace, the community at large shares a set of common assumptions about reality is rarely challenged. UFO belief is one of those rare challenges.

## Government Secrecy

### America was able to flourish as a democracy because it constantly would reiterate a “frontier” that needed to be settled. Space became the final frontier, but the idea of aliens would not allow space to be settled, because it already is.

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 19-20, book.

The American articulation of outerspace together with technology and democracy incorporates an uneasy mix of colonialist, nationalist, and globalist ideals. Until the space program, the United States rarely presented itself explicitly as a colonial power, although expansionism has been integral **to it**s self-understanding.51 By reiterating the expansive fantasy of the wild, lawless West, the metaphor of a "frontier" tapped into earlier notions of American exceptionalism.52 Indeed, this very exceptionalism, the success of America's democratic experiment, was to be revealed and proven by breaking the laws of gravity, escaping the confines of Earth, conquering space itself. As America reached out into this "new frontier," the rhetoric of outposts, settlements, colonies, and colonization became part of the public language of outerspace. This language is fitting in that "space tech­nology and communications," as Elayne Rapping points out, "make pos­sible new extensions of American imperialism, both cultural and military."53 Once linked to a growing critique of the excesses of the military-industrial complex, to increased attention to the histories and situations of Native Americans, and to continued struggle in former colonies throughout Africa and Asia, such colonial rhetoric disrupts the space program's smooth presentation of democratic freedom.

The UFO discourse resists official "space frontier" rhetoric. NASA re­deployed American frontier myths of a wild, open West, one vacant, empty, and ready to be settled. Ufology challenges the assumed vacancy of outerspace and thereby intervenes critically in narratives of national iden­tity.54 It demands that NASA, the government, the military, and the au­thorities who act in America's name, allow for the possibility that, in space, we are the aliens.

### The government hides the truth about UFOs, because it would challenge our nation’s political, economic, and religious institutions. UFOs reveal how insecure we are. Because alien technology is better than ours, the government would not be able to protect us.

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 166-167, book.

So far, I've been suggesting that in American popular culture alien ab­duction provides a narrative that explores what happens when borders are crossed, when they no longer provide boundaries. I've considered both the formal status of abduction stories as challenges to the real and the textual telling of a particular story in light of the social position of the people involved. Once within the actual accounts of abduction, border crossings occur with abandon: aliens and people walk through walls, float through space; the aliens are sexless; alien machines extract ova and sperm in a sort of techno-sex; fetuses float in vats.

It is less the details than the very fact of the existence of abduction tes­timony that is important. Even with its bizarre, unbelievable content, the narrative testifies to what for many is the predominant sense of contempo­rary reality: insecurity. The borders that secure us have been violated, transgressed. Dissolution is part of our everyday experience. Inscribed in American culture during the second half of the twentieth century, the lines between black and white, home and work, Left and Right, dangerous and safe, shift and blur so that we are never quite sure where we are. Yet, as Thomas Dumm reminds us, politics in America has "consisted of bound­ary maintenance."20 Maybe that is why when we hear a story of alien ab­duction and we can't believe it, we feel reassured. The story sets up the boundary we think we need at a place that surely must be secure(d). The stigma of the alien protects us from facing insecurity even as it enables us to think insecurity to its limits.

As a thematization of insecurity, the abduction narrative presents an ex­treme version of a classic ufological theme: the inability of the government to protect us. From its early years in the Cold War up through today, ufol­ogy has attributed the paucity of physical evidence of flying saucers to a vast cover-up, explaining that the nation's political, economic, and religious in­stitutions would collapse if the alien truth were known. Alien technology is superior to that of humans — it can't be stopped (though, in some quarters of the UFO community, there was a great deal of excitement about Rea­gan's "Star Wars" defense plan). The abduction narrative extends this in­security from the air above the nation to the bodies of its citizens. Even in our homes, our beds, our cars, we are not safe. Even when we think we are safe, we're not. Our bodies can be violated without our knowledge, our DNA stolen in a galactic version of the Human Genome Project. Somehow our time is "missing." Horrible things happen to us that we can't re­member. We cannot protect ourselves. We cannot protect our families.

# \*\*Adv\*\*

## Aliens=Other

### Ufology is stigmatized because it contests the status quo. This stigma has made the alien into an icon for social problems in America.

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 6, book.

Alternative sciences like ufology are compelling because they claim to be true. Like mainstream sciences, their truth claims take a variety of forms. Indeed, they insert themselves into the interstices of medicine, psychology, biology, religion, astronomy, and ecology. Because of their claims to truth, alternative sciences have political interconnections and repercussions, par­ticularly in democratic societies that claim to value open discussion or in scientific circles that credit themselves with being objective, interested only in evidence.15

Ufology is political because it is stigmatized. To claim to have seen a UFO, to have been abducted by aliens, or even to believe those who say they have is a political act. It might not be a very big or revolutionary political act, but it contests the status quo. Immediately it installs the claimant at the margins of the social, within a network of sites and connections that don't command a great deal of mindshare, that don't get a lot of hits. UFO researcher Robert Dean (no relation) has experienced this firsthand. He sued his employer for discriminating against him because of his UFO be­liefs. Dean won. It is this stigma attached to UFOs and UFO belief that enables the alien to function as an icon for some difficult social problems, particularly those located around the fault lines of truth, reality, and rea­sonableness. And it is also what makes aliens and UFOs interesting for crit­ical social theory, not whether or not they are real, not whether the claims about them are true. That some people believe UFOs are real and true af­fects our concepts of politics and the political.

Images of outerspace throughout popular culture give us access to social and political anxieties accompanying the information revolution. They give us a window to changes in the cultural imaginary during the late twen­tieth century. William Connolly writes: "The acceleration of speed and the multiplication of border crossings in late-modern life create distinctive possibilities and dangers simultaneously."16 Connected as they are with fantasies about the future, with time traveling and border crossing, aliens link into the hopes and fears inscribed in technologies. At the moment of globalization, of networked opportunities and communications transcending the local and national, they provide an extraterrestrial perspective.

So although aliens appeared in American popular culture at the last fin de siecle, and although most societies tell stories about otherworldly visitors, I concentrate on what the details of space stories tell us about American society today. Narratives of abduction and conspiracy are uniquely influential in the current technological context, a context where information travels at the speed of light and everything is entertainment. They tell about particular ways of being human that, as they describe experiences be­yond belief and control, reach out from the lives of UFO abductees to sug­gest an abduction of a completely different sort. They tell about ways of being human that transform the representations of agency and spectatorship found in space imagery up through the seventies. Narratives of abduction reconfigure the present's acceptance of passivity, suspicion, paranoia, and loss as, themselves, forms of action.

## Alien=Other/Unkowable

### The alien symbolizes the “strangeness” and “unknowability” of life. It questions what we know as fact in order to find the truth.

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 31-32, book.

The alien dares us to take a stand, to hold a position, to accept or reject it. Confrontation with a story of flying saucers or alien abduction pushes us to one side or another: Is it real? Do we believe? The alien seduces us into a critical reassessment of our criteria for truth: How do we determine what real is? Why do we believe? The claim to truth and its challenge to our practices for establishing it are what enable the alien to function as an icon of postmodern anxieties,12 Because its appeals to evidence incorporate sci­entific and juridical criteria, the alien works as an icon that allows us to link into embedded fears of invasion, violation, mutation. It uses the language of reality to contest our taken-for-granted experience of reality. The alien marks the radical strangeness and unknowability increasingly part of con­temporary life. It serves as the ubiquitous reminder of uncertainty, doubt, suspicion, of the fugitivity of truth. We live with the alien while never knowing it.

Intrinsic to this challenge to truth, however, is its confirmation: the truth is out there, after all. Or, as a participant at the 1992 MIT abduction conference observed about the lack of conclusive proof of UFOs, "the ab­sence of evidence is not evidence of absence."13 By reinscribing the promise of truth, the alien reassures us that *everything* is not up for grabs, although *any­thing* could be. Some things are certain. We just don't know what they are.

This preoccupation with the question of truth is a primary characteris­tic of the UFO discourse as a whole: Are UFOs real? Are they responsible for crop circles and cattle mutilations? Does the government know? Is it covering up evidence of crashed saucers? And are aliens really abducting people from their beds and cars, examining, probing, and tracking them through implants? As an ever proliferating dispersion of statements around the truth of aliens, the UFO discourse lures us into a confrontation with truth. It compulsively repeats questions of truth, whether in its eruptions into currents in mainstream cultures or within the studies, analyses, and testimonials of those working actively to capture and comprehend fugitive alien truth.14

Because the UFO discourse is constructed around uncertain evidence, evidence of something that may not be there at all, its reports, cases, and files are primarily about the witnesses and only secondarily about the wit­nessed. Even the material evidence, the photographs, soil samples, govern­ment documents, mysterious fragments, and infamous alien autopsy film always stimulate (simulate?) investigations of the people who "found" or v produced them. Are the witnesses reliable? Are their motives pure? In the UFO discourse, truth is an issue of credibility. It is produced through prac­tices designed to establish whether someone is worthy of our trust. With the rise in claims of alien abduction during the nineties, the questions have now become whether abductees are crazy, neurotic, psychotic, epileptic, fantasy-prone, hysterical, or suffering from sleep or dissociative personal­ity disorders.15 Consequently, abductees are subjected to batteries of psy­chological tests in an effort to explain their experiences. But the tests are inconclusive. Any question, any answer leads into an ever branching net­work of possibilities.16

## Aliens=Other

### The alien is linked with otherness. It operates as an “icon of the instability of formerly clear distinctions.”

Jodi Dean (professor of political science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, author of Solidarity of Stragers: Feminism after Identity Politics) “Aliens in America,” Cornell University Press, 1998, pg. 156-157, book.

This link between space alien and noncitizen appears in nonfiction (and nonscience) contexts as well. Peter Brimelow relies on it in Alien Nation: Common Sense about America's Immigration Disaster.4 Deploying the title of a 1980s science fiction film and short-lived television series, Brimelow con­structs a history of America as pristinely white up until the 1960s in order to argue for restrictive changes in U.S. immigration policy. His articulation inverts that of the more politically correct science fiction version of *Alien Nation.* Both the film and the TV series use the encounter with the alien as a metaphor for U.S. race relations. Set in Los Angeles, the story revolves around the ability of escapees from a former slave colony to create a new life in America, focusing on the prejudices they encounter in the process. Finally, although ufologists generally resist the urge to play with alien am­biguities, their awareness of the immigration link is clear. When I met with the director of the Mutual UFO Network, Walter Andrus, at MUFON headquarters in Seguin, Texas, he told me that because of the proximity to Mexico, they referred to UFO occupants as "entities."

In the borderlands between science fiction and ufology, the tabloids also articulate cultural anxieties around otherness with alien images, as in the story of Newt Gingrich's meeting with an alien.5 The tabloids, moreover, extend the link to otherness. For example, the "12 U.S. Senators Are Space Aliens!" article in the June 7,1994, *Weekly World News uses* the language of outing. Various senators are "quoted" as saying that they are "surprised it took so long to figure it out," that "the cat's finally out of the bag," and that they wish they could have told friends and relatives themselves. Already in the open, Barney Frank is not named as a space alien.

Linked to immigration, sexuality, senators, and science fiction, the alien in contemporary American cultures can't be confined. In fact, precisely be­cause the alien violates myriad borders, crossing from news to entertain­ment to tabloid spectacle, it can operate as an icon of the instability of for­merly clear distinctions. At a time when talk of the future is ever present, the alien accesses a host of associations with technology, conspiracy, viola­tion, and the changing face of the real. More specifically, alien abduction narratives highlight with particular effect concern about the future of the species. Indeed, given its ufological origins, the prominence of abduction in mainstream media already marks the boundary-blurring that the alien represents. Such narratives become as seductive as the alien abductors themselves once we realize that people truly believe this event is happening to them, to us. The themes of reproduction, the (in)security of existing children, and the odd, frightening hybrids in whom a future hope is in­vested arise out of testimonies to actual experience.

## Ethics

### Ethics in space are key

Baum, Rock Ethics Institute, Pennsylvania State University, Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University ‘09 (September 2, 2009. ScienceDirect. Universalist Ethics in Extraterrestrial Encounter, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622#sec3)

IntroductionTo date, humanity has never encountered extraterrestrial life, let alone an extraterrestrial civilization. However, we can also not rule out the possibility that such an encounter will occur. Indeed, insights from the Drake equation (see e.g. [1]) suggest that such an encounter may be likely. As human exploration of space progresses, such an encounter may become increasingly likely. Thus analysis of what would happen in the event of an extraterrestrial encounter is of considerable significance. This analysis is particularly important for the astronautics community to consider given that it is on the leading edge of space exploration.There is extensive debate on what would be the outcome of an encounter between humanity and an extraterrestrial civilization. This debate can also be extended to consider encounters between two extraterrestrial civilizations. Much of the debate centers on the moral character of the extraterrestrials and the significance of this for how humanity would fare in such an encounter. Several commentators have speculated that the extraterrestrials would be benevolent and thus safe to humans [2] and [3] while others have speculated that the extraterrestrials would be malicious and thus dangerous to humans [4] and [5]. For broad reviews of the debate, see [1] and [6].This paper considers an important set of scenarios, largely overlooked by the existing literature, in which either humanity or the extraterrestrial civilization or both act according to a universalist ethical framework. Universalist ethics roughly refers to ethics where the two civilizations value specific aspects of each other equally, regardless of which civilization these aspects occur in. Universalist ethics is defined more precisely and elaborated in greater detail in Section 2. Meanwhile, for purposes of this article, civilization can be defined as a system of individuals working towards some common objective.Heterogeneity within a civilization, though undoubtedly important, is beyond the scope of this article.Ethics in general, and universalist ethics in particular, are important in humanity–extraterrestrial encounters because the outcome of such an encounter will depend not only on the relative strengths of the civilizations (i.e. who would destroy the other in an inter-civilizational war) but also on some specifics of the ethics held by the civilizations. Encounters in which one or both civilizations act according to a universalist framework hold particularly interesting properties. For example, if each civilization acts according to a different universalist framework, then an encounter might lead to a race between the civilizations to be the first one to commit suicide. Section 3 discusses a broad range of encounter scenarios involving universalism.The particular specifics of universalist ethics possibly held by humanity or extraterrestrials have important implications both for human civilization strategy and for contemporary ethics. The implications for civilizational strategy, discussed in Section 4, are important for humanity's planning for extraterrestrial encounters and its response should such an encounter occur. The basic message is that humanity would be wise to consider extraterrestrials’ ethics in addition to their war-fighting strengths, because the ethics can be as an important factor in the outcome of an encounter. The implications for contemporary ethics, discussed in Section 5, hold even if no encounter occurs. In particular, the possibility of extraterrestrial encounter challenges certain forms of anthropocentrism commonly found in contemporary human ethics because extraterrestrials might be superior to humans on the same grounds that humans consider ourselves to be superior to other Earth species.2. Universalist ethics The term *universalist ethical framework* comes from the term *universalism* as used in the philosophy and psychology literatures on human values. The terms *values* and *ethics* can mean different things, although for the purposes of this paper both terms will be taken to mean views about right and wrong and about what should be done. As discussed in the psychology literature, universalism is a type of ethical framework humans might support in which there is great equality. For example, Schwartz and Boehnke define universalism as “Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature (equality, social justice, wisdom, broadminded, protecting the environment, unity with nature, a world of beauty)” [7, p. 239].For this paper I will employ a slightly different definition of universalism. First, I must review the concept of *intrinsic value*. Intrinsic value is that which is valuable for its own sake, independent of anything else [8]. Intrinsic value is contrasted with *extrinsic value*, which is anything that is valuable but is not intrinsic value [9]. For example, we might consider human welfare to hold intrinsic value (such as in anthropocentric variations of the utilitarianism ethical framework). In this case, phenomena such as food, clothing, and shelter would hold a form of extrinsic value called instrumental value, which is valuable because it causes other value [9]—in this case the intrinsic value of human welfare.There has been much philosophical debate over the question of whether intrinsic value actually exists or if it is instead only considered to exist by individuals with sufficient cognitive capacity to form such a consideration (e.g. humans) [8]. This question is at the heart of meta-ethic*s*, i.e. the study of the nature of ethics and ethical knowledge. Possible answers to this question will not be discussed here because this paper focuses on what different civilizations consider to hold intrinsic value, which is a topic that can be examined independent of any knowledge of what might or might not actually hold intrinsic value. The reason for this focus is to explore what civilizations might do in an encounter. No attempt is made at assessing whether the civilizations might be actually right or wrong in the ethics that they support and in the actions they perform. While they are beyond the scope of this paper, such assessments could be readily made given knowledge of what ethics actually are correct if such knowledge could somehow be achieved.

For the purposes of this paper, a universalist ethical framework is an ethical framework in which the phenomena considered to hold intrinsic value hold the same intrinsic value regardless of where or when the intrinsic value occurs. For example, a universalist form of anthropocentric utilitarianism would place the same amount of intrinsic value on all human welfare. Likewise, a universalist form of non-anthropocentric utilitarianism would place the same amount of intrinsic value on all welfare, regardless of what species (or non-species) the welfare occurred in. It should be noted that the types of ethical frameworks considered here are all consequentialist, meaning that they only place intrinsic value the consequences of actions. No consideration is given to whether certain actions are fundamentally right or wrong (as in deontological ethics) or to whether what is important is not what actions we perform but is instead the character of who we are (as in virtue ethics). While such ethics are important and have enough support among contemporary humans to merit attention, they require a somewhat different analysis and are beyond the scope of this paper.Human philosophers have extensively debated the extent to which humans should be universalist. Some argue that we have special relations to ourselves and those near us which justifies non-universalism (see [10] for examples). Others argue that universalism is too demanding and thus while being a universalist may be commendable, it is not morally required [11]. Meanwhile, still others argue that non-universalism is immoral and that we should strive for universalism [12]. A prominent argument for universalism stems from a thought experiment in which we select our ethics as if we do not know which member of society we are, thereby removing any incentive for non-universalist favoritism [13].1Much of the debate on universalism has existed within anthropocentric ethical frameworks. These frameworks only place intrinsic value on human phenomena (welfare, health, etc.) and thus only debate how intrinsic value should be distributed among humans. However, such anthropocentrism is not unanimously supported. For example, several prominent philosophers have advocated non-anthropocentric forms of utilitarianism, placing equal intrinsic value on the welfare of human and non-human animals [15], [16] and [17]. Others have called for ecocentric ethics, also placing intrinsic value on non-sentient nature [18] and [19]. The definition of universalism provided by Schwartz and Boehnke includes ecocentrism, as does other psychology research on environmental values [20].For the present paper it is crucial for universalism to extend beyond humanity. Specifically, this paper explores universalism with respect to civilizations: whether humanity places the same intrinsic value on phenomena that occur in an extraterrestrial civilization we encounter, and whether the extraterrestrials do the same for us. Universalism in this context can be contrasted with civilizationism, in which civilizations place more intrinsic value on what happens to themselves than on what happens to other civilizations. Define *pure civilizationism* as the view that what happens to other civilizations holds zero intrinsic value. This definition allows the more general term civilizationism to refer to views in which what happens to other civilizations holds less intrinsic value but not necessarily zero intrinsic value. There thus exists a continuous scale from pure civilizationism to pure universalism. However, for ease of exposition, in this paper the terms universalism and pure universalism will be used interchangeably.Available evidence suggests that human and extraterrestrial civilizations could be universalist with each other, but would not necessarily be so. The historic record of encounters among human civilizations—often mined for insights on extraterrestrial encounters [21] and [22]—shows a wide range of ethics from civilizationism to universalism. For example, the English Pilgrims and Wampanoag Native Americans coexisted in New England with mutual cooperation and assistance [23], suggesting at least some degree of universalism among the two civilizations. Many other cases of human encounters are marked by a civilizationist fight-to-win mentality. Thus if the historic record is to be any guide, universalism in extraterrestrial encounter may be possible but hardly inevitable.The existing psychological literature has only begun to explore the extent to which humans may be universalist with respect to extraterrestrial civilizations [24]; initial results are inconclusive. There has been some discussion of this issue in the ethics literature. For example, Lupisella [25] argues for respecting and protecting life on other planets. Singer [26] expresses a similar view. Meanwhile, some have speculated that intelligent civilizations evolve universalist tendencies [3] and [27]. Thus, if it is possible for humanity to encounter an extraterrestrial civilization, or for two extraterrestrial civilizations to encounter each other, it appears possible for at least one of these civilizations to be universalist with respect to each other. I now explore some of the possible outcomes of such an encounter, given that one or both civilizations are universalist.3. Universalism in extraterrestrial encounter If two civilizations (human or otherwise) encounter each other, how would the outcome be affected if one or both civilizations are universalist? Several factors are important here: (1) whether the civilizations place intrinsic value on the same set of phenomena; (2) whether the civilizations are equally efficient at producing the intrinsic value; (3) whether the civilizations are both universalist; (4) whether one civilization is capable of destroying the other (i.e. there is a *stronger* and a *weaker* civilization; note that by *destruction* I mean to include both annihilation and enslavement); and (5) whether the two civilizations could utilize the same resources. This section discusses several scenarios that result from combinations of these factors. An overview of these scenarios is provided in Fig 1.

Overview of the scenarios considered in this section. Letters in parentheses correspond to the paragraph labels throughout this section.It should be noted that the ethics relevant to the present discussion are the ethics held by the civilizations during their interaction. Codignola [22] raises the possibility that, due to an encounter, one or both civilizations may change their ethical views. In the context of the present article, this means that the civilization(s) may change what they place intrinsic value on. Codignola speculates that humanity may find the extraterrestrials’ ethics to be superior and may thus feel compelled to adopt the extraterrestrials’ ethics. This would be an important effect. Indeed, any shifts in ethical views due to the encounter would be important to account for. If there are any such shifts, then the ethics held during the civilizations’ interaction are the ethics being referred to here.(A) If the two civilizations did not utilize the same resources, then universalism may be a non-issue. This would be the case because neither civilization would have any reason to destroy the other. To see this, consider a scenario in which humans encounter a civilization consisting of intelligent photosynthetic organisms. Here, the two civilizations may find substantial opportunity for symbiotic relations that both civilizations would consider optimal regardless of whether either happened to be universalist. Alternatively, if no symbiosis existed, then instead the two civilizations may simply have no effect on each other's capacity to produce intrinsic value. Here, both civilizations would carry on maximizing intrinsic value however they could, as if the other civilization was not there.(B) If the stronger civilization is not universalist, then it may not matter that the weaker civilization is universalist. Specifically, if the stronger civilization is non-universalist in such a way that it would desire the destruction of the weaker civilization, then the stronger civilization would simply destroy the weaker civilization, regardless of what the weaker civilization's ethics are. (It may be the case that the stronger civilization was not universalist but still did not desire destroying the weaker civilization. For example, the stronger civilization may be indifferent to the existence of the weaker civilization. Alternatively, a symbiotic relationship could develop.) Thus, a non-universalist humanity could find itself destroying a weaker universalist civilization. Alternatively, a universalist humanity could find itself being destroyed by a stronger non-universalist civilization despite humanity being universalist.If the stronger civilization is universalist, then this civilization may decide how to handle the encounter based on which civilization more efficiently produces intrinsic value. If the two civilizations define intrinsic value differently, then the intrinsic value that decides which civilization survives would be the intrinsic value as defined by the stronger civilization. If the stronger civilization finds itself to be more efficient (for example due to superior physiology and technology) then it may destroy the weaker civilization in order to produce more intrinsic value. This would be the case even though the stronger civilization has no bias against intrinsic value produced by the weaker civilization. Likewise, if the stronger civilization finds itself to be less efficient, then it may instead opt to destroy itself. Again, humanity could either be the destroyer or the destroyed.If there is no stronger civilization, i.e. if the two civilizations are not capable of destroying each other, then decision making may be made according to efficiency. Here it would matter whether the two civilizations had the same conception of intrinsic value.(C) First, consider the case in which the two civilizations do have the same conception of intrinsic value. Suppose here that one civilization is more efficient than the other at producing intrinsic value. If this is the case then the less efficient civilization may agree to sacrifice itself so that the more efficient civilization could produce more intrinsic value. This scenario would occur if both civilizations use the same resources, or, to put it more precisely, if whatever resources were used by the less efficient civilization could be more efficiently used by the other civilization. That is, the more efficient civilization may also be able to use some resources that the less efficient civilization cannot use. By definition, there are no resources which the less efficient civilization can use but the more efficient civilization cannot use. Otherwise, the less efficient civilization would be more efficient at using these resources and would remain in existence in order to convert these resources into intrinsic value. In such instances of heterogeneous capacity to convert resources into intrinsic value, the civilizations would expand, contract, and/or shift so as to maximize the production of intrinsic value.(D) Second, consider the case in which the two civilizations do not have the same conception of intrinsic value. In this case, conflict can occur. Conflict would occur if the two civilizations disagreed over which civilization more efficiently produced intrinsic value. Conflict would not occur if they instead disagreed on what held intrinsic value but agreed on whom more efficiently produced that intrinsic value. There would be no conflict here because they would agree on which civilization was more worthy of continuing to exist. This scenario is similar to the scenario in which they agreed on intrinsic value, as discussed above. In this scenario, the less efficient civilization sacrifices itself for the sake of producing more intrinsic value.(E) If each civilization thought itself to be more efficient, then a fight-to-win conflict could ensue. This fight would resemble a traditional fight-to-win conflict in which the civilizations are pure (or close to pure) civilizationists. However, the pure civilizationist fight-to-win phenomenon is not identical to the universalist fight-to-win phenomenon. This is because there exists a scenario in which a pure civilizationist fight-to-win conflict would occur but a universalist fight-to-win conflict would not occur. This scenario is the scenario in which the would-be winning civilization would suffer so much damage that it would be left less efficient after the conflict than the other civilization would be without a conflict. In this scenario, the would-be winning universalist civilization might sacrifice itself, in order for there to be more total intrinsic value. A pure civilizationist civilization would make no such sacrifice, because it would place no intrinsic value on anything that happened to the other civilization.(F) If each civilization thought the other to be more efficient, then a fight-to-lose conflict would ensue. In this remarkable situation, the two civilizations might race to be the first to commit suicide. The civilizations would not want to be the second to commit suicide, because then no civilization would remain to produce any intrinsic value, however measured. In other words, even if a civilization preferred that the other civilization exist instead of itself existing, the civilization would still prefer itself existing over no civilizations existing. (If the civilization preferred no civilizations existing over itself existing, then it would have committed suicide already, before any encounter with other civilizations. There actually are some human philosophers that call for the end of human civilization on these grounds. One such philosopher is Benatar [28]; see [29] for further discussion.) Thus, if one civilization successfully committed suicide while the other was still intact, then the other could exploit the resources that otherwise would have been consumed by the suicide civilization. This would result in more intrinsic value as defined by the suicide civilization.

4. Implications for human civilization strategy If humans never encounter an extraterrestrial civilization, then the discussion here is of no strategic significance. In other words, humanity's universalism towards other civilizations and other civilizations’ universalism towards humanity only affect human strategy if humanity may encounter one of these civilizations. There are other, non-strategic implications to the possibility of universalism; some of these implications are discussed below.If humans do encounter an extraterrestrial civilization, then the outcome of the encounter will depend not only on the civilizations’ relative strength, i.e. their relative capacity to destroy the other civilization, but also on their respective ethical frameworks. Specifically, if one or both civilizations are universalist with respect to the other civilization, then the stronger civilization might not be the survivor. Indeed, it is possible that one or even both of the civilizations would attempt sacrificing itself so that the other could produce more of whatever phenomena were considered to hold intrinsic value. Thus, if humanity is interested in surviving an encounter with an extraterrestrial civilization, it would be wise to pay attention to the extraterrestrial civilization's ethics. Likewise, if humanity is interested in facilitating the best possible outcome of such an encounter (i.e. the outcome with the most intrinsic value), then it would be wise for humanity to also reflect on its own ethics, because its strategy will depend on how it defines the good. Such reflection includes reflecting on the question of whether humanity even defines the good in terms of an intrinsic value to be maximized instead of, for example, supporting a deontological or virtue ethics framework.

The exact strategic implications of universalism in encounter scenarios depend on the particular circumstances of the encounter. Analysis such as that presented above is an appropriate starting point.The importance of ethics in extraterrestrial encounter implies the importance of detecting and diagnosing the ethics of extraterrestrials. Here detection refers to the process of identifying information about the extraterrestrials’ ethics. Diagnosis refers to the process of interpreting this information to learn what the extraterrestrials’ ethics actually are. Such detection and diagnosis are part of the broader technical and intellectual challenge of identifying and interpreting whatever evidence of extraterrestrial civilization we may find. Of all the aspects of extraterrestrial civilization we can detect and diagnose, its ethics may be particularly important. This importance is suggested by the analysis presented throughout this article. Further research is necessary to establish protocols for the detection and diagnosis of extraterrestrial ethics.One important consideration in the detection and diagnosis of extraterrestrial ethics is that any information sent to us from the extraterrestrials may not be honest. Extraterrestrials could send us an “ethics Trojan horse”, i.e. a message designed to trick humanity into misinterpreting the extraterrestrials’ true ethics. The extraterrestrials’ motivation for such trickery would be to influence humanity's course of action to the extraterrestrials’ advantage, based on however they defined “advantage”. Given this possibility, humanity should be prepared to be very careful in handling any messages about extraterrestrials’ ethics in order to avoid any harmful misinterpretation.The “ethics Trojan horse” game can of course be played both ways. Just as extraterrestrials can try to trick humanity, humanity can try to trick extraterrestrials. Humanity could gain strategic advantage from such a tactic. Indeed, humanity already has extensive experience with this sort of tactic, given our long and ongoing experience with military deception [30] and [31]. Thus it is recommended that studies of ethics in extraterrestrial encounter include consideration of military and other deception so that humanity can most successfully handle the possibility of an “ethics Trojan horse”. This recommendation holds no matter what it is that humanity considers to be “successful”, i.e. no matter what our ethics are.5. Implications for contemporary ethics The civilizational encounters discussed in this paper raise some important ethical issues. These issues are important even if no extraterrestrial encounter ever occurs, because how we assess these issues says something about the nature of our character as moral beings. Furthermore, these issues raise profound questions about how we should value and treat other species here on Earth.

One ethical issue posed by the possibility of extraterrestrial encounter is the justification of ethical anthropocentrism. By ethical anthropocentrism, I mean the view that humans are more morally important due to some inherent human trait not found or not found as strongly in other species.2 For example, humans may be considered more cognitively, spiritually or intellectually advanced, and thus meriting of special consideration. This justification of ethical anthropocentrism is challenged by the possibility of extraterrestrial encounter because the extraterrestrials may turn out to be substantially more advanced than humans in any of these regards. If we believe we have encountered a more advanced civilization, then would we continue advocating anthropocentrism, or would we instead consider members of this other civilization to be more morally important? (It is the belief in the civilization being more advanced that is important here, not whether the civilization actually is more advanced, because it is the belief that drives the thoughts and the actions of the believers.) How we answer this question reveals whether we truly believe in the ethics we state or if instead we are simply using them as an excuse to prioritize ourselves. If we would not prioritize members of other, more advanced civilizations, then on what grounds other than simple selfishness can we justify anthropocentrism in our encounters with other species on Earth?The issue of ethical anthropocentrism is particularly vivid in our food choice decisions. Humans readily eat members of other Earth species, an act that may be justified by ethical anthropocentrism. Would we thus condone being eaten by extraterrestrials, if the extraterrestrials proved to be more advanced? If we would not condone this, then on what grounds could we justify eating other Earth species? Of course, our survival depends on eating other species (that is, in the absence of synthetic alternatives, which may soon include synthetic meats [33]), but human survival does not depend on eating, for example, sentient species, which are sometimes considered more morally significant. Likewise, the extraterrestrials might dine on humans even if they have culinary options they consider to be less morally significant.Closely related to food choice decisions is our evaluation of the utility monster scenario. Whereas our food choice decisions concern what we should eat, the utility monster scenario concerns what we should feed ourselves to. The scenario comes from the famous ethical thought experiment posed by philosopher Robert Nozick [34]. Nozick's utility monster is a hypothetical creature that produces more intrinsic value by eating humans than humans can produce on their own. In Nozick's original version, intrinsic value is defined as utility, although the scenario generalizes to other forms of intrinsic value. In this scenario, universalist humans would be morally obligated to feed themselves to the utility monster. Nozick perceived this obligation to be absurd and took it as an argument against universalist utilitarianism. However, if we are not to feed ourselves to the utility monster, then it must be the case either that other species should not feed themselves to us or that humanity is morally more important than all other species. If an extraterrestrial species could be more advanced than us in all of the regards we consider to be morally significant, then it becomes difficult to justify other species feeding themselves to us but us not feeding ourselves to other species.

A separate counter to the utility monster objection to utilitarianism is that the utility monster is a hypothetical thought experiment with no real-world significance. However, in the event of an extraterrestrial encounter, humanity may face a real utility monster. Given that an extraterrestrial encounter is, as far as anyone currently knows, a possibility (however remote), the utility monster should not be considered strictly a hypothetical thought experiment. Thus, the possibility of extraterrestrial encounter defeats this objection. To be sure, it is possible that there could be an extraterrestrial encounter in which humans would not be edible to the extraterrestrials (or vice versa) [35]. In this case, humanity's positions on eating or being eaten by members of other civilizations would not be of strategic significance but may still be of ethical significance. However, the opposite is also possible, i.e. that humans may be edible to the extraterrestrials. The existence of this possibility is sufficient to defeat the “thought experiment” objection to the utility monster issue.6. Summary, conclusion, and future work If humans encounter an extraterrestrial civilization, or if two extraterrestrial civilizations encounter each other, then the outcome of the encounter will depend not only on the civilizations’ relative strength to destroy each other, but also on their respective ethical frameworks. If one or both civilizations are universalist with respect to the other civilization, then the stronger civilization might not be the survivor. Indeed, it is possible that one or even both of the civilizations would attempt sacrificing itself so that the other could produce more of whatever phenomena were considered to hold intrinsic value. Thus, if humanity is interested in surviving an encounter with an extraterrestrial civilization, it would be wise to pay attention to the extraterrestrial civilization's ethics.Meanwhile, the possibility of civilizational encounter raises several profound ethical issues. These issues primarily concern whether anthropocentricism can be justified on ethical grounds given the possibility of there existing more advanced extraterrestrials. It should be noted that for those frameworks (such as anthropocentric utilitarianism) that face these issues, the issues are, for contemporary humans, relatively minor and unimportant details. That is, there are much bigger issues at stake, ones where the recommendations are far less controversial. Chief among these is the issue of ensuring long-term survival by reducing the risk of global catastrophes such as nuclear warfare, pandemic outbreaks, environmental destruction, and large asteroid impact [36]. Avoiding such catastrophe enables humanity to produce much more intrinsic value, both here on Earth and, in particular, beyond Earth [37]. (For more on opportunities for expansion into space, see [38].) Of course, one means of helping ensure long-term survival is to colonize space, which makes humanity resistant to catastrophes that only involve planetary destruction [39]. But colonizing space also increases humanity's chance of an extraterrestrial encounter, in which the issues in this paper become important again. So, while consideration of universalism with respect to civilization encounter may not be humanity's most pressing need, it is a need nonetheless.One important topic not considered in the present paper is when there may exist a diversity of ethical views within a civilization. Indeed, it is the case that humanity features such a diversity of views, ranging in, among other factors, the extent to which humans are universalist. Likewise, extraterrestrial civilizations may also have such diversity of attitudes in their populations. In this case, the outcome of an encounter may also depend on the roles of specific civilization members in the encounter. Analysis of such situations might consider these roles, building on analyses of human response to extraterrestrial contact [40] and [41].

The present analysis is also limited by the range of universalist ethical frameworks considered. These frameworks are consequentialist in that they argue that what we should do is a function of the intrinsic value of the consequences of our actions. Other types of frameworks may behave different. Some important non-consequentialist types of frameworks are deontological ethics frameworks which claim that there are duties to perform certain acts regardless of the consequences, and virtue ethics frameworks which emphasize what we should be instead of what we should do. Within consequentialism, an important type of framework not considered here is social choice frameworks (such as democracy), which recommend doing some function of what society in aggregate wants. Social choice frameworks are of interest in the extraterrestrial encounter context because they raise the question of how extraterrestrials are represented and counted in a social choice scheme.Another important topic not considered here is the extent to which ethics may be affected by whether the civilizations are biological or computational. Ćirković [42] suggests that humanity might become more universalist if it evolves into a post-biological state. On the other hand, Yudkowsky [43] cautions that an artificial intelligence not pre-programmed to be “Friendly” may be highly destructive. It is at least plausible that a biological civilization may develop empathy towards a civilization it newly encounters whereas a computational civilization might not. Given the possibility that humans may encounter a computational civilization or themselves become a computational civilization [44], this possibility may be worth exploring further.

### Ethics

Reiman ’10 (Saara Reiman Department of Political and Economic Studies in the University of Helsinki.) On Sustainable Exploration of Space and Extraterrestrial Life

The key ingredient to successfully practicing agent-prior virtue ethics, is a set of core values instead of rigid guidelines. This core will enable the agent to adapt himself to new situations. Furthermore, while rules can sometimes be seen as arbitrary and impractical by the people who should put them into practice, the value approach highlights the fact that ethics is a tool and an essential component for making good science. It guides us to make excellent science rather than delaying progress. The practical manifestation of a sustainable attitude could be the principle of caution: avoid harming that which you do not yet understand, and try to avoid causing harm you are in practice unable to repair. These guidelines should be understood as rules of thumb rather than strict rules. Exceptions to rules that are meant to guide actions in alien environments are not only easily imaginable but also sometimes necessary. That is not a weakness of the virtue approach, but on the contrary, it is precisely the feature that makes it as flexible as necessary for an ethical framework to be when acting in epistemically poor circumstances. Benevolence is another concept widely considered as a key virtue. It is a virtue that directs us away from self-centeredness. Benevolence also has its intellectually appealing side: in order to successfully express our benevolent attitudes we need to understand something about what constitutes good for another being(s). Geoffrey Frasz (2005) observes that benevolent treatment of nonhuman entities is a necessary attitude for good stewards of the land. Sustainable space exploration can be seen as an extension of Frasz’s idea: sustainable explorers are those who are good stewards of their sphere of influence whether that sphere physically exists on Earth or in space. Frasz’s view also illustrates another important feature of environmental virtue ethics: the important aspect in ethics is not to evaluate how much other beings resemble us in terms of properties we value highly, such as intelligence and sentience. Goertzel and Combs (2010) present a very interesting discussion on how subjective many such "values" could be. Their thought experiment suggests that many familiar concepts such as "causality," "individual self" and "technology" might not exist at all in intelligent life forms that have evolved in complex fluid environments. This is precisely the sort of sensitivity that should be developed further in environmental ethics, where concepts such as sentience are often used as explanations for why some species deserve better treatment than others. Rather, virtue ethics focuses on evaluating beings we understand very well: ourselves and human action. When understood as an aspect of sustainability, benevolence is well suited to the role of a guiding virtue of explorers. Benevolence not only understands but encourages intellectual curiosity. In order to truly determine what is in the best interest of the other, one needs to gather information about the life and concerns of the other (Frasz 2005). The interests of ethics and science are in the end the same thing viewed from different perspectives. Sustainable exploration of space does not mean that we should be so sensitive to interests of others that we cease to pursue our own interests. There are good reasons to place a high priority on the needs of Earth and most current human space-related interests. What is important is the manner in which we choose to pursue those interests (Reiman 2009). Virtue ethics can be applied to answer questions such as:"How far is it right to go when pursuing intellectual interests?" and "When should we start balancing scientific interests with other important concerns?" In light of the concept of benevolence, we are able understand that (scientific) curiosity is good, but it must be balanced by concern for the well-being of others and the adviseablity of acting responsibly. In essence, a benevolent attitude is one that hits the right balance between our own interests and the interests of others, be they future generations or other species.

## Ethics Solve—Anthro

### Ethical approach to ET is vital to challneg anthropocentric utilitarianism

Seth D. Baum, 2010. (PhD candidate in Pennsylvania State University's Geography Department and a visiting scholar at Columbia University's Center for Research on Environmental Decisions, Elsevier Ltd, February-March 2010, Acta Astronautica, “Universalist ethics in extraterrestrial encounter,” Volume 66, Issues 3-4, Pages 617-623, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622)

The civilizational encounters discussed in this paper raise some important ethical issues. These issues are important even if no extraterrestrial encounter ever occurs, because how we assess these issues says something about the nature of our character as moral beings. Furthermore, these issues raise profound questions about how we should value and treat other species here on Earth. One ethical issue posed by the possibility of extraterrestrial encounter is the justification of ethical anthropocentrism. By *ethical anthropocentrism*, I mean the view that humans are more morally important due to some inherent human trait not found or not found as strongly in other species.[2](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22fn2) For example, humans may be considered more cognitively, spiritually or intellectually advanced, and thus meriting of special consideration. This justification of ethical anthropocentrism is challenged by the possibility of extraterrestrial encounter because the extraterrestrials may turn out to be substantially more advanced than humans in any of these regards. If we believe we have encountered a more advanced civilization, then would we continue advocating anthropocentrism, or would we instead consider members of this other civilization to be more morally important? (It is the belief in the civilization being more advanced that is important here, not whether the civilization actually is more advanced, because it is the belief that drives the thoughts and the actions of the believers.) How we answer this question reveals whether we truly believe in the ethics we state or if instead we are simply using them as an excuse to prioritize ourselves. If we would not prioritize members of other, more advanced civilizations, then on what grounds other than simple selfishness can we justify anthropocentrism in our encounters with other species on Earth? The issue of ethical anthropocentrism is particularly vivid in our food choice decisions. Humans readily eat members of other Earth species, an act that may be justified by ethical anthropocentrism. Would we thus condone being eaten by extraterrestrials, if the extraterrestrials proved to be more advanced? If we would not condone this, then on what grounds could we justify eating other Earth species? Of course, our survival depends on eating other species (that is, in the absence of synthetic alternatives, which may soon include synthetic meats [[33]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib33)), but human survival does not depend on eating, for example, sentient species, which are sometimes considered more morally significant. Likewise, the extraterrestrials might dine on humans even if they have culinary options they consider to be less morally significant. Closely related to food choice decisions is our evaluation of the utility monster scenario. Whereas our food choice decisions concern what we should eat, the utility monster scenario concerns what we should feed ourselves to. The scenario comes from the famous ethical thought experiment posed by philosopher Robert Nozick [[34]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib34). Nozick's utility monster is a hypothetical creature that produces more intrinsic value by eating humans than humans can produce on their own. In Nozick's original version, intrinsic value is defined as utility, although the scenario generalizes to other forms of intrinsic value. In this scenario, universalist humans would be morally obligated to feed themselves to the utility monster. Nozick perceived this obligation to be absurd and took it as an argument against universalist utilitarianism. However, if we are not to feed ourselves to the utility monster, then it must be the case either that other species should not feed themselves to us or that humanity is morally more important than all other species. If an extraterrestrial species could be more advanced than us in all of the regards we consider to be morally significant, then it becomes difficult to justify other species feeding themselves to us but us not feeding ourselves to other species. A separate counter to the utility monster objection to utilitarianism is that the utility monster is a hypothetical thought experiment with no real-world significance. However, in the event of an extraterrestrial encounter, humanity may face a real utility monster. Given that an extraterrestrial encounter is, as far as anyone currently knows, a possibility (however remote), the utility monster should not be considered strictly a hypothetical thought experiment. Thus, the possibility of extraterrestrial encounter defeats this objection. To be sure, it is possible that there could be an extraterrestrial encounter in which humans would not be edible to the extraterrestrials (or vice versa) [[35]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib35). In this case, humanity's positions on eating or being eaten by members of other civilizations would not be of strategic significance but may still be of ethical significance. However, the opposite is also possible, i.e. that humans may be edible to the extraterrestrials. The existence of this possibility is sufficient to defeat the “thought experiment” objection to the utility monster issue. 6. Summary, conclusion, and future work If humans encounter an extraterrestrial civilization, or if two extraterrestrial civilizations encounter each other, then the outcome of the encounter will depend not only on the civilizations’ relative strength to destroy each other, but also on their respective ethical frameworks. If one or both civilizations are universalist with respect to the other civilization, then the stronger civilization might not be the survivor. Indeed, it is possible that one or even both of the civilizations would attempt sacrificing itself so that the other could produce more of whatever phenomena were considered to hold intrinsic value. Thus, if humanity is interested in surviving an encounter with an extraterrestrial civilization, it would be wise to pay attention to the extraterrestrial civilization's ethics. Meanwhile, the possibility of civilizational encounter raises several profound ethical issues. These issues primarily concern whether anthropocentricism can be justified on ethical grounds given the possibility of there existing more advanced extraterrestrials. It should be noted that for those frameworks (such as anthropocentric utilitarianism) that face these issues, the issues are, for contemporary humans, relatively minor and unimportant details. That is, there are much bigger issues at stake, ones where the recommendations are far less controversial. Chief among these is the issue of ensuring long-term survival by reducing the risk of global catastrophes such as nuclear warfare, pandemic outbreaks, environmental destruction, and large asteroid impact [[36]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib36). Avoiding such catastrophe enables humanity to produce much more intrinsic value, both here on Earth and, in particular, beyond Earth [[37]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib37). (For more on opportunities for expansion into space, see [[38]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib38).) Of course, one means of helping ensure long-term survival is to colonize space, which makes humanity resistant to catastrophes that only involve planetary destruction [[39]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib39). But colonizing space also increases humanity's chance of an extraterrestrial encounter, in which the issues in this paper become important again. So, while consideration of universalism with respect to civilization encounter may not be humanity's most pressing need, it is a need nonetheless. One important topic not considered in the present paper is when there may exist a diversity of ethical views within a civilization. Indeed, it is the case that humanity features such a diversity of views, ranging in, among other factors, the extent to which humans are universalist. Likewise, extraterrestrial civilizations may also have such diversity of attitudes in their populations. In this case, the outcome of an encounter may also depend on the roles of specific civilization members in the encounter. Analysis of such situations might consider these roles, building on analyses of human response to extraterrestrial contact [[40]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib40) and [[41]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib41). The present analysis is also limited by the range of universalist ethical frameworks considered. These frameworks are consequentialist in that they argue that what we should do is a function of the intrinsic value of the consequences of our actions. Other types of frameworks may behave different. Some important non-consequentialist types of frameworks are deontological ethics frameworks which claim that there are duties to perform certain acts regardless of the consequences, and virtue ethics frameworks which emphasize what we should be instead of what we should do. Within consequentialism, an important type of framework not considered here is social choice frameworks (such as democracy), which recommend doing some function of what society in aggregate wants. Social choice frameworks are of interest in the extraterrestrial encounter context because they raise the question of how extraterrestrials are represented and counted in a social choice scheme. Another important topic not considered here is the extent to which ethics may be affected by whether the civilizations are biological or computational. Ćirković [[42]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib42) suggests that humanity might become more universalist if it evolves into a post-biological state. On the other hand, Yudkowsky [[43]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib43) cautions that an artificial intelligence not pre-programmed to be “Friendly” may be highly destructive. It is at least plausible that a biological civilization may develop empathy towards a civilization it newly encounters whereas a computational civilization might not. Given the possibility that humans may encounter a computational civilization or themselves become a computational civilization [[44]](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003622%22%20%5Cl%20%22bib44), this possibility may be worth exploring further.

## Ethics Key

### Without a change in behavior, human pose a threat to ourselves and others organisms and extraterrestrials.

Savulescu, Romanian-Australian philosopher and bioethicist. He is Uehiro Professor of Practical Ethics at the University of Oxford, Fellow of St Cross College, Oxford, Director of the Oxford Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics ’10 (April 27,2010. Practical Ethics. Are We Future Evil Aliens? <http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2010/04/are-we-future-evil-aliens/>)

Stephen Hawking, the Cambridge physicist, has recently argued, in a Discovery channel documentary, that alien life forms probably exist somewhere in the Universe, but we should avoid contact with them. (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8642558.stm). His reason is, apparently, that if they are anything like humans, they are likely to be aggressive and either exterminate us or pillage our resources. "If aliens visit us, the outcome would be much as when Columbus landed in America, which didn't turn out well for the Native Americans," he said. "We only have to look at ourselves to see how intelligent life might develop into something we wouldn't want to meet."  Of course, aliens might be thoroughly different to us. Whether we should make contact with them will depend on the information available to us relating to the threat which they or the benefits they might provide. However, the tricky bit is deciding whether to get information, or more information. Perhaps that issue will be decided for us. However, Hawking’s interesting claims have another implication for us. He implies we are not the kinds of beings which should be encountered, which “we wouldn’t want to meet”. We are dangerous. Here he is surely right. And our powers will exponentially increase through the relentless progress technology. We will soon have the superpowers of the aliens which Hawking imagines and will likely strip our planet of resources and make it one day uninhabitable. We will likely be the future aliens which Hawking is imagining. That is, if we do not destroy ourselves with our technology first. Hawking has discussed this possibility. His solution then was genetic engineering to make ourselves wiser and less aggressive. I have recently been working on human moral enhancement (see references). I have discussed his claims there. I have argued that if technology, especially cognitive enhancement, continues to increase in power, we must enhance our very limited moral dispositions. We must address the characteristics which have caused us to obliterate peoples and we pose such a threat to ourselves. But Hawking’s comments provide another reason for human moral enhancement: the threat we pose to the Universe and other sentient life forms. We have a moral obligation not to become the aggressive threatening aliens which Hawking rightfully fears. We have an obligation not only to ourselves, our world but to the Universe.

## Space Inev—Ethics Key

### Although reaching space is a definite possibility during the next decade the question is what type of ethics will we embrace.

Billings ‘06 (Dr. Linda Billings PhD Communication Studies SETI Institute Volume 22 Issue 4) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964606000749

Today's US civilian space program, borne of the 20th century Cold War, is focused on planning for a new round of human missions to the Moon and, later, perhaps, to Mars. These plans are intended to realize a ‘vision’ for 21st century human exploration articulated by President George W. Bush in January 2004. The US National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) promotes its plans for a new round of human exploration as a way to maintain US leadership in space. Critics argue that the cost of such missions may be prohibitive in the current fiscal environment and, and curious observers keep asking: why are we going back to the Moon? Since the turn of this century China has launched people into Earth orbit and announced plans for human missions to the Moon. NASA is phasing out its Space Shuttle system and developing a new crew and cargo transport system but, given the cost and complexity of this enterprise, the USA may be without its own means of human access to space at some point in the next decade, perhaps for several years. Russia has an operating human space flight system and is also developing a new human-rated space vehicle that government officials have said might begin flying as early as 2013. Canada, India, Japan, and member countries of the European Space Agency (ESA) are among nations interested in collaborating on human missions to the Moon and Mars. Still more nations—some with their own capabilities to build satellites, robotic spacecraft, and unpiloted space launch vehicles, some without any space capabilities of their own—would like to have a role in the global enterprise of space exploration and development. Some important questions must be addressed in considering future human exploration of space, questions that spacefaring nations have given insufficient attention. How will extending the human presence into the Solar System affect society and culture on Earth? What legal, ethical and other value systems should govern human settlements and other activities in space? Do humans have rights to exploit extraterrestrial resources and alter extraterrestrial environments? Do spacefaring nations have an obligation to share the benefits of access to space with those nations that do not have access? Do those nations with early access to space have a right to impose their social and cultural norms on space-based civilization? The following review of issues relating to space law, ethics and culture provides a framework for speculating on what the human future in space might hold and how President Bush's ‘vision’ might play out in the broader context of 21st century space exploration.

## Ethics

### Ethics is a fundamental part of our being and so we must determine an appropriate code of ethics before we go to space.

Space Daily 2k (http://www.spacedaily.com/news/ethics-00a.html)

ESA and UNESCO have prepared a joint report on the ethics of space. It will be presented to the media on 10 July in Paris by Professor Alain Pompidou, former Member of the European Parliament, and Antonio Rodota, ESA’s Director General. In 1998 the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST) – the UNESCO body charged with studying the social and ethical implications of the applications of science and technology chaired by Mrs Vigdis Finnbogadottir, former President of Iceland (1980-1996) – set up a special group to examine ethical issues related to the exploration of extra-atmospheric space. In the same spirit, in December of that year the Director General of ESA, Mr Antonio Rodota (who inspired the initiative), and Mr Federico Mayor, the Director General of UNESCO, created a working group on the ethics of extra-atmospheric space. This multi-disciplinary group was tasked with preparing a report on the ethical implications of space activities. Its work was coordinated by Professor Alain Pompidou, former MEP and a member of the French government’s "Conseil Economique et Social". ESA and UNESCO are now publishing this report, which draws on the experience and knowledge of international experts from the United Nations, national space agencies and industry. On Monday, 10 July 2000 the report will be presented to the media at ESA Headquarters in Paris during a press conference starting at 18h30. The report examines the ethical problems posed by the utilisation of outer space. Topics such as life in space - whether manned space flight, the search for life in space or the return of samples from other celestial bodies - space debris, Earth monitoring and the public image of space exploration are analysed in the report. "Ethics is a fundamental aspect of human society. For those who are involved in space activities, ignoring this debate is not an option." said Antonio Rodota. "At the European Space Agency we are committed to ensuring that the ethics of space science and technology will be considered in our decisions and in our programmes", he added.

## Aliens=Benevolent

### Aliens would have benevolent intentions if contact with them is made.

Tow ‘10 (Hunter David Tow, writer for the SETI Institute)

The Director of The future of Life Research Centre- David Hunter Tow, predicts that intelligent species on other planets, that we might contact through the SETI project in the future, are highly likely to be peaceful and non-threatening. Therefore the stereotype notion of aggressive and warlike aliens needs to be urgently revised. There has been a debate for many years within the general public and SETI communities as to whether aliens from other worlds, if they exist, would be human-friendly or aggressively predatory towards our civilisation. The general consensus is that the latter is more likely. This attitude is particularly relevant to the future planning of the SETI project, recently canvassed in the January 23rd issue of New Scientist. The discussion centred on whether it would be advisable to signal our presence on planet Earth by actively broadcasting a message to our intergalactic neighbours or to just continue passively scanning for their messages.
This debate is now beginning to have practical consequences for SETI and therefore deserves a closer and more sophisticated analysis. The pro-active alternative involves significantly greater investment and broader cooperation with both the scientific community and public in general. Supporters of the negative side of the argument base their analysis primarily on our own past behavioural patterns. Humans have aggressively waged war throughout our evolutionary history. The inference therefore is that other intelligent species would do the same, reflecting this same aggressive archetype, which has been portrayed in numerous sci-fi scenarios.

## Aliens=Benevolent

### Not all aliens are evil

Alfred Lambremont Webre, 6/5/11, (JD, Med, WWIII, a war between hostile ETs and humanity, has started, http://www.examiner.com/exopolitics-in-seattle/whistleblower-wwiii-a-war-between-hostile-ets-and-humanity-has-started#ixzz1PTKi1cXf

Mr. Prince states that the U.S. government knows of the existence of at least 118 extraterrestrial races that are involved with the affairs of Earth. He states, “There have also been Human/ET treaties with these compassionate races, and their motivations and actions in these areas seem to prove their intentions.”

Mr. Prince writes, “This situation is so bizarre and gets even more so as we go deeper into highly classified areas. I have been told by my NSA contact, X3, there are at least 118 different extra-terrestrial races, that the NSA knows about, involved in the affairs of this planet. The NSA refers to this ET grouping under such titles as The Link and others.

There are the benevolent ETs visiting this planet from star sectors such as the Pleiades, Andromeda, Lyra, Tau Ceti, Sirius A, and Ummo, which have been referred to by contactees and secret service personnel as The Galactic Confederation of Worlds. Here we are going into complicated Star Wars-type Exo-politics.

“However, there are benevolent factions of Orion Greys and Draco Reptilians and evil factions of Pleiadians, for example. This is obvious, as in any race there are good and evil elements. I wanted to just make this distinction clear because in the so-called New Age movement, there is almost a religious type of obsession with New Age advocates claiming all reptilians are negative and all Pleiadians are here to save us from them. There have also been Human/ET treaties with these compassionate races, and their motivations and actions in these areas seem to prove their intentions

## We Percieve Aliens as Evil

### We perceive aliens as aggressive because of the way we think of each other. AS we evolve into more ethical beings the idea of benevolent aliens becomes more plausible to us.

Tow ‘10 (Hunter David Tow, writer for the SETI Institute)

But the second flaw is more pertinent. Behaviour in a species is not a static property- it can be modified over time. Our civilisation is moving towards a phase change in its social awareness, following 10,000 years of evolution, since the end of the last ice age. Although humans have waged war continuously over this period, with greater knowledge and hindsight we are beginning to comprehend more clearly its appalling consequences for future as well as current generations and the urgent need to avoid or mitigate its debilitating outcomes at all costs. In the 20th century when the ferocity of conflict began to spiral out of control, threatening the very existence of our species, we began to construct an institutional and legal architecture to better reflect this awareness and safeguard our survival. Evidence of this accelerating trend includes- the creation of global institutions such as the UN including the World Health Organisation and UNESCO, major advances in democracy, human rights and social justice, the creation of global Peace-keeping forces, implementation of critical treaties and protocols covering nuclear disarmament, war crime resolution, conflict mediation and outlawing the use of chemical weapons and land mines. This new ethical framework will provide the basis for managing our civilisation in the future and provide the glue to hold it together in times of extreme stress such as during global warming.

# \*\*Racism Adv\*\*

## Race Kritik—Advantage I/L

### Contemporary ufological discourses rely on implicit racialized identity categories—our ethnographic approach is key.

Christopher F. Roth, Anthropology—University of Northern Illinois, DeKalb, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 40-2

Ufology and academic social science intersect at various points. The "ancient astronaut" literature has been responding to developments in academic archaeology for more than half a century. Millennial flying-saucer religions have been investigated by social psychologists and scholars of religion (Festinger, Riecken, and Schachter 1956; Balch and Taylor 1977; Balch 1982; Lewis 1995; Denzler 2001). Ufologists turn to folklore studies (such as Evans-Wentz 1911) to demonstrate the universality of something resembling the ufo experience (Vallee 1969a; Conroy 1989: 302-44), while sympathetic folklorists have fitted ufo reports into a "legend" para­digm (Rojcewicz 1987; Bullard 1987,1989). Ufology has its own school of thought, referred to as the "psychosocial hypothesis," which explores the limits of the social and psychological embeddedness of ufo imagery and beliefs. Each of these intertwinings of traditions of thought deserves a sepa­rate study of the type attempted here. What I concentrate on now, how­ever, is a particular line of thinking in ufology that has been continually informed by academic human sciences: the attempt to understand alien physical forms in light of understandings and paradigms in physical an­thropology—a discipline that I will treat as, even in its high-academic form, emergent from and responding to folk thought and embedded in political, social, and popular-cultural discourses. Put simply, ufology is in one sense all about race, and it has more to do with terrestrial racial schemes as social and cultural constructs than most ufo believers are aware.

Cultural and physical anthropologists have attended to the social and political contexts of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century physical anthropology and how its understanding of human variation reflected and supported social and political structures in Europe and America. But, as twentieth-century anthropology shed the race concept and cultural and social anthropologists began to dominate the discipline and separate their project from physical anthropology, the older anthropological discourses that had legitimized a hierarchical racial and class order did not vanish. Those "disproven" paradigms persist in scientific creationism, racist an­thropology, and other pseudo sciences. Donna Kossy (2oor) provides a model for an intellectual history of such pseudo science (see also Kafton-Minkel 1989; Godwin 1992). Her work is essentially the dark underbelly of George Stocking's work on the history of academic anthropology. Ufology, despite its deep intellectual roots, is one less well-studied reservoir of such discredited ideas. I decline, as Slocking does (1968), to distinguish science and pseudo science, instead treating both as shilling folk categories (like the concepts "disproven" and "discredited" themselves), which, if applied analytically would deny the historical contextualizability of institutionalized knowledge. Instead, I trace the rise of anthropological concepts and their diffusion into what became the ufological community, a community whose members by necessity have always been embedded in and responding to the socially constructed ethnoscapes of the larger society.

There is, in one sense, no organic folk culture of ufology distinct from a more official or intellectual discourse of it. Those interested in UFOs have always been avid autodidacts of religion, history, biology, physics, anthropology, and the occult. At a typical ufo interest group meeting in any American city, one can hear debates about social psychology, interdimensional physics, and the ethnography of shamanism. But there might be not a degree holder among them, and the names dropped are far more likely to include Carl Jung, Terence McKenna, Stephen Hawking, Immanuel Velikovsky, and Julian Jaynes than Freud, Marx, Boas, or Levi-Strauss. Their ideas are more likely to echo the essentialisms of Muller, Eliade, and Castaneda than the relativism and social constructivism that characterize most academic thinking in the humanities and social sciences today. Any ethnography of the belief structure of ufology must, then, also be an intellectual history, responding to social and historical shifts in a tighter feedback loop than is the case with the mainstream developments in any academic discipline.

## Race Kritik I/L

### Alien threat discourse draws on anti-Semitic tropes of foreign parasites that justify racial violence—only our critical approach can solve.

Christopher F. Roth, Anthropology—University of Northern Illinois, DeKalb, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 57-8

Although such explicit anti-Semitism has always been on the fringes even of the ufo movement, it is impossible to ignore its formative effect on the ufo discourse. It is not the fascist political orientation of the old contactees that marginalizes them today; in fact, it is striking how many ufo enthusiasts will, off the record and after some theatrical dissembling, allow, for example, that Jews probably do control the media. This has been especially true since the 1990s, when the Internet facilitated a convergence between ufological and conspiracy-theory discourses that is now nearly total. Rather, modern believers are put off only by the lack of verisimilitude in the 195os reports: the rosiness of the Venusian (and other) messages, the beings' too human appearance, and the rapid obsolescence of their scientific pronouncements.

Nonetheless, the 1950s contactees quietly shaped ufological discourses. For one thing, we can see in contactees' writings some of the shifts from an Old World theosophy (broadly defined), with its orientation toward South Asian civilizations and esoteric mystery religions and its obsession with the place of the Anglo-Saxon in world politics and history, to a New World occultism focused on futuristic technology; a more generalized valorization of the tribal, with less emphasis on the East and more on the Americas; and a preoccupation, always present and rarely acknowledged, with comprehending the role of America in the world and the meanings and values of different components of the American ethnoscape. These shifts can be read in and on alien bodies, since so much of American racial discourse is inscribed on bodies and in folk racial classifications.

Williamson's vision of the physically weak, materialistic aliens infiltrating our society is a durable image, even though these particular beings — like Shaver's Deros, whom they resemble—were never reported, photo­graphed, or encountered face-to-face during the early contactee period. They were invoked only as a specter. It was instead the soft-skinned, longhaired Nordic space brothers who were stepping out of the saucers to interact with humans directly. In effect, the "slop and waste" beings from Orion were not so much aliens as a secret society within humanity, hidden in plain sight. This concept of demonic intruders among us, infiltrating our social institutions, moving in next door, originates in anti-Semitic conspiracy theories dating even to the Middle Ages (Trachtenberg 1943), and, as we will see, some features of the image of the abducting Greys stem directly from components of these scenarios.

# \*\*Aliens=Sweet\*\*

## 2AC Aliens No Exist

### Doesn’t respond to the aff—its irrelevant whether we can determine the existence of extraterrestrials—we say that not being open to the possibility of ET is bad

Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall, ‘8 (“Sovereignty and the UFO”, Profs at OSU and U of Minnesota, Political Theory)

Proving Our Ignorance Our argument is that UFO ignorance is political rather than scientific. To motivate this argument, however, we first need to critique UFO “skepticism” as science.31 Science derives its authority from its claim to discover, before politics, objective facts about the world. Since today these putative facts include that UFOs are not ETs, we have to show that this fact is not actually scientific.

We consider very briefly the strongest arguments for UFO skepticism and show that none justifies rejection of the ET hypothesis (ETH). Indeed, they do not come close.32 It is not known, scientifically, that UFOs are not ETs, and to reject the ETH is therefore to risk a Type II error in statistics, or rejecting a true explanation. Of course, this does not mean that UFOs are ETs, either (inviting a Type I error), but it shifts the burden of proof onto skeptics to show that a Type II error has not been made.33 The UFO taboo is then puzzling, and open to political critique.

“There is No Evidence”

Echoing Hume’s discussion of miracles, Carl Sagan once said about UFOs that “extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence,” and the empirical evidence for the ETH is certainly not that. If there is any ET signal in the noise of UFO reports it is very weak. However, some evidence warrants reasonable doubt.

Physical evidence. Usually the first objection to the ETH is the lack of direct physical evidence of alien presence. Some ET believers contest this, claiming that the U.S. government is hiding wreckage from a 1947 crash at Roswell, New Mexico, but such claims are based on conspiracy theories that we shall set aside here. Not because they are necessarily wrong (although they cannot be falsified in the present context of UFO secrecy), but because like UFO skepticism they are anthropocentric, only now We know that UFOs are ETs but “They” (the government) aren’t telling. Such an assumption leads critique toward issues of official secrecy and away from the absence of systematic study, which is the real puzzle. In our view secrecy is a symptom of the UFO taboo, not its heart.

While there is no direct physical evidence for the ETH, however, there is considerable indirect physical evidence for it, in the form of UFO anomalies that lack apparent conventional explanations—and for which ETs are therefore one possibility.34 These anomalies take four forms: ground traces, electro-magnetic interference with aircraft and motor vehicles, photographs and videos, and radar sightings like the Belgian F-16 case. Such anomalies cannot be dismissed simply because they are only indirect evidence for ETs, since science relies heavily on such evidence, as in the recent discovery of over 300 extra-solar planets (and counting).35 For if UFO anomalies are not potentially ETs, what else are they?

Testimonial evidence. Most UFO reports consist primarily of eyewitness testimony. Although all observation is in a sense testimonial, by itself testimony cannot ground a scientific claim unless it can be replicated independently, which UFO testimony cannot. Such testimony is problematic in other respects as well. It reports seemingly impossible things, much is of poor quality, witnesses may have incentives to lie, honest observers may lack knowledge, and even experts can make mistakes. In view of these problems skeptics dismiss UFO testimony as meaningless.

Problems notwithstanding, this conclusion is unwarranted. First, testimony should not be dismissed lightly, since none of us can verify for ourselves even a fraction of the knowledge we take for granted.36 In both law and social science, testimony has considerable epistemic weight in determining the facts. While sometimes wrong, given its importance in society, testimony is rejected only if there are strong reasons to do so. Second, there is a very large volume of UFO testimony, with some events witnessed by literally thousands of people. Third, some of these people were “expert witnesses”— civilian and military pilots, air traffic controllers, astronauts, astronomers, and other scientists. Finally, some of this testimony is corroborated by physical evidence, as in “radar/visual” cases.

In short, the empirical evidence alone does not warrant rejecting the ETH. It does not warrant acceptance either, but this sets the bar too high. The question today is not “Are UFOs ETs?” but “Is there enough evidence they might be to warrant systematic study?” By demanding proof of ETs first, skeptics foreclose the question altogether.

## Aliens Exist

### Vast evidence demonstrate the existence of ET

GREER, February 28th 2004

Steven M, emergency physician and former chairman of the Department of Emergency Medicine at Caldwell Memorial Hospital. He is a lifetime member of Alpha Omega Alpha, the nation's most prestigious medical honor society. Inspired, in part, by his uncle who helped design the original lunar module, Dr. Greer has spent years researching exotic energy and propulsion systems. He has been examining what systems have been developed and how the implementation of those systems would affect the environment and society as a whole. He has met with and provided briefings for senior members of government, military and intelligence operations in the United States and around the world, including senior CIA officials, Joint Chiefs of Staff, White House staff, senior members of Congress and congressional committees, senior United Nations leadership and diplomats, senior military officials in the United Kingdom and Europe and cabinet-level staff members of the Japanese government, among others. Dr. Greer has addressed tens of thousands of people live at conferences and lectures around the world including the international convention for MENSA, The Institute of Noetic Sciences Board of Directors, and the Sierra Club, THE UNACKNOWLEDGED THREAT SECRET AND COVERT OPERATIONS BY THE USA, World Affairs; The Journal of International Issues, http://www.disclosureproject.org/World%20Affairs%20-%20The%20Journal%20of%20International%20Issues.htm

Today, this subject usually elicits laughter, embarrassment and dismissal. This is certainly understandable since at least 99 per cent of everything said, written, filmed or otherwise placed in the public domain on the subject is outright deception. But in the corridors of power — and especially in the corridors of covert programmes — the matter is of utmost importance. This is because at the core of this enigma lies a body of science that eliminates in one generation the need for oil, fossil fuels and the related pollution and establishes a truly sustainable world civilisation exempt from poverty as we know it. The relentless ridicule associated with the UFO subject matter is deliberate and staged: It hides a profound body of knowledge dwarfing the changes that have transpired from the industrial revolution until today by several orders of magnitude. In a letter to Congress, first CIA Director Admiral Roscoe Hillenkoetter had this to say:

It is time for the truth to be brought out … Behind the scenes, high-ranking Air Force officers are soberly concerned about the UFOs. But through official secrecy and ridicule, many citizens are led to believe the unknown flying objects are nonsense … I urge immediate Congressional action to reduce the dangers from secrecy about unidentified flying objects...

We have identified nearly 500 military, corporate, intelligence and laboratory witnesses to events and programmes connected to these matters. The body of evidence is overwhelming and definitive. In May 2001, we held a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, DC at which more than 20 such witnesses provided testimony and documents regarding their direct, first-hand involvement in the subject. It was the most-watched webcast in history, and ultimately over a million people viewed the event over the Internet. The event was reported by CNN, CNN International, major networks like the BBC, the Voice of America, Pravda, the Chinese News Agency, Telemundo, The Washington Times and other media around the world. Tens of thousands of people wrote to the president and members of Congress asking for an investigation of the subject and a general declassification of information.

And then September 11 happened. In view of the US Patriot Act and other developments, including the Iraq war, the US Congress has elected not to pursue the matter. But the international community, which is greatly harmed by the continued imposition of this secrecy, is the primary victim and should be the prime mover in getting these matters investigated.

EXPERT WITNESSES AND TESTIMONY

Sufficient evidence, documents, physical proof and testimonies exist to definitively make the case for the reality of the issue as well as its illegal handling. Beginning in 1992, we met with senior government officials in the US, UK, the United Nations and other agencies and discovered a remarkable degree of interest in resolving this problem and obtaining a general disclosure of the facts. The officials ranged from members of the US Senate Intelligence Committee to the first acting CIA director under President Clinton, including very senior admirals and generals at the Pentagon and in the British General Staff. There is widespread agreement that the subject has enormous implications for the future of humanity and that the secrecy has become inexcusable.

What has been lacking is the will to take meaningful action on the issue. While interest and moral support for disclosure are high, fear is even greater. Consider what some of these top secret “whistle-blower” witnesses have said about this secrecy and the fear it engenders:

Brigadier General Stephen Lovekin: Army National Guard Reserves. As a young army officer he worked with President Eisenhower in the last years of his presidency.

But what happened was that Eisenhower got sold out. Without him knowing it, he lost control of what was going on with the entire UFO situation. In his last address to the nation, I think he was telling us that the military industrial complex would stick (sic) you in the back if you were not totally vigilant. And, I think that he felt like he had not been vigilant. I think he felt like he trusted too many people. And Eisenhower was a trusting man. And I think that he realised that all of a sudden this matter is going into the control of corporations that could very well act to the detriment of this country.

This frustration, from what I can remember, went on for months. He realised that he was losing control of the UFO subject. As far as I can remember, that was the expression that was used, “It is not going to be in the best hands.” That was a real concern. And so it has turned out to be ...

“It had been discussed with me on numerous occasions what could happen to me militarily if I discussed this. I would say that the government has done as good a job enforcing secrecy through the installation of abject fear as they have done with anything within the memory of modern man.”

One older officer discussed with me what possibly could happen if there was a revelation. He was talking about being erased and I said, “Man, what do you mean erased?” And, he said, “Yes, you will be erased — disappear.” And I said, “How do you know all this?” And he said, “I know.” Those threats have been made and carried out. Those threats started way back in 1947. The Army [and the] Air Force was given absolute control over how to handle this. This being the biggest security situation that this country has ever dealt with and there have been some erasures …

I don’t care what kind of a person you are. I don’t care how strong or courageous you are. It would be a very fearful situation because from what Matt [this older officer] said, “They will go after not only you. They will go after your family.” Those were his words. And, so I can only say that the reason that they have managed to keep it under wraps for so long is through fear. They are very selective about how they pull someone out to make an example of. And I know that that has been done.

Lance Corporal Jonathan Weygandt : US Marine Corps, present at a retrieval of a UFO in South America

“You weren’t supposed to be there.” “You are not supposed to see this.” “You are going to be dangerous if we let you go.” I thought that they were going to kill me, really … Lethal, deadly force has been used. For those of you who don’t know, I know marine snipers and I have heard other guys talk about it and I’ve heard that these guys go on the streets and they stalk people and they kill them. I know that the Army Airborne snipers do the same thing. They use Delta Force to go grab these people and silence them by killing them.

Larry Warren: US Air Force, Security Officer, present during the landing of a UFO at Bentwaters Air Force Base in the UK

We were gone over with a Geiger counter and there was one return on one of the guys, and something was taken out of his pocket. (He had picked up an item from the retrieved craft.) This guy was removed very quickly. And, I will swear on my life, I never saw him again. He was removed. This happened to a lot of people. It led to a suicide that the Air Force is responsible for. This is a real person with a real name ...

Master Sergeant Dan Morris : US Air Force, NRO (National Reconnaissance Office) Operative

I became part of a group that would investigate, gather the information, and in the beginning it was still under the Blue Book, Snowbird and different covert programmes. I would go interview people who claimed they had seen something and try to convince them they hadn’t seen something or that they were hallucinating. Well, if that didn’t work, another team would come in and give all the threats. And threaten them and their family and so on and so forth. And they would be in charge of discrediting them, making them look foolish and so on and so forth. Now if that didn’t work, then there was another team that put an end to that problem, one way or another.

Professor Robert Jacobs: US Air Force, who filmed a UFO intercepting an early ICBM test

After an article [came out about the incident] … I started being harassed at work. I started getting odd telephone calls that would come during the day. At night, at my house I would get telephone calls — all night long sometimes — 3.00 in the morning, 4.00 in the morning, midnight, 10.00. People would call and start screaming at me. “You are going down (unprintable expletive)! You are going down! And that’s all they would say.” And they’d keep screaming that until I finally hung up the phone.

  One night somebody blew up my mailbox by putting a big load of skyrockets in it. The mailbox went up in flames. And that night at 1:00 in the morning the phone rang. I picked it up and somebody said, “skyrockets in your box at night, oh what a beautiful sight!”

And things like that have happened on and off since 1982 …

I believe this nutty fringe around UFOs is part of a concerted effort to keep serious study of it down. Anytime anybody tries to study this subject seriously, we are subject to ridicule. I’m a full professor at a relatively major university. And I’m certain that my colleagues at the university laugh at me and hoot and holler behind my back when they hear that I have an interest in studying unidentified flying objects — and that’s just one of the things that we have to live with …

  What happened to the film is an interesting story in itself as Major Mansmann related to me and other people. Sometime after I had gone, the guys in civilian clothes — I thought it was the CIA but he said no, it wasn’t the CIA, it was somebody else — took the film and they spooled off the part that had the UFO on it and they took a pair of scissors and cut it off. They put that on a separate reel. They put it in their briefcase. They handed Major Mansmann back the rest of the film and said here, “I don’t need to remind you, Major, of the severity of a security breach; we’ll consider this incident closed.” And they walked off with the film. Major Mansmann never saw it again.

Merle Shane McDow: US Navy Atlantic Command

These two gentlemen began to question me about this event. They were being pretty rough about it, to be honest with you. I remember literally putting my hands up and saying, “Wait a minute fellows. I am on your side. Just a minute.” Because they were not really nice. They were very intimidating and made it quite clear to the point that nothing that was seen, heard, or witnessed, that transpired was to leave this building. You are not to say a word about it to your co-workers. And off base, you just forget everything that you may have seen or heard concerning this. It didn’t happen ...

Major George A Filer, III: US Air Force (Retd.)

At times I used to carry nuclear weapons. In other words, I was mentally fit to carry nuclear weapons, but I’m not mentally fit if I see a UFO. This criticism and this ridicule have done more to keep the story coming out than almost anything else.

John Callahan: FAA Head of Accidents and Investigations

… When they got done, they actually swore all these other guys in there that this never took place. We never had this meeting. And this was never recorded …   This was one of the guys from the CIA. Okay? That they were never there and this never happened. At the time I said, well I don’t know why you are saying this. I mean, there was something there and if it’s not the stealth bomber, then you know, it’s a UFO. And if it’s a UFO, why wouldn’t you want the people to know? Oh, they got all excited over that. You don’t even want to say those words. He said this is the first time they ever had 30 minutes of radar data on a UFO. And they are all itching to get their hands onto the data and to find out what it is and what really goes on. He says if they come out and told the American public that they ran into a UFO out there, it would cause panic across the country. So therefore, you can’t talk about it. And they are going to take all this data …

  … When the CIA told us that this never happened and we never had this meeting, I believe it was because they didn’t want the public to know that this was going on. Normally we would put out some type of a news release that such and such happened ...

In short, so ruthless and unrelenting has been the secrecy associated with these issues that no institution or leader to date has been willing to take the matter on. Indeed, after we met with CIA Director James Woolsey in December 1993 and recommended that President Clinton take direct executive action to end the secrecy and facilitate a disclosure, we saw first hand how great the fear was. A friend of the president visited us after this meeting and informed us that it was felt that the president would “end up like [President] John Kennedy if he did what we suggested.” Of course, we initially burst into laughter, until we were stopped and informed that such concerns were real. We were stunned. Until then, we had relegated such concerns to the dustbin of conspiracy theories. But it appears that the fear and ruthless control exercised by these projects around the world has effectively kept the matter off the public radar screen. In our view, the propagation of such fear as a tool for control is a genuine form of international terrorism. Its effects are devastating: it has neutralised democratic processes and institutions, engendered paralysing fear, hijacked the future of humanity, impoverished billions of people and decimated the earthly environment in the span of one human lifetime. Indeed, the harmful effects of such rogue secrecy exceed by orders of magnitude the consequences of any terrorist organisation operating today.

Subsequent meetings with members of Congress and other high officials resulted in enormous concern — even consternation — but no action. We repeatedly heard that many in senior positions were concerned with such unsanctioned secrecy, but these officials would simply pass the buck to others, saying “Why don’t you meet with so and so on another committee and get him to hold a hearing?”

Other witnesses have described these operations thus:

Dr Paul Czysz: McDonnell Douglas Career Engineer

The black budget world is like trying to describe Casper the friendly ghost. You might see a cartoon of him but you don’t know how big he is, you don’t know where his funding comes from, you don’t know how many there are because of the compartmentalisation and the oath that people have to take. I know people today that worked on one of the things that I worked on, and if you asked them about it — even if it is being discussed on the Internet — they would say “No, I have no idea what you’re talking about.” They’re in their seventies now, but they still would absolutely never admit that they even know what you’re talking about. You have no idea, but it’s probably larger than you think.

John Maynard: DIA Official

Of corporations involved in this matter, Atlantic Research Corporation is one of the big ones. So it’s not very often heard about. It’s an insider beltway bandit, if you want to call it that, very low profile, mostly has all of its work done within Intelligence. TRW, Johnson Controls, Honeywell; All of them at some point or another became involved with the intelligence field. Certain works, activities were contracted out to them. Atlantic Research was one of them — way back. These are entities that were created out of people in the Pentagon to become a “beltway bandit” — received projects, grants, and monies to do certain projects that were so highly classified and compartmentalised that, you know, only about four people would know what was going on. So it was that tightly controlled.

Edgar Mitchell : Astronaut

Whatever activity is going on, to the extent that it is a clandestine group, a quasi-government group, a quasi-private group, it is without any type, as far as I can tell, of high-level government oversight. And that is a great concern.

Mitchell later made a statement to the media, reported in the St Petersburg Times of February 28, 2004, “The Aliens have landed … a few insiders know the truth and are studying the bodies … A cabal of insiders stopped briefing presidents about extraterrestrials after President Kennedy.”

Sergeant Clifford Stone : US Army

…. They immediately come out and say, “Oh, we can’t keep secrets, we can’t keep secrets.” Well, the truth is, yes, we can. The National Reconnaisance Office remained secret for many, many years. The mere existence of the NSA remained secret. The development of the atomic weapon remained secret until once you exploded one you eventually had to tell some people what was going on.

  …. I had classified documents the Air Force acknowledged. When I got members of Congress to help me open up more files, they were immediately destroyed and I can prove this.

  When Congress did their review of the way we protect documents, and the way we go ahead and implement our secrecy programmes, they found that you had special access programmes within special access programmes — that it was essentially impossible to keep control of them all by Congress. And, I’m telling you right now; it is essentially impossible to keep control of them all.

  When it comes to UFOs, the same criteria [sic] applies. Therefore, only a small nucleus within the intelligence community, numbering less than a hundred — no, I’d suggest less than 50 — control all that information. It is not subject to congressional review or oversight at all.

Dr Robert Wood: McDonnell Douglas Aerospace Engineer

As you may know, when you get cleared for one of these classified programmes you wear your special badge and you know you can talk to anybody who’s in the room with a lot of candour and it feels like that’s one’s psychological group — there’s a lot of camaraderie that builds up. And you had access to special libraries. So one of the things that we could do is go up to the library that the Air Force ran and sort of paw through top secret material. Since I was interested in UFOs, when I had some usual business to take care of, I’d also look in their library to see what they had on UFOs. And for about a year I was getting quite a few hits on the subject about various reports. Then all of a sudden, the whole subject material vanished. The entire classification for the subject just vanished. The librarian in our group that I was working with said he’d been in that vault for twenty years and knew exactly how things were normally done. He said, “This is remarkable!” He said, “I’ve never seen that before, you just don’t have a whole subject vanish out from under you.” He said, “I think there is something there that you hit on ...”

  In the meantime, there was one other thing that came about as a result of my association with Jim McDonald (a well-known UFO scientific investigator). I liked the guy; he was really an energetic physicist and wouldn’t let any grass grow under his feet. When he got a case he would dig his teeth into it and present an overwhelmingly convincing story to professional societies. He would talk to the American Institute of Aeronautics and the American Physical Society, and I happened to be members of both. So whenever he was in town I would pick him up, escort him, made sure he felt welcome.

So once when I was travelling through Tucson, where he lived, I stopped — I had a two-hour layover to catch an airplane — and he came out to the airport to have a beer with me. I said, “What’s new, Jim?” He said, “I think I’ve got it.” I said, “What do you think you got?” He said, “I think I got the answer.” I said, “What is it?” He said, “I can’t tell you yet. I have got to be sure.” It was six weeks after that that he tried to shoot himself. A couple months after that he finally died.

  Knowing what I think I now suspect about the skills of our counter intelligence people, I think we had the capacity to convince him to do it himself. I think that’s what happened ...

  Clearly in order to have effective control of this subject, you have to control it at all levels and the most obvious level is the media. So you have to look at all the kinds of media there are, the movies, the magazines, and of course in the early days that’s all it is, newspapers and movies and magazines. Now we have the Internet and video and all those other sorts of things. But as the technology has blossomed in these other avenues, the people worrying about this control have also just moved into those avenues right along with them. So every time a new avenue comes up they have a new counterpoint.

The reader should note that we have gathered nearly 500 such credentialled witnesses from every agency and branch of the military, as well as select corporations involved in the secrecy.

The group maintaining this secrecy, at least at a policy level, numbers some 200–300 individuals from a number of countries and represents a powerful array of interests including those connected to financial, technological, security, religious, media, political and scientific areas. In 1993, contacts in this group stated to us that about a third of those involved were in favour of ending the secrecy and a broad disclosure of the facts; as of today we estimate over 40 per cent hold this opinion. Those who think that such a group could not get away indefinitely with such secrecy are right. We have obtained sufficient actionable intelligence, sources and documents to make the case. We have names, programme code numbers, the locations of operations and corporate programmes and related vital intelligence. But to whom will this information be disclosed and to what end?

Since the secrecy related to these technologies and operations is rogue, unconstitutional and harmful, any legitimate governmental or international body could hold a hearing at which witnesses and evidence could be presented. Legal and national security experts associated with the Disclosure Project have determined that, since the secrecy is unregulated and outside the bounds of the law, the leaders of such projects have no legitimate right to enforce such secrecy. This means those persons holding secrets are no longer constitutionally bound by any past or current secrecy oaths. This assessment has been shared with senior governmental officials and to date no entity or official has challenged this position.

Significantly, during the preparation and in the aftermath of the above-mentioned National Press Club event, none of the whistle-blowers or staff of the Disclosure Project have been threatened or silenced in any way. We have been able to make a definitive case for the evidence as also for the illegal nature of the secrecy. Hence, no legal entity can insist on silence.

## Aliens Exist

### Recorded testimonies prove they exist

GREER AND WEBRE, MAY 9TH 2001

Dr, Steven, and Alfred, MILITARY, GOVERNMENT WITNESSES TO PROVIDE TESTIMONY ON UFO/EXTRATERRESTRIAL PRESENCE CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION SOUGHT, The Disclosure Project, [http://www.gewo.cz/util/pressreleases&briefingpts.doc](http://www.gewo.cz/util/pressreleases%26briefingpts.doc)

The recorded testimony of scores of military, government and other witnesses to Unidentified Flying Objects and Extraterrestrial events and projects from around the world establishes the existence of a UFO/Extraterrestrial presence on and around Earth.  This recorded testimony consists of dozens of first-hand, often top-secret witnesses to UFO and Extraterrestrial events, internal UFO-related government projects and covert activities, space-based weapons programs, Extraterrestrial Intelligence, and covert, reverse-engineered energy and propulsion system projects.  The technologies that are of an Extraterrestrial origin, when publicly released within a planned transition period, will provide solutions to global environmental and security challenges.

These numerous recorded witnesses constitute only a small portion of a vast pool of identified present or former military, intelligence, corporate, aviator, flight control, law enforcement officers, scientists and other witnesses, who will come forward when subpoenaed to testify at Congressional hearings.  Without a grant of immunity releasing them from their security oaths, many such unimpeachable witnesses fear to speak out.

### They exist

GREER, 1994

Steven M., The Foundations of Interplanetary Unity, Center for the Study of Extraterrestrial Intelligence, http://www.cseti.org/position/greer/foundation.htm

To any impartial observer, the evidence which exists certainly supports a greater than 10% probability that we are being visited by advanced extraterrestrial civilizations. Indeed, to most people who have seen the data in its entirety, the probability is in excess of 90%. Having spoken to several government officials who have held Top Secret clearances on this subject, and who have confirmed to me that the US Government has in its possession several objects and bodies of extraterrestrial origin, my own personal assessment approaches certainty. Beyond this, I have personally been present when these spacecraft have approached the CSETI research teams within a few hundred feet, and have then signaled repeatedly to us. Frankly, there is very little doubt in my mind that we are dealing with at least one extraterrestrial civilization, and that they are non-hostile.

However, for argument sake, let us state that all of the evidence available to us in the civilian domain constitutes only a 10% probability of contact with extraterrestrial intelligence. Does this not constitute adequate evidence to initiate a serious scientific and diplomatic mission? Certainly in medicine a 10% probability of finding a cure for cancer would warrant an all out effort in the cancer research community. For it is generally true that when the stakes are very high, the probability of success need not be, prior to initiating a research project. Without question, the stakes are so high in this area that even a 10% probability is adequate to mount one of the most extensive worldwide research initiatives in history.

## Disclosure Good—Technology

### Disclosure of aliens will facilitate the dispersal of technology that is vital to stave of extinction

GREER, February 28th 2004

Steven M, emergency physician and former chairman of the Department of Emergency Medicine at Caldwell Memorial Hospital. He is a lifetime member of Alpha Omega Alpha, the nation's most prestigious medical honor society. Inspired, in part, by his uncle who helped design the original lunar module, Dr. Greer has spent years researching exotic energy and propulsion systems. He has been examining what systems have been developed and how the implementation of those systems would affect the environment and society as a whole. He has met with and provided briefings for senior members of government, military and intelligence operations in the United States and around the world, including senior CIA officials, Joint Chiefs of Staff, White House staff, senior members of Congress and congressional committees, senior United Nations leadership and diplomats, senior military officials in the United Kingdom and Europe and cabinet-level staff members of the Japanese government, among others. Dr. Greer has addressed tens of thousands of people live at conferences and lectures around the world including the international convention for MENSA, The Institute of Noetic Sciences Board of Directors, and the Sierra Club, THE UNACKNOWLEDGED THREAT SECRET AND COVERT OPERATIONS BY THE USA, World Affairs; The Journal of International Issues, http://www.disclosureproject.org/World%20Affairs%20-%20The%20Journal%20of%20International%20Issues.htm

The Disclosure Project, an NGO based in the United States, has identified several hundred military, intelligence and corporate witnesses to illegal and extra-constitutional projects that have suppressed information and prevented public access to technologies which could provide a definitive replacement for oil, coal, nuclear power and other conventional energy sources. These technologies have been both acquired and developed by military and industrial interests in the US, UK and other countries that have repeatedly lied to or withheld this information from legally constituted authorities and the public. This information has the potential to completely transform the current state of the world in the areas of technology, energy production, propulsion, the environment and geopolitical issues related to oil and energy supplies. In short, a sustainable, non-polluting and affluent civilisation could be created by the wise application of these technologies, and many of the most pressing crises facing the world community could have been avoided if it had not been for the deliberate suppression of such technological knowledge. While “national security concerns” have been invoked as reasons for such secrecy, in reality the policy is driven by the resolve to maintain the current “status quo” based on the pre-eminence of oil and fossil fuels and related special interests.

By the time President Eisenhower left, a transformation had occurred in the structure of Western military, intelligence and corporate programmes. The urgent pressures of the nuclear arms race and the Cold War with the Soviets had created an atmosphere of extreme secrecy, dwarfing the secret infrastructure surrounding the Manhattan Project that built the atomic bomb during the Second World War. The fate of the free world was at stake, and no expense was spared to create the means to advance technologies within the dark womb of secrecy. A culture evolved that required such secrecy for national survival and the “need-to-know-only” requirements of such programmes were further reinforced by the well-known espionage scandals of that era, including that of the Rosenbergs.

However, such a culture of generally regarded justifiable secrecy also created opportunities for abuse within the military, intelligence, corporate and laboratory complex. Classified programmes, appropriately structured to require a genuine need-to-know situation in order for one to have access to them, became increasingly “compartmented”, restricted and shadowy. Mechanisms for funding became Byzantine and obscure; programme structures were hidden with cover stories, “store front” operations and became virtually impenetrable; and the people within such programmes found themselves at once increasingly isolated and strangely empowered.

It was in this womb, awash with billions of dollars of so-called “black budget” funding, that extreme (and many would maintain essential) secrecy gave birth to the monster of rogue, illegal and powerful “unacknowledged special access projects” (USAPs) dealing with a number of unusual phenomena and technologies. In the world of USAPs, compart-mentalisation is so great, the need to know so restricted and the information so important, that meaningful supervision by the constitutionally required authorities in the US, UK and other countries became simply impossible. Here, “unacknowledged” means that nobody is ever told about the project unless he absolutely needs to know and is directly required to be involved in operations. Even if a senior official inquires, the answer is “no such project exists.”

Moreover, the milieu of the “revolving door” world of military, intelligence and corporate programmes created corporate and financial influences that ran counter to genuine “national security” interests or any legitimate public interest. Especially in the United States, the multi-billion dollar expenditures on military technologies, research and development programmes and outsourced services and operations allowed for a comingling of public finances and private interests. This, combined with the extreme compartmentalisation of programmes, allowed for serious abuses of the public trust to take place.

Ultimately, such programmes — networked carefully with other programmes and corporate research — became so restrictive that legal authorities were routinely and as a matter of course left out of the loop. Ultimately, those left out of the loop would become members of Congress and even the US president.

Indeed, when President Eisenhower left office, operations had become so complex and out of control, that he was convinced he was being shut out of vital developments and operations. In the years since, matters have decayed exponentially to the point that we estimate today some $100 billion per year go into unacknowledged programmes escaping the substantial knowledge of the US president and US Congress.

USAP AND ADVANCED ENERGY AND PROPULSION SYSTEMS

The “crown jewels” of such USAPs are those connected to very advanced energy and propulsion systems. In the 1940s and 1950s, a concerted effort was made to investigate a number of phenomena related to emerging sciences, including those associated with electromagnetism and electro-gravitic/magneto-gravitic technologies for their promising potential in creating energy and propulsion systems valuable to urgent defence projects.

## Disclosure Good—Extinction

### Disclosure is key to prepare for the inevitable aliean war that threatens the entire planet

GREER, April 7th 2002

Steven M. emergency physician and former chairman of the Department of Emergency Medicine at Caldwell Memorial Hospital. He is a lifetime member of Alpha Omega Alpha, the nation's most prestigious medical honor society. Inspired, in part, by his uncle who helped design the original lunar module, Dr. Greer has spent years researching exotic energy and propulsion systems. He has been examining what systems have been developed and how the implementation of those systems would affect the environment and society as a whole. He has met with and provided briefings for senior members of government, military and intelligence operations in the United States and around the world, including senior CIA officials, Joint Chiefs of Staff, White House staff, senior members of Congress and congressional committees, senior United Nations leadership and diplomats, senior military officials in the United Kingdom and Europe and cabinet-level staff members of the Japanese government, among others. Dr. Greer has addressed tens of thousands of people live at conferences and lectures around the world including the international convention for MENSA, The Institute of Noetic Sciences Board of Directors, and the Sierra Club, DISCLOSURE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, WORLD PEACE, WORLD POVERTY AND THE HUMAN FUTURE, UFO Casebook, http://www.ufocasebook.com/disclosureproject.html

Testimony, corroborated by multiple military witnesses who do not know each other and who have had no opportunity for collusion, will show that the US and other countries have engaged these ETVs in armed attack, in some cases leading to the downing of these vehicles. As I said to Mrs. Boutros Ghali, wife of the then Secretary General of the UN, if there is even a 10% chance that this is true, then this constitutes the gravest threat to world peace in human history.

Having personally interviewed numerous credible military and aerospace officials with direct knowledge of such actions, I am certain that we have done this. Why? Because these unknown vehicles have been in our airspace without our permission and because we wanted to acquire their technology. Nobody has asserted that there is an actual threat to humanity from these objects: Obviously, any civilization capable of routine interstellar travel could terminate our civilization in a nanosecond, if that was their intent. That we are still breathing the free air of Earth is abundant testimony to the non-hostile nature of these ET civilizations.

We have also been informed that the so-called Star Wars (or National Missile Defense System) effort has really been a cover for black project deployment of weapon systems to track, target and destroy ETVs as they approach Earth or enter Earth’s atmosphere. No less a figure than Wernher Von Braun warned on his death-bed of both the reality and the madness of such a scheme, apparently to no avail (see the Testimony of Carol Rosin, former spokesperson for Wernher Von Braun).

Well, unless we change directions we are likely to end up where we are going.

With the types of weapons currently in the covert arsenal weapons more fearsome even than thermonuclear devices there is no possibility of a survivable conflict. Yet in the darkness of secrecy, actions have been taken on behalf of every human that may endanger our future. Only a full, honest disclosure will correct this situation. It is not possible for me to convey in words the urgency of this.

For 10 years I worked as an emergency doctor and saw how every possible object can be used as a weapon. Every technology, unless guided by wisdom and a desire for that good and peaceful future – the only future possible will be used for conflict. Super-secret projects that answer to no legally constituted body- not the UN, not the US Congress, not the British Parliament must not be allowed to continue to act in this way on behalf of humanity.

One of the greatest dangers of extreme secrecy is that it creates a hermetically sealed, closed system impervious to the free and open exchange of ideas. In such an environment, it is easy to see how grave mistakes can be made. For instance, the testimony here will show that these ETVs became very prominent after we developed the first nuclear weapons and began to go into space. There were multiple events corroborated here by numerous credible military officials of these objects hovering over and even neutralizing ICBMs (Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles).

A closed, military view of this might be to take offense, engage in counter-measures and attempt to down such objects. In fact, this would be the normal response. But what if these ET civilizations were saying, "Please do not destroy your beautiful world and know this: we will not let you go into space with such madness and threaten others" An event showing concern and even a larger cosmic wisdom could be construed over and over again as an act of aggression. Such misunderstandings and myopia are the stuff wars are made of.

Whatever our perceptions of these visitors, there is no chance that misunderstandings can be resolved through violent engagement. To contemplate such madness is to contemplate the termination of human civilization.

It is time for our wise elders and our levelheaded diplomats, like Sen. Pell, to be put in charge of these weighty matters. To leave this in the hands of a clique of un-elected, self-appointed and unaccountable covert operations is the greatest threat to US national security and world security in history. Eisenhower was right, but nobody was listening.

## Disclosure Good—Extinction

### More evidence

GREER, 2009

Steven M., emergency physician and former chairman of the Department of Emergency Medicine at Caldwell Memorial Hospital. He is a lifetime member of Alpha Omega Alpha, the nation's most prestigious medical honor society. Inspired, in part, by his uncle who helped design the original lunar module, Dr. Greer has spent years researching exotic energy and propulsion systems. He has been examining what systems have been developed and how the implementation of those systems would affect the environment and society as a whole. He has met with and provided briefings for senior members of government, military and intelligence operations in the United States and around the world, including senior CIA officials, Joint Chiefs of Staff, White House staff, senior members of Congress and congressional committees, senior United Nations leadership and diplomats, senior military officials in the United Kingdom and Europe and cabinet-level staff members of the Japanese government, among others. Dr. Greer has addressed tens of thousands of people live at conferences and lectures around the world including the international convention for MENSA, The Institute of Noetic Sciences Board of Directors, and the Sierra Club, [Implications of Extraterrestrial Disclosure](http://www.bluealien.net/aliens-and-ufos/implications-of-extraterrestrial-disclosure), http://www.bluealien.net/aliens-and-ufos/implications-of-extraterrestrial-disclosure

The near-term implications of a high-level disclosure on the existence of extraterrestrial life forms range from the geopolitical to the philosophical. The most pronounced immediate effect of such a disclosure will be that of altering the fundamental paradigm of how we view ourselves, the world of humanity and the universe. While the full effect of this will take some decades, if not centuries, to manifest fully, there will be an immediate realization that we are really all one people on the homeland of earth, among many worlds inhabited by other intelligent life forms.

This realization will alter not only our view of ourselves and the earth, but I believe it will impact on the current state of geopolitical fractionation. In the post-Cold War era, the world is becoming increasingly "balkanized", precisely at the time when one would hope for increasing world unity and coherence. The definitive disclosure that we are not alone in the universe, and that, more importantly, these advanced life forms are landing on terra firma, will provide significant impetus to the as-yet incomplete process of forming a truly global civilization. This disclosure will complete the galvanizing effect which the space program provided as it sent back to the earth photographs of this beautiful blue sphere floating in space, which we all call home.

As the global community contemplates the immediate and future reality of earth coming into contact with other advanced civilizations, all of the usual preoccupations with the endless internecine battles among nations and peoples on earth will suddenly appear in quite a different light. The differences and conflicts between various racial, religious, ethnic and national identities will be seen in a new perspective as we begin to contemplate the reality of earth evolving into an inter-planetary civilization. The world will rapidly quicken the pace of globalization and integration into a functional, peaceful civilization.

This can - and must - be done without either demonizing or deifying these extraterrestrial peoples. The ingrained xenophobic response of today and yesteryear will need to give way to a new paradigm motivated by hope, understanding and tolerance of diversity.

Even the process of coming to grips with the post-disclosure reality of an extraterrestrial presence will force the world to evolve the moral, spiritual, psychological and physical capacity to effectively meet the challenges of the situation. So the immediate impact will include the rapid development of a functional global capability vis á vis an extraterrestrial presence. No single nation can achieve this; no superpower, however well meaning, can think and act on behalf of the entire world as it adjusts to the early challenges of inter-planetary relations. This, then, will provide both the practical and philosophical setting for the development of a world civilization.

While people will no doubt retain their various national, ethnic and religious identities, there will be added to these the over-arching identity of being "from earth". Beyond this, an awareness will grow that, indeed, all conscious, intelligent life forms have in common the intangible but real link of awareness, of consciousness, and the early stages of universal "citizenship" will dawn. That is, we will experience, first inwardly and later in practical life, the awareness of the universality of life. This theme could, no doubt, fill an entire book, if not several volumes of books. But in the interest of time, let us look at other immediate implications:

Governments around the world will immediately be affected in several inter-related ways. There will be an examination of covert, previously unacknowledged "black" projects in the military/intelligence/industrial sector, and these projects will be moved back to the public domain and to conventional oversight and control. Currently, these projects officially "do not exist" and as such constitute a serious threat to governmental integrity, especially in constitutional democracies such as the United States. A disclosure will set in motion governmental and social pressures to restore constitutional chain of command and control over this matter, and senior government leaders will no longer be able to avoid responsibility for this issue by claiming "plausible deniability". In short, this disclosure on the existence of extra-terrestrial life forms in proximity to earth will reverse the excesses of secrecy which developed in the post-World War II era and Cold War.
Academic, scientific and governmental institutions and agencies will quickly focus on the meaning, implications and requirements of a newly ordered global paradigm, which suddenly includes the existence of extraterrestrial civilizations visiting earth. From international policy "think-tanks" to various academies of science around the world, this issue will become a prime focus of discussion, study and debate. In an academic sense, no field of study will be untouched by such a disclosure: history, anthropology, philosophy, geopolitics, exo-biology, theology, the arts, sciences and technology, business and economics — all will be immediately galvanized by and preoccupied with such a disclosure.

## Alien Tech Good—Environment

### THE ENVIRONMENT – EXTRATERRESTRIAL ENERGY SOURCES WILL ALLEVIATE NEARLY ALL SOURCES OF POLLUTION AND AVERT PLANETARY EXTINCTION. OIL SPILLS, AIR POLLUTION AND ENERGY INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE WOULD INSTANTLY BECOME A THING OF THE PAST.

GREER, April 7th 2002

Steven M. emergency physician and former chairman of the Department of Emergency Medicine at Caldwell Memorial Hospital. He is a lifetime member of Alpha Omega Alpha, the nation's most prestigious medical honor society. Inspired, in part, by his uncle who helped design the original lunar module, Dr. Greer has spent years researching exotic energy and propulsion systems. He has been examining what systems have been developed and how the implementation of those systems would affect the environment and society as a whole. He has met with and provided briefings for senior members of government, military and intelligence operations in the United States and around the world, including senior CIA officials, Joint Chiefs of Staff, White House staff, senior members of Congress and congressional committees, senior United Nations leadership and diplomats, senior military officials in the United Kingdom and Europe and cabinet-level staff members of the Japanese government, among others. Dr. Greer has addressed tens of thousands of people live at conferences and lectures around the world including the international convention for MENSA, The Institute of Noetic Sciences Board of Directors, and the Sierra Club, DISCLOSURE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, WORLD PEACE, WORLD POVERTY AND THE HUMAN FUTURE, UFO Casebook, http://www.ufocasebook.com/disclosureproject.html

We have identified insiders and scientists who can prove, in open Congressional hearings, that we do in fact possess classified energy generation and anti-gravity propulsion systems capable of completely and permanently replacing all forms of currently used energy generation and transportation systems. These devices access the ambient electromagnetic and so-called zero point energy state to produce vast amounts of energy without any pollution. Such systems essentially generate energy by tapping into the ever-present quantum vacuum energy state the baseline energy from which all energy and matter is fluxing. All matter and energy is supported by this baseline energy state and it can be tapped through unique electromagnetic circuits and configurations to generate huge amounts of energy from space/time all around us. These are NOT perpetual motion machines nor do they violate the laws of thermodynamics they merely tap an ambient energy field all around us to generate energy.

This means that such systems do not require fuel to burn or atoms to split or fuse. They do no require central power plants, transmission lines and the related multi-trillion dollar infrastructure required to electrify and power remote areas of India, China, Africa and Latin America. These systems are site-specific: they can be set up at any place and generate needed energy. Essentially, this constitutes the definitive solution to the vast majority of environmental problems facing our world.

The environmental benefits of such a discovery can hardly be overstated, but a brief list include:

¤ The elimination of oil, coal and gas as sources of energy generation, thus the elimination of air and water pollution related to the transport and use of these fuels. Oil spills, global warming, illnesses from air pollution, acid rain etc can and must be ended within 10-20 years;

¤ Resource depletion and geo-political tensions arising from competition for fossil fuel resources will end;

¤ Technologies already exist to scrub manufacturing effluent to zero or near zero emissions for both air and water-but they use a great deal of energy and thus are considered too costly to fully utilize. Moreover, since they are energy intensive, and our energy systems today create most of the air pollution in the world, a point of diminishing return for the environment is reached quickly. That equation is dramatically changed when industries are able to tap vast amounts of free energy (there is no fuel to pay for only the device, which is no more costly than other generators) and those systems create no pollution.

¤ Energy-intensive recycling efforts will be able to reach full application since the energy needed to process solid waste will, again, be free and abundant.

¤ Agriculture, which is currently very energy dependent and polluting, can be transformed to use clean, non-polluting sources of energy.

¤ Desertification can be reversed and world agriculture empowered by utilizing desalinization plants, which are now very energy intensive and expensive, but will become cost-efficient once able to use these new, non-polluting energy systems.

¤ Air travel, trucking and inter-city transportation systems will be replaced with new energy and propulsion technologies (anti-gravity systems allow for silent above surface movement). No pollution will be generated and costs will decrease substantially since the energy expenses will be negligible. Additionally, mass transportation in urban areas can utilize these systems to provide silent, efficient intra-city movement.

¤ Noise pollution from jets, trucks and other modes of transportation will be eliminated by the use of these silent devices.

¤ Public utilities will not be needed since each home, office and factory will have a device to generate whatever energy is needed. This means ugly transmission lines that are subject to storm damage and power interruption will be a thing of the past. Underground gas pipelines, which not infrequently rupture or leak and damage Earth and water resources, will not be needed at all.

¤ Nuclear power plants will be decommissioned and the technologies needed to clean such sites will be available. Classified technologies do exist to neutralize nuclear waste.

Utopia? No, because human society will always be imperfect but perhaps not as dysfunctional as it is today. These technologies are real I have seen them. Anti-gravity is a reality and so is free energy generation. This is not a fantasy or a hoax. Do not believe those who say that this is not possible: they are the intellectual descendants of those who said the Wright brothers would never fly.

Current human civilization has reached the point of being able to commit planeticide: the killing of an entire world. We can and we must do better. These technologies exist and every single person who is concerned about the environment and the human future should call for urgent hearings to allow these technologies to be disclosed, declassified and safely applied.

## Alien Tech Good—Environment

### More evidnece

GREER, March 26th 2004

Steven, emergency physician and former chairman of the Department of Emergency Medicine at Caldwell Memorial Hospital. He is a lifetime member of Alpha Omega Alpha, the nation's most prestigious medical honor society. Inspired, in part, by his uncle who helped design the original lunar module, Dr. Greer has spent years researching exotic energy and propulsion systems. He has been examining what systems have been developed and how the implementation of those systems would affect the environment and society as a whole. He has met with and provided briefings for senior members of government, military and intelligence operations in the United States and around the world, including senior CIA officials, Joint Chiefs of Staff, White House staff, senior members of Congress and congressional committees, senior United Nations leadership and diplomats, senior military officials in the United Kingdom and Europe and cabinet-level staff members of the Japanese government, among others. Dr. Greer has addressed tens of thousands of people live at conferences and lectures around the world including the international convention for MENSA, The Institute of Noetic Sciences Board of Directors, and the Sierra Club, Going Tactical, Center for the Study of Extraterrestrial Intelligence, http://www.cseti.org/position/greer/goingtactical.htm

Indeed, such thinking, driven by fear, greed and a myopic world and cosmological view, is bringing human civilization to the brink of collapse. The suppression of these earth-saving and life-saving technologies has gone too far, for too long - so much so that those responsible are on the verge of consciously committing planeticide - the killing of an entire planet.

At this point, [**Space Energy Access Systems**, Inc. (SEAS)](http://www.seaspower.com) has identified scientists capable of developing technologies to completely replace fossil fuels. We estimate that a generation one version of such an energy generating system can be ready for widespread application in 12-36 months. But such an undertaking, requiring millions of dollars in basic research and development funds, remains unsupported by either the government or financial community. Why?

The public must demand that our representatives at every level investigate seriously these technologies and begin an environmental Marshall Plan to get see that new energy solutions are fast-tracked into widespread application..

To date, inventors have funded their own efforts, and have created proof-of-principle systems. But they are immature technologies so far not supported by the private financial community and the government granting process has been unresponsive. Would the public support such an undertaking - bypassing the corruption and inertia of government and large financial players? We may soon find out.

But one thing is certain: Unless we change directions, we are likely to end up where we are going…

No national or international leader has presented anything remotely close to a real strategy to address the nexus of intertwined problems related to terrorism, oil dependency, geopolitical tensions, environmental destruction and global warming. They GO TACTICAL and mistake this for a strategy. It is not. It is a sham and a poor excuse for decisive strategic planning and action. This action has been needed for half a century, but out of fear, greed, corruption and power politics has been tragically deferred. Now we are paying the price.

Even if we tactically succeed in temporarily delaying the progress of terrorists, we will yet be left with the core of the problem: Our desperate need for oil and lots of it. The zero sum game of energy supplies based on oil, coal and gas necessitates a disparity that places at least two thirds of the world's population in a state of perpetual poverty. Within this crucible, a thousands hells will be born, and it will not be ameliorated one iota by the current tactical response to 9/11, or the invasion of Iraq or even by establishing democracy in the Mid-east, laudable as that may be. The hard reality is that our civilization is on a terminal trajectory. We are at the crossroads of history at which we either crash or fly into the future intact. Real leadership is required, and a meaningful strategy to phase in these new technologies in an orderly and rational manner is needed now.

I challenge every concerned citizen to bring this matter to the attention of his representatives and to those aspiring to lead us -whether at the presidential or congressional level. Do not let them off the hook. They have the solemn responsibility of leading if they aspire to be leaders. At every campaign stop, at every rally, at every town meeting, citizens should be present to present the facts and demand action.

We have abdicated our sacred obligation to provide for a good and sustainable future and allowed rogue and selfish interests to hijack our destiny. Will we persist in this madness?

The solutions to these problems exist. But the 'special interests' that would deceive the public and our leaders are enormously powerful and ruthless. Shills in the media ignore, censor or ridicule the subject. And an army of paid disinformation hacks, pretending to be scientists, 'experts' and the like stand ready to hammer down any meaningful solution presented to the world. The task is, therefore, daunting. But the consequences of inaction are so dire, so potentially catastrophic, that every effort must be expended to correct the situation.

In discussing this problem with a large coalition of scientists, inventors and energy researchers, we have concluded that progress requires a serious research and development effort of some tens of millions of dollars. But this is a rounding error in light of the tens of billions of dollars spent by the US alone for bogus energy research and the so-called energy bill of 2003. The public should demand that at least seed funding be provided for such promising new energy research.

## Alien Tech Good—Poverty

### POVERTY – FREE ENERGY TECHNOLOGY COULD ELIMINATE WORLD POVERTY BY 2030.

GREER, April 7th 2002

Steven M. emergency physician and former chairman of the Department of Emergency Medicine at Caldwell Memorial Hospital. He is a lifetime member of Alpha Omega Alpha, the nation's most prestigious medical honor society. Inspired, in part, by his uncle who helped design the original lunar module, Dr. Greer has spent years researching exotic energy and propulsion systems. He has been examining what systems have been developed and how the implementation of those systems would affect the environment and society as a whole. He has met with and provided briefings for senior members of government, military and intelligence operations in the United States and around the world, including senior CIA officials, Joint Chiefs of Staff, White House staff, senior members of Congress and congressional committees, senior United Nations leadership and diplomats, senior military officials in the United Kingdom and Europe and cabinet-level staff members of the Japanese government, among others. Dr. Greer has addressed tens of thousands of people live at conferences and lectures around the world including the international convention for MENSA, The Institute of Noetic Sciences Board of Directors, and the Sierra Club, DISCLOSURE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, WORLD PEACE, WORLD POVERTY AND THE HUMAN FUTURE, UFO Casebook, http://www.ufocasebook.com/disclosureproject.html

The disclosure of these new technologies will give us a new, sustainable civilization. World poverty will be eliminated within our life times. With the advent of these new energy and propulsion systems, no place on Earth will need to suffer from want. Even the deserts will bloom.

Once abundant and nearly free energy is available in impoverished areas for agriculture, transportation, construction, manufacturing and electrification, there is no limit to what humanity can achieve. It is ridiculous obscene even that mind-boggling poverty and famine exists in the world while we sit on classified technologies that could completely reverse this situation. So why not release these technologies? Because the social, economic and geo-political order of the world would be greatly altered. Every deep insider with whom I have met has emphasized that this would be the greatest change in known human history. The matter is so highly classified not because it is so silly, but because its implications are so profound and far reaching. By nature, those who control such projects do not like change. And here we are talking about the biggest economic, technological, social and geo-political change in known human history. Hence, the status quo is maintained, even as our civilization hurtles towards oblivion.

But by this argument, we would have never had the industrial revolution and the Ludites would have reigned supreme to this day.

An international effort to minimize disruption to the economy and to ease the transition to this new social and economic reality will be needed. We can do this and we must. Special interests in certain oil, energy and economic sectors need to be reigned in and at the same time treated compassionately: Nobody likes to see their power and empire crumble. Nations very dependent on the sale of oil and gas will need help diversifying, stabilizing and transitioning to a new economic order.

The United States, Europe and Japan will need to adjust to a new geo-political reality as well: As currently poor but populous countries dramatically develop technologically and economically, they will demand and will get a meaningful seat at the international table. And this is as it should be. But the international community will need to put in place safeguards to prevent such potential geo-political rapprochement between the first and third world from devolving into bellicose and disruptive behavior on the part of the newly empowered.

The US in particular will need to lead through strength but avoid the current trend towards domination. Leadership and domination are not the same, and the sooner we learn the difference the better off the world will be. There can be international leadership without domination and hegemony, and the US needs to realize these distinctions if it is to provide much-needed leadership on this issue.

These technologies, because they will decentralize power literally and figuratively will enable the billions living in misery and poverty to enter a world of new abundance. And with economic and technological development, education will rise and birth rates will fall. It is well known that as societies become more educated, prosperous and technologically advanced and women take an increasingly equal role in society the birth rate falls and population stabilizes. This is a good thing for world civilization and the future of humanity.

With each village cleanly electrified, agriculture empowered with clean and free energy and transportation costs lowered, poverty will dramatically fall in the world. If we act now, by 2030 we will be able to effectively eliminate all poverty in the world, as we know it today. We only need the courage to accept these changes and the wisdom to steer humanity safely and peacefully into a new time.

## Alien War Bad—Extinction

### A WAR WITH EXTRATERRESTRIALS WOULD RESULT IN THE USE OF GRAVITY WEAPONS WHICH WOULD DEMAGNETIZE EARTH WIPING OUT ALL LIFE.

INDIA DAILY TECHNOLOGY TEAM, JANUARY 30TH 2008

Gravity wave applications in Air Force – the technologies reverse engineered from Extraterrestrial UFOs, India Daily, <http://www.indiadaily.com/editorial/18998.asp>

The interaction of gravity waves and times form the basis of stability in the 3D universe. If that can be disturbed, the nastiest and most dangerous weapon systems can be created – thousand time worse than nuclear weapons.

When relatively immense amount of energy in applied on a point, the effect is amazing. According to some contemporary physicists, it is possible to detach the space from time in a very local area to create havoc in adversary’s weapon systems. Some extraterrestrial UFOs do that all the time to escape the 3D mesh and enter the galactic black holes. They detach the space fro time in a very controlled manner. It is similar to using nuclear energy in a controlled chain reaction to generate energy versus uncontrolled manner for the purpose of destruction.

Many have suggested, extraterrestrial warfare created planets like Mars. Mars was full of life and some how it lost all its electromagnetic properties to become a barren red planet. Mars may have observed the effects of detaching time from space in a local area.

## Aliens Good—Nuke War

### Aliens will prevent nuclear war from causing extinction because it threatens them too

SALLA, AUGUST 12TH 2006

Michael, held full time academic appointments at the Australian National University, and American University, Washington DC. He has a [PhD](http://www.exopoliticsinstitute.org/Salla-PhD.pdf) in Government from the University of Queensland, Australia. During his professional academic career, he was best known for organizing a series of citizen diplomacy initiatives for the East Timor conflict funded by U.S. Institute of Peace and the Ford Foundation. He is the Founder of the Exopolitics Institute ([www.exopoliticsinstitute.org](http://www.exopoliticsinstitute.org/) ); and Chief Editor of the Exopolitics Journal, “Divine Strake” vs. ‘Divine Strike’ –  Did Extraterrestrials Deter the Pentagon from a Preemptive Nuclear War Against Iran?, Exopolitics Research Study #11, <http://www.exopolitics.org/Study-Paper-11.htm>

In an article analyzing Velasco’s correlation of UFOs and nuclear weapons, French UFO researcher, Eric Julien speculates that the use of nuclear weapons affects the time/space continuum in ways that disrupt UFO/extraterrestrial navigation and propulsion systems.[[20]](http://www.exopolitics.org/Study-Paper-11.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn20%22%20%5Co%20%22) He argues that there is a correlation between UFO behavior around nuclear tests and 74 alleged UFO crashes documented in Ryan Wood's book, Majic Eyes Only (2006). This is used to support Julien’s thesis that nuclear testing negatively affects UFOs by impacting the space-time continuum they use to navigate to Earth. In his book, The Science of Extraterrestrials, Julien argues that atomic explosions directly impact on the space-time continuum that they occupy.[[21]](http://www.exopolitics.org/Study-Paper-11.htm%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn21%22%20%5Co%20%22) This suggests that use of nuclear weapons threaten the civilizations of extraterrestrials who use space-time to travel and to establish bases of operation on or near the vicinity of the earth.

Based on historical precedents described by Salas and Dedrickson, it appears that extraterrestrials have the capacity to deactivate nuclear weapons while either in storage or in flight, and to destroy nuclear weapons while in flight. Consequently, extraterrestrials could give warnings through their communications with individuals and military officials of impending action to prevent the possible use of nuclear weapons. If these warnings went unheeded then extraterrestrials could take a range of defensive measures based on their influence over key policy makers and institutions, and their ability to impact on the capacities of nations to use nuclear weapons. Such measures could culminate in a coordinated set of extraterrestrial responses, a ‘Divine Strike’, to prevent the Bush administration launching a preemptive nuclear war against Iran. These responses may have been communicated and/or displayed, and actively deterred the US military from pursuing a preemptive nuclear attack against Iran.

# \*\*2ACs\*\*

## 2AC Aliens Bad DA (ET Threat Con)

### Their fear of aliens is merely a displacement of their anxiety over the fractured nature of subjectivity in the postmodern era—our 1AC straight turns and undermines the epistemological basis for all their DAs.

Debbora Battaglia, Anthropology—Mounty Holyoke, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 14-5

This debate prompts us to revisit Richard Hofstadter's famous essay, "The Paranoid Style in American Politics" (1965; also Marcus 1999), in which he argues for a "higher paranoid scholarship" that entails "A careful accumulation of facts, or at least what appear to be facts, and to marshal these facts toward an overwhelming 'proof' of a particular conspiracy that is to be established. In fact, the paranoid mentality is far more coherent than the real world since it leaves no room for mistakes, failures, or ambi­guities." Of special interest here: "What distinguishes the paranoid style is not, then, the absence of verifiable facts ... but rather the curious leap in imagination that is always made at some critical point in the recital of events" (reprinted in Marcus 1999: 1). An interesting point about Hofstadter's discourse is that the "leap of imagination" characteristic of paranoid ideation is likewise an element of scientific hypothesis making and other forms of creative action (as I discuss later). In fact, the use of the term *paranoid* arguably precludes process-level comparison with other opera­tions of imagination and the alternative value of these for making new con­nections, including new social relational connections—for example, con­necting with others who are investigating governmental secrecy. As regards the extraterrestrial, contemporary discourse privileges the affective force and cultural and historical thematic of fear over optimistic imaginaries and social strategies of hope. In short, the construct of paranoia, or even the less charged "anxiety," while training our attention on opaque technologies of power that are important to confront, should not preclude a constructive value for mistakes, failures, and ambiguities as spurs to creative action.

The debate over whether aliens' plans for humankind are destructive or constructive is a displacement of the same logic and the same "problematic of gaps." In public culture, both positive and negative relations to the alien are significant themes. Big budget films such as E.T.: *The Extra-Terrestrial, Contact,* and A.I.: *Artificial Intelligence* make the point for the "good alien" .and *Independence* Day, Signs, and *The Matrix* for the "bad" to mention only a small sample **of** the films that alien/UFO believersconsumes avidly and critically.

Meanwhile for "insiders," these positive and negative positions on alien contact have been distilled in dense descriptive accounts of contact and (since the mid-1960s) abduction (e.g., Pritchard et al. 1994), in which persons relate experiences of profound deterritorialization. Unlike Connie Isele's rescue scenarios, exchanges in this domain may produce embodied artifacts: emblematically, the part human, part alien "babies in bottles"22 and fully developed "Greys," who move among us unrecognizably, their motivations and powers unknown. John Mack again represents the side of optimism in *Passport to the Cosmos* (1999), arguing that aliens' hybrid "project," placed within the larger context of our ecological crisis, is to "ful­fill our responsibility for the care of Earth ... as a kind of intervention, sometimes harsh, that may have the purpose of bringing about change in the ways of human kind" (110-12). Again, he is arguing against Hopkins, for whom the essence of abduction is a nefarious hybridization project. In these terms, Greys embody a dangerous, essentially racial, program. They threaten our species purity and that of the body politic —as Mary Douglas would have put it in her classic *Purity and Danger* ([1966] 1978), or Georg Simmel writing in "The Stranger" of the traveler half-expected to seduce, steal from, and abandon his host (n.23). In this light, the "imagenation" (Dyck 1998) of cross-species exchange expresses the mobility anxiety of those most firmly attached to their species identity and its status privileges.

## 2AC CP

### This makes global destruction inevitable—the pursuit of the short-term gains of political expediency sacrifices any hope of sustainable peace

M. Cherif Bassiouni, law at DePaul University, Spring 2003 (35 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 191)

The human rights arena is defined by a constant tension between the attraction of realpolitik and the demand for accountability. Realpolitik involves the pursuit of political settlements unencumbered by moral and ethical limitations. As such, this approach often runs directly counter to the interests of justice, particularly as understood from the perspective of victims of gross violations of human rights. Impunity, at both the international and national levels, is commonly the outcome of realpolitik which favors expedient political ends over the more complex task of confronting responsibility. Accountability, in contrast, embodies the goals of both retributive and restorative justice. This orientation views conflict resolution as premised upon responsibility and requires sanctions for those responsible, the establishment of a clear record of truth and efforts made to provide redress to victims.
The pursuit of realpolitik may settle the more immediate problems of a conflict, but, as history reveals, its achievements are frequently at the expense of long-term peace, stability, and reconciliation. It is difficult to achieve genuine peace without addressing victims' needs and without  [\*192]  providing a wounded society with a sense of closure. A more profound vision of peace requires accountability and often involves a series of interconnected activities including: establishing the truth of what occurred, punishing those most directly responsible for human suffering, and offering redress to victims. Peace is not merely the absence of armed conflict; it is the restoration of justice, and the use of law to mediate and resolve inter-social and inter-personal discord. The pursuit of justice and accountability fulfills fundamental human needs and expresses key values necessary for the prevention and deterrence of future conflicts. For this reason, sacrificing justice and accountability for the immediacy of realpolitik represents a short-term vision of expediency over more enduring human values.

## 2AC CP/Politics

### Focus on the political process kills agency—on CP block

Gijs Van Oenen, ‘6 (senior lecturer in practical philosophy at the Department of Philosophy, Erasmus University Rotterdam, A Machine That Would Go of Itself: Interpassivity and Its Impact on Politic al Life, Theory and Event, Muse)

This understanding of interpassivity differs from, but accords well with th e views espoused by Zizek and Pfaller. For instance, it fits Zizek's observ ation of the loss of 'substance': series of products are nowadays deprived of their 'malignant properties', that is to say of their substance, the har d resistant kernel of the Real: coffee without coffeine, cream without fat, beer without alcohol, politics as expert administration, that is, without politics.15 My account also confirms Pfallers and Zizeks thesis that interpa ssivity implies an increase in activity. In interpassive 'mode' we do indeed exhibit increased activity, but this activity expresses a shif t of involvement, or 'interest', from product to process. In its radical fo rm, interpassivity even implies that the product is being replaced (we migh t say 'negated') by the process. The product, once the original goal and pu rpose of the process, has become superfluous; it is no longer especially ne eded or valued. What is valued, on the contrary, is the ability to be invol ved in the production process.

 The whole notion of 'involvement', however, has itself been affected by thi s development. The commitment has become procedural rather than substantial. To a certain extent, this is inherent in the flexibility they are expecte d to exhibit. Skills are no longer connected to specific products; the most important skill of modern workers is the ability to 'interact', or be inte ractive', in a variety of different processes.

 Let me summarize my theses concerning the way interpassivity affects our co ntemporary lives, in the sphere of labor.

 First, we do not much care (anymore) about the end result of the productive process we are involved in. We just do not get around to consummating the product of our involvement. Second, and more precisely, our activity and ou r 'interest' shifts towards the earlier or preceding phases of the process. Our passivity concerning the product is compensated for by our increased ( inter-)activity in the process of production. Third, the process of interac tivity itself suffices; the reception and appreciation of the produc t is taken over, or preempted, by the process of production, or 'provision' .

## Congress Key

### Congressional action on aliens is vital to facilitate the best approaches to dealing with alieans

HEIN, 2005

Simeon, Ph. D., sociology, Washington State University, seven semesters of college teaching experience, publications in mainstream social science journals, teaches Resonant Viewing at the Institute for Resonance, personal correspondence with interviewer Michael Antonucci, 4/15/05, published with author’s permission, http://opencaselist.wikispaces.com/Simeon+Hein+

I think the best approach to Open Contact would be through congressional legislation. This is because such a law would necessitate congressional hearings, which would go a long way in getting the facts out to the American people. How long has contact been going on? With whom? What federal agencies are involved? Are they doing this legally? And where are these ETs coming from (if they exist at all)? With a great educational process intended to inform our entire society, we could go a long way in bringing Americans up to speed politically and scientifically. And it would raise our standing in the world community to show that we have opened up the closets of secrecy and started to clean our political house. It would show that we care about the truth. America could once again take the lead as the most democratic, scientifically advanced, and educated country in the world. The status quo right now is that all official knowledge of the UFO phenomenon is held in secret black budget programs to which the public has no access. Legitimate researchers are ridiculed and targeted for disinformation campaigns. Military and intelligence witnesses to the phenomenon are harassed, threatened, and intimidated. They are told that their chances for promotion would end, the pensions could be revoked, and their families could be harmed. Understandably, only a few hundred witnesses have publicly come foward, with the Disclosure Project (disclosureproject.org) for example. The UFO situation now is like a disease the cuts off our flow of information and expression. The secrecy surrounding the whole phenomenon dampens scientific progress, curiousity, and economic development. Obviously, there is a lot at stake here. And in my view, open Congressional hearings and legislation are the best way the cure this illness of ignorance. There were Congressional hearings about UFOs in the 1960's but testimony was limited to a handful of people and the whole subject was forgotten. This time, hundreds should testify openly and in front of the news media. With 40 to 80 billion dollars a year going into these secret projects, the public has, at a minimum, the right to know how its money is being spent. So far, none of the Congressional budget commitees, like Senate Appropriations, have been able to get any information about these black projects.

## 2AC Private CP

### Plan prereq to success of private action

[Margaret S. Race](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=RedirectURL&_method=outwardLink&_partnerName=27983&_origin=article&_zone=art_page&_linkType=scopusAuthorDocuments&_targetURL=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scopus.com%2Fscopus%2Finward%2Fauthor.url%3FpartnerID%3D10%26rel%3D3.0.0%26sortField%3Dcited%26sortOrder%3Dasc%26author%3DRace,%2520Margaret%2520S.%26authorID%3D6603732443%26md5%3D2ba07dbfd7dc18fc2dd9dc91f0369a92&_acct=C000059607&_version=1&_userid=4420&md5=8dc2bd354a85b8f4303781ee77dad753) and [Richard O. Randolph](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=RedirectURL&_method=outwardLink&_partnerName=27983&_origin=article&_zone=art_page&_linkType=scopusAuthorDocuments&_targetURL=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scopus.com%2Fscopus%2Finward%2Fauthor.url%3FpartnerID%3D10%26rel%3D3.0.0%26sortField%3Dcited%26sortOrder%3Dasc%26author%3DRandolph,%2520Richard%2520O.%26authorID%3D15744621200%26md5%3D91f9e7e403dab6773d50bb2cf1b4a08f&_acct=C000059607&_version=1&_userid=4420&md5=cebca1caa9fd4a6c4956802cca4ff95b), 2002. (Margaret S. Race has obtained a Ph.D. in Zoology (ecology) from the University of Berkeley in 1971 and currently works at the SETI Institute, Carl Sagan Center for the Study of Life in the Universe in Mountain View, CA as a principal investigator. She does research and outreach activities on Planetary Protection (PP), Social Issues and Risk Communication related to astrobiology and solar system exploration. Richard O. Randolph has obtained a Ph.D. in Ethics, Graduate Theological Union from Berkeley, California in 2003. He is current an Associate Professor in the Department of Bioethics at the University of Kansas City University of Medicine and Bioscience. Elsevier Science Ltd, Advances in Space Research, “The need for operating guidelines and a decision making framework applicable to the discovery of non-intelligent extraterrestrial life,” [Volume 30, Issue 6](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_tockey=%23TOC%235738%232002%23999699993%23380099%23FLP%23&_cdi=5738&_pubType=J&view=c&_auth=y&_acct=C000059607&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=4420&md5=de88afaa767fa147c9e86b06ecb95a3e), Pages 1583-1591, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273117702004787>)

Interestingly, this position in relation to non-intelligent life is an area of debate among scientists and space advocates, especially since it is by no means certain what martian microbes ‘want.’ For example, Sagan (1980) asserted “if there is life on Mars, I believed we should do nothing with Mars. Mars then belongs to the Martians, even if they are only microbes.” Taking the argument further, McKay (1990, 2001) suggests that the rights of Martian life to ‘confer upon us the obligation to assist it in obtaining global diversity and stability” by altering the planet “to promote the biota’s emergence as a global biological system controlling the planet’s biogeochemical cycles.” Lupisella and Logsdon (1997) suggest consideration of “peaceful coexistence” as a practical compromise position. Zubrin and Wagner (1996), on the other hand, suggest that martian microbes should be viewed no differently than terrestrial microbes which ‘we wouldn’t hesitate to kill with an antibiotic pill.” Ultimately the various advocacy arguments for non-interference in the evolutionary trajectory of extraterrestrial ecosystems grow out of a commitment to freedom as a privileged intrinsic value for life. This commitment to freedom for all life to live and die freely is also mirrored in environmental ethics on Earth. As applied to ET life, all species and ecosystems should be allowed to grow and develop freely; to flourish or become extinct without undue interference from more advanced, space-faring species. It is important to note that this principle and commitment to freedom from undue influence does not exclude the taking of sample specimens or the conduct of scientific experiments within the extraterrestrial ecosystem. Clearly, this would require careful study and observation of the ecosystem before proceeding further. Until we know more about ET life and how to mitigate potentially adverse ecological effects, it may be advisable to put a hold on projects such as ecopoiesis, terraforming, and future private-sector entrepreneurial or commercial activities on celestial bodies with the potential for life.

## 2AC Util

### The prior question is whether the plan on its-face affirms a worthy ethical principle. To void this obligation in the name of future consequences is a literally absurd notion—it fails to establish any coherent moral framework and makes your decision impossible.

Finnis, PF LAW AND LEGAL PHILOSOPHY - OXFORD, 80 [JOHN, NATURAL LAW AND NATURAL RIGHTS, 120-2]

To choose an act which in itself simply (or primarily) damages a basic good is thereby to engage oneself willy-nilly (but directly) in an act of opposition to an incommensurable value (an aspect of human personality) which one treats as if it were an object of measurable worth that could be outweighed by commensurable objects of greater (or cumulatively greater) worth. To do this will often accord with our feelings, our generosity, our sympathy, and with our commitments and projects in the forms in which we undertook them. But it can never be justified in reason. We must choose rationally (and this rational judgment can often promote a shift in our perspective and consequently a realignment of initial feelings and thus our commitments and projects). Reason requires that every basic value be at least respected in each and every action. If one could ever rightly choose a single act which itself damages and itself does not promote some basic good, then one could rightly choose whole programmes and institutions and enterprises that themselves damage and do not promote basic aspects of human well-being, for the sake of their 'net beneficial consequences'. Now we have already seen that consequences, even to the extent that they can be 'foreseen as certain', cannot be commensurably evaluated, which means that 'net beneficial consequences' is a literally absurd general object or criterion. It only remains to note that a man who thinks that his rational responsibility to be always doing and pursuing good is satisfied by a commitment to act always for best consequences is a man who treats every aspect of human personalitv (and indeed, there, treats himself) as a utensil. He holds himself ready to do anything (and thus makes himself a tool for all those willing to threaten sufficiently bad consequences if he does not cooperate with them).

But the objection I am making to such is not that programmes of mass killing, mass deception, etc. would then be morally eligible (though they would) and indeed morally required (though they would), but that no sufficient reason can be found for treating any act as immune from the only direction which we have, viz. the direction afforded by the basic practical principles. These each direct that a form of good is to be pursued and done' and each of them bears not only on all our large-scale choices of projects (in which attainment of the objective will indeed be the good consequence of successful deployment of effective means), but also on each and every choice of an act which itself is a complete act (whether or not it is also a step in a plan or a phase in a project). The incommensurable value of an aspect of personal full-being (and its corresponding primary principle) can never be rightly subordinated to any project or commitment. But such an act of subordination inescapably occurs at least whenever a distinct choice-of-act has in itself no meaning save that of damaging that basic value (thus violating that primary principle).

Such, in highly abstract terms, is the seventh requirement, the principle on which alone rests (as we shall later see) the strict inviolability of basic human rights: VIII.7. There is no human right that will not be overridden if feelings (whether generous and unselfish, or mean and self-centered) are allowed to govern choice, or if cost-benefit considerations are taken outside their appropriate technical sphere and allowed to govern one's direct engagement (whether at the level of commitment, project, or individual act) with basic goods. And the perhaps unfamiliar formulation which we have been considering should not obscure the fact that this 'seventh requirement' is well recognized, in other formulations: most loosely as `the end does not justify the means'; more precisely, though still ambiguously, as 'evil may not be done that good might follow therefrom'; and with a special Enlightenment flavour, as Kant's 'categorical imperiative;: Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only'.12

## 2AC Util

### Consequentialism’s infinitely vulnerable to manipulation—it can’t produce a just outcome because it literally has no conception of what constitutes justice

Finnis, ‘80, PF LAW AND LEGAL PHILOSOPHY – OXFORD [JOHN, NATURAL LAW AND NATURAL RIGHTS, 115-17]

Consequentialism is arbitrary in a number of other respects. And again this arbitrariness is not a matter of mere `unworkability' that can be surmounted 'in principle', i.e. if human limitations could be surmounted. For example, consequentialism provides no reason for preferring altruism to egoism or to exclusive concern for one's family or party or class or country or church. Jeremy Bentham oscillated and equivocated for sixty years about whether his utilitarianism was to maximize his own happiness or the happiness of 'everybody'. A given consequentialist may happen to find (or think he finds) his own good in maximizing the good of others or of `all'; but his consequentialist analysis and method of practical reasoning affords him no principle by reference to which he could criticize as unreasonable or immoral those who set out to maximize their own happiness regardless of the welfare of others.

Again, consequentialism that goes beyond pure egoism requires a principle of distribution of goods. Supposing (what is in fact logically impossible) that human goods could be commensurated and summed, and supposing (what is for consequentialism an arbitrary importation of a principle of universalization not explicable by appeal to consequences) that 'everyone's' good is to be counted impartially, it remains that the methodological injunction to maximize good still yields no determinate result. No determinate result will follow until we further specify whether maximized good means (a) maximum amounts of good regardless of distribution (`over-all utility': a minority, or even a majority, can be enslaved, tortured or exterminated if that will increase over-all net satisfaction/happiness/good), or (b) maximum average amounts of good Coverage utility': any number of people can be enslaved, etc., if that will increase the average net satisfaction, etc.) or (c) maximum amounts of good for those worst-off (`maximin' or 'minimax' utility: whatever is chosen must increase the well-being of those worst-off more than any alternative choice), or (d) equil amounts of good for 'everyone' (notwithstanding that almost everyone might be much better-off in a society regulated in accordance with specifications (a), (b), or (c)). Some such specification is logically necessary: as it stands, any principle containing a term such as 'the greatest good of the greatest number' is as logically senseless as offering a prize for 'writing the most essays in the shortest time' (Who wins?-the person who turns up tomorrow with three essays, or the person who turns up in a week with twelve, or ...?). But there is no consequentialist reason for preferring any particular one of the 116 eligible specifications. The ambition to maximize goods logically cannot be a sufficient principle of practical reasoning. Again, consequentialist method enjoins us to make the choice that would produce greater net good than could be expected to be produced by any alternative choice. But the alternatives that are in fact 'open' or 'available' to one are innumerable. A genuine consequentialist assessment of alternative possibilities could never end, and could begin anywhere. So it should never begin at all, in reason. ( To say this is not at all to say that one should ever disregard or shut one's eyes to foreseeable consequences, or look no further than one's 'good intentions' ) Now individuals and societies do in fact `solve' these problems for themselves, and so make the consequentialist injunctions seem workable. They focus on something which they have already set their hearts on (an increase in national wealth by collectivizing farming, an end to the war, the detection of those heretics or criminals, re-election as President, an end to that young woman's suffering...). 'The' good consequences of this, and 'the' bad consequences of omitting or failing to get it, are dwelt upon. Such requirements as interpersonal impartiality of focus, fidelity to commitments, etc., are brushed aside. Thus the 'calculus' is forced through to provide a determinate solution (the quickest, cheapest way of getting what was first focused upon: hence the forced collectivization and liquidation of the farmers, the nuclear or fire-storm bombing of the enemy's hostage civilians, the inquisitorial torture of suspects or informers, the fraudulent cover-up and obstruction of legal process, the abortion of unbordn and 'exposure' of newly-born children...). Of course, by focusing on some other alternatives, and on some other long-term or over-all consequences of choosing the favoured alternative, and on the lifepossibilities of the proposed victims, and so on, one can in every case find reasons to condemn the favoured action 'on consequentialist grounds'. But in truth both sets of calculations, in such cases, are equally senseless. What generates the 'conclusions' is always something other than the calculus: an overpowering desire, a predetermined objective, the traditions or conventions of the group, or the requirements of practical reason discussed in this chapter.

## 2AC State Key

### State key, must locate specific instantiations of neoliberal governmentality in ordre to challenge it

Hiroyuki Tosa, ‘9 (Professor of Graduate School of International Cooperation Studies, Kobe University, “Anarchical Governance: Neoliberal Governmentality in Resonance with the State of Exception Issue”, International Political Sociology, Volume 3, Issue 4, pages 414–430, December 2009)

Although the articulation of both disciplinary and regulatory mechanisms remains intact, they are in a different form in the present than they were in the past. The Fordistic form of biopolitics—where positive intervention is made in each life—that had close connections with welfare states, has now been transformed into a post-Fordistic form. To clarify, this notion has now been transformed into one that is focused on the neoliberal biopolitical message “to let live and let die.” On the other hand, we notice the reemergence of the right of “the sovereign power to take life,” in the periphery of the world system.1 For example, instances of the state of exception tend to appear more and more as the dominant paradigm in contemporary politics when faced with the unstoppable progression of “global civil war” (Agamben 2005:2). In this case, the camp is the arena where life is nothing but “bare life”—an example of the extreme case of biopolitics. In this sense, the camp at Guantánamo Bay seems to be emblematic of the increasing instances of states of exception.

However, the proposition that the “bare life” that is lived in the camp is a representative form of biopolitics, or that it is a permanent of state of exception in current global politics is dubious. First, we should pay attention to the relationship between, on the one hand, the neoliberal global governmentality or quasi-legality that lies at the center of the world system and on the other hand, the state of exception at its periphery. Although it is clear that both complement each other, we cannot be certain that the latter will necessarily swallow up the former. The conceptual context behind the practices at Guantánamo, Abu Ghraib, and elsewhere are saturated with a received colonial history that can reactivate our colonial past (Gregory 2007). This means that a continuity exists between our colonial past and the present violence. In other words, the state of exception or emergency, which had been rather normal in colonial governments, under the guise of martial law, seems to reappear in a new form (Hussain 2003:99–131). To summarize, the rule of law always accompanies a state of exception. However, it is not clear that the latter will become decisive in future global politics.

Furthermore, there must be recognition of the diversity within such terms as harsh biopolitics. Even within the same category—for instance, refugee camps—we can see a diversity in the kinds of biopolitics that are deployed, from extreme cases like the massacred Palestinian refugees at Sabra and Shatila in 1982, to the case of Burundian refugees who live in a camp that functions like a kind of a laboratory for UNHCR (Turner 2005). If the extreme cases, such as the “bare life” that is lived in the camp at Guantánamo or Gaza Strip in 2008, represent the total picture, then there can be neither possibilities nor hope for emancipation. Agamben’s concept of the exception-as-the-rule seems to leave no room for resistance from the social realm, nor for the Schmittian concept of exceptional rule (Huysmans 2008). As Laclau has pointed out, Agamben’s message seems to reflect his own political nihilism (Laclau 2007:42). Therefore, we should handle Agamben’s assertive statement with caution.

On the other hand, the theory of governmentality is also too general. Governmental programs are never perfectly realized in practice (Garland 1997:194). Therefore, governmentality studies have to go beyond the tendency to totalize, and they must instead look at specific ways in which the actual powers operate, and how resistance and movements can modify governmentality. This article tries to examine not only the intricate relationship between neoliberal political rationalities and the state of exception, but also the actual practices that instantiate neoliberal rationality at the global political level, in order to explore some possibilities of resistance against the present global governmentality.

Before discussing the intricate relation between neo-liberal global governmentality and a state of exception, we need to clarify the concept of governmentality itself. Although Foucault himself tried to define and explain the concept of “governmentality” in various ways, his famous definition, “conducting the conduct,” seems to be the most significant (Foucault 2008:186). To paraphrase it, governmentality is something like meta-governance, which is structured around a supreme principle that directs various aspects of actual governance. As the word “govern” is derived from the Latin word gubernare (steer), the government is the appropriate arena for the promotion of policies that are implemented to lead the people toward a suitable goal—rather like steering a ship toward a destination. Following Guillaume de La Perrière’s text, Foucault also used the metaphor of the ship in his lectures (Foucault 2007:97). At this stage it would be fitting to recall the fact that meta-governance also changes depending on historical conjuncture. This means that the direction of ship and the practices of shipping might also change. Foucault gave a more general explanation of governmentality in the same lecture. Despite its length, I quote the whole paragraph here because of its importance:

By this word “governmentality” I mean three things. First, by “governmentality” I understand the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, calculations, and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific, albeit very complex, power that has the population at its target, political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument. Second, by “governmentality” I understand the tendency, the line force, that for a long time, and throughout the West, has constantly led toward the preeminence over all other types of power—sovereignty, discipline, and so on—of the type of power that we can call “government” and which has led to the development of a series of specific governmental apparatuses (appareils) on the one hand, [and, on the other] to the development of a series of knowledges [sic] (savoirs). Finally, by “governmentality” I think we should understand the process, or rather, the result of the process by which the state of justice of the Middle Ages became the administrative state in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and was gradually “governmentalized.” (Foucault 2007:108–109)

Here Foucault defined governmentality as akin to a nexus between governmental apparatuses (appareils) and knowledge (savoirs). Governmentality as a nexus of power/knowledge provides political rationality as a base for each actual governance. According to Foucault’s rough sketch, the principle behind the notion of western governmentality in its role as a meta-governance, began as Christian pastoralism and shifted to embrace the principle of raison d’état, which—after secularization—refused to subordinate the needs of the state to divine command (Foucault 1981). This transformed either into the police theory (Polizeiwissenshaft), which promoted public tranquility and security in Germany, or into liberalism, which promoted governance through self-governing spheres in England between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. After the crisis of liberalism, the politically rationalistic justification for active intervention into each life emerged, and it became institutionalized in the form of welfare states.

However, this system also faced difficulties in sustaining itself during the 1970s. It has been generally accepted that political rationality transformed into neoliberalism at this point. While the technique of social-liberalism under the welfare regime was an attempt to directly control the “social problems” that were caused by an excess of laissez-faire, neoliberalism was a technique that indirectly controlled the problems by ascribing responsibilities to each individual and socializing them in the context of an eternal self-improvement movement. It is noteworthy that neoliberalism is a technique that governs “the social” at a distance, not only through the markets, but also through civil society, which includes non-governmental organizations. In this regard, neoliberalism is not simply a return to the past laissez-faire. As this kind of new political rationality penetrates the global system, a multi-level global governance based on a benchmarking system emerges. Even after the global financial crisis, this political rationality seems to survive by tuning itself to new fluctuations.

## ET K2 Space Politics

### Debating about aliens is important to space politics

SALLA, JANUARY 20TH 2003

Dr. Michael, The Need for Exopolitics: Implications of Extraterrestrial Conspiracy Theories for Policy Makers & Global Peace, Research Study #1, http://www.thewatcherfiles.com/et\_conditioning.html

Fourth, there is a need to release into the public arena all knowledge about alternative energy sources which have a commercial application but are withheld on national security grounds. There is substantial evidence to suggest that reverse engineered ET technologies have been used in the development of energy sources for 'black projects' such as the anti-gravity propulsion system that is claimed to fuel the B2 bomber. Given the environmental impact of the continued use of fossil fuel energy, there is a need to release into the public arena all available technologies that have commercial application. The final policy recommendation is that there needs to be more effort in determining the extent to which congressional oversight is required for organizations created to deal with the ET presence. There is evidence to suggest that elected public officials including even sitting Presidents, have been denied access to information on the ET presence on the basis of national security considerations. While the argument that national security considerations may at times require public secrecy and even non-disclosure to most elected public officials, there needs to be more effort devoted into working out an effective and constitutional process establishing firm guidelines for such a process.

While the relevance of exopolitics as an emerging field of public policy may justifiably be questioned in a pre-disclosure political environment, the seriousness of the claims and the evidence provided by those conducting exopolitical research, and the policy implications drawn by exopolitical analysis, deserves close attention from academic researchers, policy makers and the general public. Exopolitics provides an opportunity for understanding how humanity can better share and manage the resources of this planet with other species, both terrestrial and extraterrestrial, thereby contributing to a more peaceful and harmonious planet for this and future generations.

## 2AC Realism

### Tag

Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall, ‘8 (“Sovereignty and the UFO”, Profs at OSU and U of Minnesota, Political Theory)

Although we draw on theorists not associated with epistemic realism, a key premise of our argument is that a critical theorization of the UFO taboo in relation to modern rule is possible only if it includes a realist moment, which grants to things-in-themselves (here the UFO) the power to affect rational belief. To see why, consider Jodi Dean’s otherwise excellent Aliens in America, one of the few social scientific works to treat UFOs as anything more than figments of over-active imaginations.26 Like us, Dean emphasizes that it is not known what UFOs are, leaving open the ET possibility. But for her the significance of this ignorance is to exemplify the postmodern breakdown of all modern certainties, such that scientific truth is now everywhere a “fugitive”—not that it might be overcome by considering, scientifically, the reality of UFOs.

In the UFO context such anti-realism is problematic, since its political effect is ironically to reinforce the skeptical orthodoxy: if UFOs cannot be known scientifically then why bother study them? As realist institutions, science and the modern state do not concern themselves with what cannot be known scientifically. For example, whatever their religious beliefs, social scientists always study religion as “methodological atheists,” assuming that God plays no causal role in the material world. Anything else would be considered irrational today; as Jürgen Habermas puts it, “a philosophy that oversteps the bounds of methodological atheism loses its philosophical seriousness.”27 By not allowing that UFOs might be knowable scientifically, therefore, Dean implicitly embraces a kind of methodological atheism about UFOs, which as with God shifts attention to human representations of the UFO, not its reality.

Yet UFOs are different than God in one key respect: many leave physical traces on radar and film, which suggests they are natural rather than supernatural phenomena and thus amenable in principle to scientific investigation. Since authoritative discourse in effect denies this by treating UFOs as an irrational belief, a realist moment is necessary to call this discourse fully into question. Interestingly, therefore, in contrast to their usual antagonism, in the UFO context science would be critical theory. In this light Dean’s claim that UFOs are unknowable appears anthropocentrically monological. It might be that We, talking among ourselves, cannot know what UFOs are, but any “They” probably have a good idea, and the only way to remain open to that dialogical potential is to consider the reality of the UFO itself.28 Failure to do so merely reaffirms the UFO taboo. In foregrounding the realist moment in our analysis we mean not to foreclose a priori the possibility that UFOs can be known scientifically; however, we make no claim that they necessarily would be known if only they were studied. Upon close inspection many UFOs do turn out to have conventional explanations, but there is a hard core of cases, perhaps 25 to 30 percent, that seem to resist such explanations, and their reality may indeed be humanly unknowable—although without systematic inquiry we cannot say. Thus, and importantly, our overarching position here is one of methodological agnosticism rather than realism, which mitigates the potential for epistemological conflict with the non-realist political theorists we draw upon below.29 Nevertheless, in the context of natural phenomena like UFOs agnosticism can itself become dogma if not put to the test, which requires adopting a realist stance at least instrumentally or “strategically,” and seeing what happens.30 This justifies acting as if the UFO is knowable, while recognizing that it might ultimately exceed human grasp.

## AT Kritiks of Epistemology

### No link—the aff employs a self-relexive and agnostic epistemology which doesn’t claim to provide an account of alien “essence.”

Christopher F. Roth, Anthropology—University of Northern Illinois, DeKalb, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 68-9

Epistemologically, the spirit of this discourse is agnostic. No idea is too absurd to be considered, but all ideas are provisional and subject to revision. Some see the abductors as good or bad extraterrestrials, angels or demons or fairies, manifestations of hidden domains of consciousness, or covert government operatives. Abductees with any of these viewpoints can share their experiences and commune with one another.

Amid this antinomian agnosticism, however, there are ideologically driven attempts to systematize the disparate data in contact reports. Much of this is in the form of channeled material, which tends to dominate the inevitable book tables at ufo meetings. But there are also informal local gurus. One, based in Seattle who used a generic-sounding name that may have been a pseudonym, offered counseling to abductees in the 1980s and 1990s and distributed his own cassette tapes detailing elaborate narratives and typologies. Such figures, including channelers who might technically be "contactees," are distinct from abductees or physical contactees themselves, who typically do not offer or accept tidy explanations for their nap ratives, while still greedily devouring any such information, whatever the source. If the alien abduction program can be seen as a kind of physical anthropology being performed on humanity, then in the same way the ufological community can be seen to be engaged in its own ethnological investigations of who the aliens are and how the different types can be categorized and why, or even whether, they are constituted as they appear to be.

# \*\*Misc\*\*

## Area 51

### Government secrets about the Area 51 base are still causing nationwide confusion

Booth, UFO writer and researcher, ’11, Area 51: A Top Secret Government Facility (Booth, Billy. 2011. Area 51: A Top Secret Government Facility, About.com, http://ufos.about.com/od/governmentconspiracyufos/p/area51.htm)

Preface:

Literally thousands of government employees are sworn to secrecy at the base called Area 51. Why? It is known for a fact that many USA aircraft are designed and tested there, and for national security reasons, these state-of-the-art planes and weapons demand secrecy.

Captured UFOs:

But is that the only reason for the veil? Many think not. Many reports have come from this clandestine site of reverse-engineering of UFOs, test flying UFOs from other worlds, and development of our own designs based on craft captured from other galaxies. The employees who work under the shroud of mystery are flown to the base in an unmarked Boeing 737 to perform their duties.

Government Denial:

For years even our own government denied its existence until Soviet pictures confirmed what many knew all along. The base did exist. The facility was originally designed for the testing of U-2 spy planes, and ultimately Stealth technology would be born there. The secret site has grown to many times its original size. The USAF took over command of Area 51, and its airspace in 1970. The facility is usually referred to as Dreamland.

Spacecraft of Futuristic Design:

This mysterious fortress and its surrounding grounds are strictly off-limits. What secrets are kept inside this highly guarded facility? The rumors abound. Yes, there have been pictures of craft doing amazing maneuvers over these guarded skies, and pictures and video smuggled from inside. These smuggled articles show living and dead aliens, spacecraft of futuristic design, but still the government denies these claims.

Toxic Chemicals:

During the 70's and 80's the workers at Area 51 were exposed to jet fuel toxins like JP7. Supposedly old computer parts were also burned in trenches. The workers were ordered to go into the trenches and mix up the material and were only allowed to wear protection up to their waist.

Helen Frost Lawsuit:

Helen Frost, whose husband Robert died in 1988 from the fumes, filed a lawsuit against the government in 1996 but the case was dismissed by the judge because the government could neither confirm nor deny the allegations, and it was also stated that the base is exempt from any environmental laws.

Activities Classified:

The Air Force has acknowledged the existence of the Nellis Range Complex near the Groom Dry Lake for many years now. There are a variety of activities, some of which are classified, throughout the complex.

National Security:

The range is used for the testing of technologies and systems training for operations critical to the effectiveness of U.S. military forces and the security of the United States.

Cannot Be Discussed:

Some specific activities and operations conducted on the Nellis Range, both past and present, remain CLASSIFIED and cannot be discussed.

### Area 51 is far more classified then we can even imagine.

Jacobsen, Journalist for the LA Times Magazine, ‘11

(Jacobsen, Annie. 2011. Area 51: An Uncensored History of America’s Top Secret Military Base, pg 77-78)

Everything that happens at Area 51, when it is happening, is classified as TS/SCI, or top secret/sensitive compartmented information-an enigmatic security policy with protocols that are also top secret. “TS/SCI classification guides are also classified,” says Cargill Hall, historian emeritus for the National Reconnaissance Office; this government espionage agency is so secret that even its name was classified top secret from the time it was founded, in 1958, to its declassification, in 1992. In 2011, most Americans still don’t know what the NRO is or what it does, or that it is a partner organization routinely involved with Area 51, because that is classified information.

Information classified TS/SCI ensures that outsiders don’t know what they don’t know and insiders know only what they have a need-to-know. Winston Churchill famously said of Russia, “It is a riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma.” The same can be said about Area 51. In the lesser-known second part of Churchill’s phrase, he said, “But perhaps there is a key. That key is Russian national interest.” Facing a totalitarian government like the Soviet Union’s, where secrets are easily kept, Area 51 had to mirror Soviet secrecy techniques in order to safeguard the U-2. It was in America’s national interest to do so because human intelligence was failing. “We obtain little significant information from classical covert operations inside Russia,” bemoaned the president’s science advisors in secret 1954 national security report in which they gunned for “science and technology to improve out intelligence take.”

## Aliens and Human Rights

### Labeling aliens as monsters is immoral. It diminishes human rights.

Barbra Hudson, 2006. (Professor at Lancashire Law School, University of Central Lancashire and Director of the Centre for Criminology and Criminal Justice, Austrian Academic Press, Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, “Punishing Monsters, Judging Aliens: Justice at the Borders of Community,” Volume: 39, Issue: 2, Page Number: 232)

At the borders of community we find two kinds of figures with whom we are called upon to deal: monsters and aliens. While we struggle with terrorism and human rights violations in the international arena, there are more domestic monsters who make Buber's comments pertinent to present dilemmas of criminal justice. First, we are confronted by offenders and offences, within our own geo-political communities, that we cannot possibly understand. And if we cannot understand them, how can we do justice to them? How, for instance, can one respond to the recent German cannibalistic killing? In this case, a killer and a victim met through the internet. The killer advertised for someone who wanted to be killed and then eaten. Most of us could not imagine committing such an act, and even more, cannot imagine that anyone would willingly become a victim of cannibalistic killing. Whether the victim had volunteered or had been entrapped was relevant to judgment in the case: was it murder or manslaughter, consensual or coerced? A similar case then arose in the UK, although police intervention meant that the killing did not actually take place. How can an act be 'consensual' if the behaviour of both offender and victim would by any normal standards be judged as outside the senses? The Snowtown case in Australia raises similar questions: not just revulsion, but also incomprehension. The discovery of eight bodies in plastic barrels on May 20, 1999, followed by finding two more bodies 3 days later, horrified police, press, and the population. The victims in the vault had been tortured and mutilated. Four men were charged with the murders, with one of them, John Bunting, judged to be the ringleader. Neither the media nor the public could make sense of these horrific killings, and at different times the narrative swung between hate crime directed against homosexuals and paedophiles, killing for fun, and killing to rob victims of small amounts of money (Mason, 2005). Although the victims were not willing participants in the manner of the internet recruitment cases, the Snowtown case raises the same questions of crimes which are impossible to understand: they are not merely reprehensible but incomprehensible, 'abnormal' crimes which could surely only have been committed by monsters. How can a justice system based on proportionate responses to crimes that we can understand, even if we condemn them as wrong, respond to such deeds? Such crimes indicate a cognitive community, as well as a moral community, a community bounded by limits of understanding as well as by limits of shared moral values, shared ethnic and cultural history, and political sovereignty. Criminal justice processes are discursive: some, such as restorative justice, may be more discursively open than formal state procedures, but in all criminal justice processes, an agreed story has to be established, the status of offenders and victims has to be confirmed, the nature of the harm to the community has to be named, acknowledged and assessed. But processes which seek to reach inter-subjective understandings between offenders, victims and communities surely reach their limit at the boundaries of cognitive as well as moral understanding. It is not just the perpetrators of exceptional crimes who are beyond the boundaries of our understanding. There is a tendency to expel perpetrators of routine delinquencies from the moral and cognitive community. Both Dario Melossi and Jock Young have written vividly and persuasively of the social construction of offenders as monsters (Melossi, 2000; Young, 1999). Monsters are people who do not share our moral universe; they are people with whom, like Buber with Eichmann, we feel no common humanity. They are people to whom we attach dehumanising labels: the super-predator, suggestive of a violent beast; vermin and the word 'animal' itself. The figure of the monster appears every time we speak of individuals or groups as creatures who lack the attributes that make 'us' human: compassion, respect for others. We find monsters in our constructions of terrorists, when we ask how can they kill innocent women and children, how can they have no respect for human life, how can they show no human sympathy for the suffering of others? But we also find monsters in our constructions of sex offenders; young offenders who brutalise victims for the sake of robbing them of what seem (to us) tiny sums of money ('feral' is the de-humanising in-vogue word for such young people); in our constructions of 'neighbours from hell' and the recipients of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders. (1) Criminal justice processes--especially but not exclusively restorative justice--which give these so-called 'monsters' the opportunity to disclose their human motivations and affections, can reveal such persons as not monsters at all. I recall the 'rat boy' case in the northern England city of Newcastle a few years ago. The label was applied because he fled the homes he burgled by scuttling through the central heating vents in his estate: he was obviously, therefore, small, but when he appeared in court people were surprised by his smallness. They had been expecting a monster, a super-rat. Monster is a label applied by us. The monster may be actually created by us--Frankenstein's monster--but at the very least it is a label constructed and bestowed by us. 'Monster' is always an evaluative, pejorative label: any recognition of sympathetic characteristics re-humanises, that is, de-monsters, the supposed monster. Criminal justice processes--at whatever level of community they are operating--should be active in this re-humanisation process. This is the first prerequisite for Duff's goal of community reintegration. Re-humanisation is the prerequisite for criminal justice proceedings to be offering justice rather than expelling those who come before them to a wilderness beyond the borders of community. Receiving the Alien The other figure at the borders of community is the alien. Unlike monsters, the alien is a figure we have not yet judged. We do not know if the alien will be a monster, or will have qualities we recognise as human. The alien is the not-yet-classified, the undecided, whom we must classify before we know how to respond (Bauman, 1991, p. 58). When we encounter the alien, we do not know if she will turn out to be friend or foe, and this matters, because the alien has not remained in her proper place. By entering our space, crossing the borders of our community, she has forced an encounter and we need to classify in order to render her predictable, to assess and manage the risk she may pose. Think about the alien in the film ET. The adults respond with fear and hostility; the children respond with curiosity and without preconceptions. The mother gradually moves from her initial horrified reaction to a more protective stance, but she does this primarily for the sake of her children, rather than because of any acknowledgment of a responsibility to do justice to ET. Modern state societies, and more and more individuals and their elective communities of similarity, respond to aliens at and beyond the borders of community in the way that the adults do to ET. Formal criminal justice processes rarely provide opportunities for the changing response of the mother; more discursively open justice processes may do so. The stark 21st century characterisation of aliens as monsters is apparent in the film War of the Worlds. These aliens are monsters with no emotion, no sympathy, aliens whose intention towards humans is to feast on their blood and cover the earth in red weed which will extinguish the human-friendly environment. That the director is Spielberg, the director of 'friendly alien' films ET and Close Encounters of the Third Kind in a gentler, more open age, shows how our response to strangers has changed. We see the political effects of treating aliens as monsters most dramatically in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib, but the same instinct motivates our treatment of asylum seekers, sex offenders, and the young robbers and burglars of our inner cities. So how, and even more problematic, why, should we seek to deal justly with the aliens who enter our gaze? One argument is that we should do so because we recognise them as fellow human beings and all humans have rights. While there is much debate about which rights should be guaranteed and in what circumstances, the prior question is who should have rights, what does it involve to acknowledge people who stand before us as humans with rights? The stranger within our gaze may be outside our community, but, surely, nonetheless shares our common humanity. Hannah Arendt, Primo Levi and our own knowledge of recent and present history show us time and time again how little 'common humanity' without community means: the Jews of the concentration camps, the Tutsis in Rwanda, the Bosnian neighbours of Serbians were stripped of their signs of membership of the same community as their tormentors, reduced to their signs of non-membership in their erstwhile communities (the Jewish star in the ghettoes) and left naked in their common humanity in the concentration camps and killing fields. If liberal ethical and political theory is based on the Kantian dictum to treat rational human agents as ends and not means, then as Rorty says, 'everything turns on who counts as a fellow human being, as a rational agent in the only relevant sense--the sense in which rational agency is synonymous with membership in our moral community' (Rorty, 1998, p. 177). We do not, Rorty argues, recognise people who do not appear to share our values as fellow human beings. Modernity's experience of common humanity without community demonstrates that human rights are not universal and that they are not self-actualising; they lose their effectiveness once one crosses the borders of community. Douzinas puts forward a similar argument, and says that at the very moment when 'human rights' becomes, as Cohen describes, the moral discourse of our time, actual human rights may be becoming unachievable (Cohen, 1993; Douzinas, 2000). It is the globalised condition of post-modernity, which fragments our sense of community while bringing us into unsought-for contact with more and more persons outside our community, which undermines human rights. Human rights are based on our understandings of identity between ourselves and others; the impossible dilemmas of justice today are to do with doing justice to those we perceive as irreducibly different. While I would be a strong advocate and defender of human rights in many (indeed most) contexts, and while I would argue for expanding our notions of community to the limit, I recognise, with Douzinas and Rorty, that the relational nature of rights means that they cannot traverse the community/wilderness border. Rights are mutual relationships of duties and responsibilities; they are rules that protect freedom and dignity within human relationships (Young, 1990); they are constructions to demarcate reciprocal rights and duties (Minow, 1990). The relational nature of rights means that it is easy for communitarians in theory, and governments, neighbours, gaolers and interrogators in practice, to deny rights to those with whom they have no mutually acknowledged reciprocal relationships. Rorty says that what is needed is 'sentimental' rather than legal education. We need to undertake what he calls a long sentimental journey to reach an appreciation of the circumstances of the alien. We should ask not 'what do I have in common with her?', but 'what is it like to be her?', what is it like to live in fear, to have no home, to lose one's loved ones, to feel one's identity denied? He invites us to try to fill in the 'back-stories', to use a movie term, of those we meet at the limits of community. Social hope, for Rorty, rests not on our capacity as humans to discover identity with others through abstract reasoning, but on our capacity for empathy and for embracing difference (Rorty, 1999). But we live in times when this sort of empathetic journey is not only not encouraged, but is positively discouraged. Understand less, punish more, is the tenor of our times. As examples, we can point to the disappearance of social background information in probation reports, replaced by rigidly structured offence-focused information; restriction of opportunities for asylum seekers to give accounts of their sufferings; the hostile reaction in the United States (US) to singer-songwriters such as Bruce Springsteen and Steve Earle who try to undertake these empathetic constructions in their words and music; vilification of any public figure who professes that she or he could understand the resort to terrorism of inhabitants of Gaza and the West Bank. With our politics in the grip of authoritarian communitarianism, and our laws and social institutions dominated by ideas of reciprocal rights and duties within communities, we need to look for new principles to guide our response to the aliens at the borders of our communities.

## Aliens on the Moon

### Alien Life may be closer to home than any one could imagine

Speigel, 2010, “Some Say Moon Photos Show Signs of Alien Life,” (Speigel, Lee. Nov. 1, 2010. “Some Say Moon Photos Show Signs of Alien Life.” AOL News. http://www.aolnews.com/2010/11/01/some-say-moon-photos-show-signs-of-alien-life/)

We're all familiar with the phrase "the man in the moon," the idea that the full moon looks like a human face. But what about this far-out notion: Could there be aliens on the moon watching humankind from a relatively close distance?

That's a meaty question that brings out emotional responses from anyone you ask.

For decades, researchers have claimed that strange objects have been seen on or above the moon -- things that shouldn't be there. From mysterious pyramid shapes to unusual moving lights to tall towerlike objects to geometrically oriented buildings and huge glasslike dome structures, stories and pictures abound claiming that Earth's next-door neighbor is loaded with extraterrestrial artifacts.

"What NASA did not tell the American people is that it discovered the remains of an ancient lunar civilization, and to this day, that data and those artifacts have been withheld from the American people," claims Richard C. Hoagland, founder of [**The Enterprise Mission**](http://www.enterprisemission.com/%20), an extensive private space research analysis website.

Hoagland, a former NASA consultant and curator of astronomy and space [science](http://www.aolnews.com/category/science) at the Springfield Science Museum in Springfield, Mass., was also a consultant to CBS News during the Apollo moon missions. He has spent decades looking into what he asserts is the truth about the numerous unmanned spacecraft missions as well as the manned Apollo voyages to the moon 40 years ago.

"The orbital photographs show us the scale of ancient ruins on the moon. And surface photography by the astronauts have shown remarkable, specific examples of anomalies that could only be explained through there being ancient remnants of some extraordinarily advanced technology," he says.

In his book, "[**Dark Mission: The Secret History of NASA**](http://www.amazon.com/Dark-Mission-Secret-History-NASA/dp/1932595260)" (Feral House), co-written with Mike Bara, Hoagland alleges there are huge glass towers and domes on the moon that have produced repeated prismatic or rainbow effects on Apollo astronaut photographs available on NASA websites. He also claims numerous geometric ground features are evidence of ancient structures.

Lunar Anomalies: Are Aliens on the Moon?

This striking "geometric square" on the moon was photographed from lunar orbit by the Apollo 10 astronauts in 1969. Author-researcher Richard Hoagland points to the "rectilinear geometry" in both the surface markings framing and crisscrossing the square itself, as well as what he claims are repeating, equally geometric glasslike lunar ruins visible around it. He believes this is evidence of an alien structure.

For years, Hoagland and other researchers have quoted from something known as "[**The Brookings Report**](http://www.scribd.com/doc/40154030)," short for "Proposed Studies on the Implications of Peaceful Space Activities for Human Affairs," a study commissioned in 1960 by NASA and put together by the [**Brookings Institution**](http://www.brookings.edu/about.aspx), a highly trusted think tank in [Washington](http://www.aolnews.com/tag/washington).

One section of the report says: "While face-to-face meetings with it [extraterrestrial intelligence] will not occur within the next 20 years (unless its technology is more advanced than ours, qualifying it to visit Earth), artifacts left at some point in time by these life forms might possibly be discovered through our space activities on the moon, Mars or Venus."

Hoagland believes that NASA did indeed uncover evidence on the moon of an extraterrestrial civilization, but decided the public wasn't ready to accept such information.

But what about the astronauts who went to the moon? Wouldn't they have spoken up if they had encountered any evidence of an ET presence there? Cover-up theorists would say the astronauts were either ordered not to talk about this subject or they somehow, conveniently, forgot critical things about their trips to the moon.

I reached out to one of the most famous moonwalkers, who is also a scientist, test pilot and 2005 Nobel Peace Prize nominee.

[**Capt.** (USN, Ret.) Edgar **Mitchell**](http://www.jsc.nasa.gov/Bios/htmlbios/mitchell-ed.html), the sixth man to walk on the moon, was the Apollo 14 lunar module pilot in 1971.

According to Hoagland's computer analysis of an image of Mitchell standing on the lunar surface, an ancient glass dome can be seen in the background. Did Mitchell spot this?

"It's just nonsense! But this isn't to say that aliens haven't used the moon or Mars. I'm not saying that. I'm saying that what Hoagland is pointing out doesn't make any sense," Mitchell says.

He also says he knows of no cover-up by astronauts. He isn't convinced by images Hoagland points to as evidence of an alien presence.

"Most of what I have seen is either so fuzzy, out of focus or nebulous that it would stretch the imagination to be what it's claimed to be. I haven't seen anything that really definitively fits as a structure on the moon. I haven't seen any credible evidence for it."

But while Mitchell himself hasn't seen evidence of an alien presence on the moon, he's open to the possibility.

"There could very well be alien utilization of the moon. Those guys have to be in space out there somewhere. They may keep themselves concealed behind the moon."

Mitchell, author of "[The Way of the Explorer](http://www.amazon.com/Way-Explorer-Revised-Edgar-Mitchell/dp/1564149773)" (New Page Books), has doubts about claims of alien artifacts on the moon, but he definitely believes ETs are close by.

"Well, for me, it's just a matter of the evidence, and the evidence, as far as I'm concerned, is overwhelming. Not only are they here, they've been here for quite a long time, and the more I've investigated, the more I realize it's been much longer than any of us really thought," he says.

Mitchell grew up near Roswell, N.M., home of the legendary Roswell [UFO](http://www.aolnews.com/tag/ufos) crash, where, in 1947, an alien spaceship allegedly crashed, killing its otherworldly crew. Mitchell believes the Roswell alien crash was "a real event and it was strongly covered up by the military."

The former astronaut, member of the U.S. military and founder of the [Institute of Noetic Sciences](http://www.noetic.org/%20) thinks the amount of evidence going back many decades points to more than one group of ETs involved.

"It's the preponderance of evidence that counts here. There seems to be far more than one species of visitors here, from all the evidence that I know, and several of them are investigating our people in their own way.

"Their motivations are somewhat different, depending upon what species we're talking about. Some seem to be here to help us and to be saying, 'Hey, you're about to destroy yourselves and your civilization with your way of doing things,' and what others are doing -- maybe they're just looking at us."

The recent news of [**vast quantities of water**](http://www.aolnews.com/weird-news/article/nasa-usable-water-found-in-moon-crater/19685190) -- and other compounds, including mercury, silver and gold -- on the moon raised many more interesting questions about our rocky satellite in space. But Peter H. Schultz, one of the scientists on the team analyzing lunar water data, doesn't think the aliens-on-the-moon theory holds water.

## Secrecy

### Government intelligence is hiding the truth about the Men in Black.

Roberts, Doctor of Philosophy at Cambridge University, ‘3

(Roberts, Andy. Redford, Nick. 2003. Strange Secrets, pg 129-130.)

“The door banged really slowly but hard, like someone was hitting it with their fist instead of knocking, [and] when I opened it, there was this horrible little man about five feet tall. He was dressed in a black suit and tie and had a funny little black hat on. His face was really strange: he looked like someone with anorexia, you know? His cheeks were all gaunt; his eyes were dark and his skin was almost white.

“I didn’t know what to do and just stared; it was really frightening. Then he suddenly gave me this horrible grin, and I could tell his lips had been colored, like with makeup or something. He took off his hat and had this really bad wig on. You know he looked about sixty but the wig was jet-black.

“All he said was, ‘We would ask you cease your studies.’ I said, ‘What?’ Then he repeated it, exactly the same and I had to ask what he meant. ‘The sky lights; always the sky lights,’ he said. Then it dawned on me. I’d seen a UFO late at night about a week before when me and my husband had been driving home, and we both had a really weird dream after about some little men standing around our car on the edge of the woods. “Then he said something like ‘Cease and dream easy.’ I think that was it, and he gave me a really long stare like he was going to attack me, or something. But he just walked away down the drive. I started to feel dizzy and slammed the door. I just crawled into bed and fell asleep for about three hours. But when I woke up, there was this horrible smell like burning rubber all through the house. We had to have the windows open for days and get the carpets and furniture cleaned to get rid of [the smell]. “It really shook me up, and apart from telling you, I haven’t really talked to anyone-and I don’t really want to.” This account comes from a British woman who lives in a rural, English village near to Cannock Chase, a large, forested area in the central part of the country. It is a classic description of an encounter with what has popularly became known as a Man in Black. Since the early 1950s the Men in Black (we use the plural as they are generally reported traveling in groups of two or three) have been a persistent part of UFO lore, as have their attempts to silence witnesses to UFO encounters. Not surprisingly, perhaps, accounts of Men in Black-style encounters abound in the files of a number of government and intelligence agencies. While many of the cases herein cited seen to have a paranormal or otherworldly aspect, there are firm grounds for believing that the MIB are, in reality, covert operatives of the intelligence services of the United States and Great Britain. In support of our argument we cite various papers that have surfaced from the CIA, FBI, U.S. Air Force, and an elite division of Britain’s Royal Air Force. Typically, those who attract the attention of the Men in Black are either UFO researchers who perhaps have some sensitive information, or witnesses to UFO phenomena. More often than not the person concerned is visited at home by the MIB and warned not to discuss his or her experiences with outsiders.

# \*\*Neg\*\*

## Politics Links—Unpopular

### Alien policy is unpopular

HEIN, 2005

Simeon, Ph. D., sociology, Washington State University, seven semesters of college teaching experience, publications in mainstream social science journals, teaches Resonant Viewing at the Institute for Resonance, personal correspondence with interviewer Michael Antonucci, 4/15/05, published with author’s permission, http://opencaselist.wikispaces.com/Simeon+Hein+

There is no doubt that the UFO question has created the equivalent of a cosmic Watergate. This is issue has been withheld from public view for 50 years. But one could argue that such a disclosure is necessary and healthy for the body politic. The easiest way for any President to be remembered for centuries is to be the President that makes an official announcement about the existence of ETs on or near Earth. Both Presidents Carter and Clinton tried to get the truth, but were stopped. Harvard educated attorney, Daniel Sheehan worked for Carter in this respect, and found evidence, including photos, in the classified section of the Library of Congress. Clinton, through deputy attorney general Webster Hubbell, also tried to find out about UFOs but was rebuffed by NORAD at Cheyenne Mountain, CO and told that no such information existed. If the President cannot get access to this information, who can? I think members of Congress who supported an Open Contact law would certainly be considered controversial, but after such open hearings, they might be seen as brave people who did the right thing. Afterall, if members of Congress only concern is their day- to-day popularity we will never make any progress with any legislation. Civil rights legislation in the 1960's wasn't popular in many parts of the country either.

## Aliens=Evil

### Intelligent life is expected to act similar to each other, posing threats to one another.

Leake, The Sunday Times, ‘10( April 25, 2010. The Sunday Times. Don’t talk to aliens, warns Stephen Hawking. http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/space/article7107207.ece)

THE aliens are out there and Earth had better watch out, at least according to Stephen Hawking. He has suggested that extraterrestrials are almost certain to exist — but that instead of seeking them out, humanity should be doing all it that can to avoid any contact.

The suggestions come in a new documentary series in which Hawking, one of the world’s leading scientists, will set out his latest thinking on some of the universe’s greatest mysteries.

Alien life, he will suggest, is almost certain to exist in many other parts of the universe: not just in planets, but perhaps in the centre of stars or even floating in interplanetary space.

Hawking’s logic on aliens is, for him, unusually simple. The universe, he points out, has 100 billion galaxies, each containing hundreds of millions of stars. In such a big place, Earth is unlikely to be the only planet where life has evolved.

“To my mathematical brain, the numbers alone make thinking about aliens perfectly rational,” he said. “The real challenge is to work out what aliens might actually be like.”

The answer, he suggests, is that most of it will be the equivalent of microbes or simple animals — the sort of life that has dominated Earth for most of its history.

One scene in his documentary for the Discovery Channel shows herds of two-legged herbivores browsing on an alien cliff-face where they are picked off by flying, yellow lizard-like predators. Another shows glowing fluorescent aquatic animals forming vast shoals in the oceans thought to underlie the thick ice coating Europa, one of the moons of Jupiter.

Such scenes are speculative, but Hawking uses them to lead on to a serious point: that a few life forms could be intelligent and pose a threat. Hawking believes that contact with such a species could be devastating for humanity.

He suggests that aliens might simply raid Earth for its resources and then move on: “We only have to look at ourselves to see how intelligent life might develop into something we wouldn’t want to meet. I imagine they might exist in massive ships, having used up all the resources from their home planet. Such advanced aliens would perhaps become nomads, looking to conquer and colonise whatever planets they can reach.”

He concludes that trying to make contact with alien races is “a little too risky”. He said: “If aliens ever visit us, I think the outcome would be much as when Christopher Columbus first landed in America, which didn’t turn out very well for the Native Americans.”

The completion of the documentary marks a triumph for Hawking, now 68, who is paralysed by motor neurone disease and has very limited powers of communication. The project took him and his producers three years, during which he insisted on rewriting large chunks of the script and checking the filming.

John Smithson, executive producer for Discovery, said: “He wanted to make a programme that was entertaining for a general audience as well as scientific and that’s a tough job, given the complexity of the ideas involved.”

Hawking has suggested the possibility of alien life before but his views have been clarified by a series of scientific breakthroughs, such as the discovery, since 1995, of more than 450 planets orbiting distant stars, showing that planets are a common phenomenon.

So far, all the new planets found have been far larger than Earth, but only because the telescopes used to detect them are not sensitive enough to detect Earth-sized bodies at such distances.

Another breakthrough is the discovery that life on Earth has proven able to colonise its most extreme environments. If life can survive and evolve there, scientists reason, then perhaps nowhere is out of bounds.

Hawking’s belief in aliens places him in good scientific company. In his recent Wonders of the Solar System BBC series, Professor Brian Cox backed the idea, too, suggesting Mars, Europa and Titan, a moon of Saturn, as likely places to look.

Similarly, Lord Rees, the astronomer royal, warned in a lecture earlier this year that aliens might prove to be beyond human understanding.

“I suspect there could be life and intelligence out there in forms we can’t conceive,” he said. “Just as a chimpanzee can’t understand quantum theory, it could be there are aspects of reality that are beyond the capacity of our brains.”

## Space Protected Now

### Protection of space is happening now through treaties

Billings ‘06 (Dr. Linda Billings PhD Communication Studies SETI Institute Volume 22 Issue 4) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964606000749

History thus offers space advocates and policy makers useful insights into the functions and the dangers of frontier rhetoric. The drive to conquer and develop bumps up against the need to preserve and protect. One place in the area of space policy where legal and ethical considerations of preservation and protection intersect with the drive to explore—and where frontier rhetoric is notably absent—is in planetary protection policy. NASA and the Committee on Space Research (COSPAR) of the International Council of Science have long-standing national and international planetary protection policies in place directing solar system exploration missions to take steps to prevent the transport of terrestrial biological contamination to extraterrestrial environments and the transport of possible extraterrestrial biological contamination to Earth through solar system sample returns.

## Squo Solves Ethics

### Space ethics will be based around protecting the environment and not exploiting space

Billings ‘06 (Dr. Linda Billings PhD Communication Studies SETI Institute Volume 22 Issue 4) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964606000749

In the USA current dialogue on legal and ethical aspects of extending human presence into the Solar System tends to focus on protecting commercial interests. Elsewhere, space ethics and the principle of protecting the space environment for all humankind have been the subject of a broader discussion. UNESCO has been studying the feasibility and outlining the principles of an international declaration or policy on space ethics, in consultation with COPUOS. In 1998 UNESCO established COMEST and tasked it to examine space ethics, among other topics. COMEST has identified a number of principles to be embodied in any national and international codes of space ethics, among them respect for extraterrestrial environments, benefit sharing, free and open access, and public participation in space policy making. The challenge “is to devise an ethics of positive action and wise prevention, not an ethics of regret”. While opinions differ as to what the ethics of space exploration and development should be, one point that parties to UNESCO-sponsored examinations of the subject tend to agree on is that space is the common heritage of humankind: “space and celestial bodies are non-appropriable,” and “no exploitation of [space] resources should be undertaken without a prior international agreement”.

## Neg—Exploration Bad

### The search for extraterrestrials should end- humans have a moral obligation to respect extraterrestrial ecosystem

[Margaret S. Race](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=RedirectURL&_method=outwardLink&_partnerName=27983&_origin=article&_zone=art_page&_linkType=scopusAuthorDocuments&_targetURL=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scopus.com%2Fscopus%2Finward%2Fauthor.url%3FpartnerID%3D10%26rel%3D3.0.0%26sortField%3Dcited%26sortOrder%3Dasc%26author%3DRace,%2520Margaret%2520S.%26authorID%3D6603732443%26md5%3D2ba07dbfd7dc18fc2dd9dc91f0369a92&_acct=C000059607&_version=1&_userid=4420&md5=8dc2bd354a85b8f4303781ee77dad753) and [Richard O. Randolph](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=RedirectURL&_method=outwardLink&_partnerName=27983&_origin=article&_zone=art_page&_linkType=scopusAuthorDocuments&_targetURL=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scopus.com%2Fscopus%2Finward%2Fauthor.url%3FpartnerID%3D10%26rel%3D3.0.0%26sortField%3Dcited%26sortOrder%3Dasc%26author%3DRandolph,%2520Richard%2520O.%26authorID%3D15744621200%26md5%3D91f9e7e403dab6773d50bb2cf1b4a08f&_acct=C000059607&_version=1&_userid=4420&md5=cebca1caa9fd4a6c4956802cca4ff95b), 2002. (Margaret S. Race has obtained a Ph.D. in Zoology (ecology) from the University of Berkeley in 1971 and currently works at the SETI Institute, Carl Sagan Center for the Study of Life in the Universe in Mountain View, CA as a principal investigator. She does research and outreach activities on Planetary Protection (PP), Social Issues and Risk Communication related to astrobiology and solar system exploration. Richard O. Randolph has obtained a Ph.D. in Ethics, Graduate Theological Union from Berkeley, California in 2003. He is current an Associate Professor in the Department of Bioethics at the University of Kansas City University of Medicine and Bioscience. Elsevier Science Ltd, Advances in Space Research, “The need for operating guidelines and a decision making framework applicable to the discovery of non-intelligent extraterrestrial life,” [Volume 30, Issue 6](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_tockey=%23TOC%235738%232002%23999699993%23380099%23FLP%23&_cdi=5738&_pubType=J&view=c&_auth=y&_acct=C000059607&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=4420&md5=de88afaa767fa147c9e86b06ecb95a3e), Pages 1583-1591, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273117702004787>)

Beyond the two principles discussed above, analysis of exobiology discovery scenarios suggests that additional ethical concerns are involved. In fact, the underlying ethical principles for microbial ET life are actually more complex than for intelligent ET life. Perhaps the most significance difference between the search types is that virtually all the discovery scenarios for non-intelligent life involve space travel in some form or another, whereas SETI’s search for electromagnetic signals does not. The inclusion of space travel raises two critical concerns for solar system exploration that are not considered in the SETI Principles: (i) concerns about biohazardous back contamination of planet Earth when extraterrestrial samples or spacecraft are returned, and (ii) questions about obligations that earthly space travelers may have to preserve extraterrestrial life and ecosystems. Thus, in addition to the two ethical principles identified earlier—do good science and communicate widely—exploration via space travelers raises the following other ethical principles: 3. Cause no harm to the biota and ecosystems of planet Earth. As with many ethical systems, perhaps the most fundamental principle is: “First, do no harm.” Because of the real-time transfer of materials associated with space missions, there is a need to be concerned with cross-contamination, especially from the return to Earth of materials that may harbor ET life forms or contaminants, whether in samples themselves or via ‘hitchhiker’ materials. 2. From the earliest days of space travel, scientists and policy makers acknowledged these concerns through provisions in the Outer Space Treaty which urges the avoidance of harmful cross contamination during exploration (United Nations, 1967). Current Planetary Protection controls and policies promulgated by COSPAR and implemented by NASA through regulatory directives formalize these cross-contamination concerns from a scientific perspective. 4. Respect and do not substantively (or perhaps) alter the extraterrestrial ecosystem. While the Outer Space Treaty addresses the question of forward contamination, it does so out of concern for protecting celestial bodies of biological interests for the sake of science. Even today, current terrestrial international space law recognizes no absolute protection for alien life-forms or alien environments per se (Cypser, 1993). NASA’s planetary protection controls during the Viking missions required that spacecraft orbits be designed to prevent impacting Mars for a period of “biological interest,” which extended decades into the future “in order to provide sufficient time for the study of Mars before it became contaminated by terrestrial spacecraft.” (DeVincenzi et al., 1998). Likewise, all of the key NRC reports on Mars exploration and sample return are written from the perspective of ensuring the integrity of scientific experiments to detect and characterize possible extraterrestrial life, rather than any concern for that life. Part of the reason for this position is pragmatic: it is important to preserve life and ecosystem in a manner that insures they will be available for research by future scientists of all nations. While pragmatic concerns are important in maintaining the opportunity for future science study, a more fundamental and central rationale for a policy of non-interference or non-disturbance of an extraterrestrial ecosystem arises if ET life is found. Put simply, human space explorers may have a moral obligation to respect the integrity of extraterrestrial ecosystems just as they do those on Earth. It can be argued that extraterrestrial ecosystems should continue to function essentially the same as they did before their discovery by space explorers, following their natural evolutionary or development trajectory, whatever that might entail. This fourth ethical concern is perhaps the most unusual and far reaching when considering non-intelligent ET life. In essence, this argument is consistent with the Christian conception of the Golden Rule: “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you,” an axiom that has cognates in most other religious traditions as well as many secular ethical systems. If planet Earth were visited by extraterrestrial beings with vastly superior intellectual capacities, we would want ten to respect Earth’s life, ecosystems and evolutionary trajectory or at least not interfere in harmful ways. Similarly we should follow the same ethical considerations when human explorers play the role of the intellectually superior species vis-à-vis non-intelligent ET life.

## Neg—They’re All Crazy

### Can we trust the people revealing the secrets that the government is so desperately trying to hide from us?

Stark, author and journalist on alien encounters, 2007, (Stark, R.R. “Dark Conspiracies and Extraterrestrial Secrets, Part 3,” Ezine Articles, August 16, 2007, http://ezinearticles.com/?Dark-Conspiracies-and-Extraterrestrial-Secrets,-Part-3&id=686466)

We've been trying to narrow down what secrets the government has been hiding from us involving the whole UFO phenomenon. The problem is there's too much information and disinformation in circulation. There are conspiracy theorists, whistleblowers, alien abductees, UFO and alien eyewitnesses, UFO investigators, and so forth, some of which could be total crackpots, or just wild yarn-spinners. Then we have the disbelievers and skeptics, and the covert government operators, some of which are probably Men in Black, and then we have the military and the government and its intelligence agencies that are trying to cover something up. With all of these people and groups on the loose, how are we the public to know what to believe? How can we discern the truth from the lies?

Can we trust the whistleblowers, many of whom have written fascinating books on how they revealed the truth after keeping government secrets for so many years? Case in point: Col. Philip J. Corso, who wrote The Day After Roswell, claimed many questionable things in his book, one of which is that he inadvertently peaked into a crate containing a dead alien at Fort Riley. And his claim that our military maintained a space war with extraterrestrials, not to mention an alien Cold War, is highly questionable also. Although there is a lot of fascinating information in his book, I've been questioning its reliability now, especially since various skeptical individuals have accused Col. Corso of being just another whacked-out crackpot; and yet others have said his book contains a mixture of truth and unresolved data, if not fabrication. So the question is, was he an independent crackpot, or did the government deliberately send him on a mission to write a book filled with propaganda, containing half-lies and half-truths, in an attempt to further confuse the masses with disinformation? Or was he an honest whistleblower trying to reveal the truth of something he was once ordered to keeps secret from the public? We may never know, since he has recently died.

Bob Lazar is another so-called whistleblower who has come out of the government closet, who claimed that he analyzed an alien spacecraft at Area 51. Bob Lazar says he was part of a reverse-engineering operation with an extraterrestrial saucer craft, finding ways to use its propulsion systems for our own aircrafts. Critics have denied his claims, so it's hard to tell if he's just another crackpot, or someone trying to reveal the truth.

Jenny Randles is a UFO investigator who believes Men in Black have been harassing and silencing witnesses of UFO phenomena for the last several decades, at least since 1947. She also reports that they have been thwarting and scaring various UFO investigators also, to stop their research endeavors, sometimes quite successfully. After interviewing countless witnesses and reporting her case studies in her book, *The Truth Behind Men In Black*, it is obvious that these mysterious MIBs are a large factor in the ongoing UFO cover-ups, although it's still not clear exactly who or what they are, whether or not they represent the government, the military, extraterrestrials, or if they are simply masquerading hoaxers. Whoever they are, are they covering up more than just UFO sightings and alien abductions and alien encounters? The well-hidden truth of what the government is still trying to hide from us still eludes us, but will we ever find it? Will the whistleblowers and investigators and the eyewitnesses provide enough evidence to blow the lid off the whole UFO cover-up?

How long can the conspiracies and the cover-ups last? And how long will they last before it's too late? When we discover the truth, will it be right in our faces and will there be panic in the streets? Will there be huge flying discs hovering overhead in every major city?

Or is this imaginary scenario just another ploy, another titillating cover-up just to keep us busy while the government is still keeping its best-kept secret?

## Neg—Abduction Discourse Bad

### The affirmative’s hybridity and abduction discourse violently co-opts the language of minority rights activists and reinscribes racial hierarchies.

Christopher F. Roth, Anthropology—University of Northern Illinois, DeKalb, 2005

E.T. Culture: Anthropology in Outerspaces, ed. Debbora Battaglia, p. 89-90

The social function of alien self-identification is structured similarly to the phenomenon of reincarnation beliefs in mainstream U.S. society: in contrast to societies with long-standing reincarnation traditions such as, for example, some indigenous North American groups, middle-class American 1 (incarnation beliefs usually serve to set the believer apart from his or her community and kinship network rather than weaving him or her into it more firmly (Harkin 1994: 194-95). Middle-class reincarnation is almost never within the family and tends to be expressed in past-life memories focusing on romanticized ancient civilizations such as pharaonic Egypt or classical (Greece, out of all proportion to the statistical representation of those societies in the accumulated human population. Mack's clients *who* report past-life memories fall into this pattern as well (Mack 1994). In a sense, being the reincarnation of an alien is a further extension of this radical-individualist trend.

But inevitably alien self-identification adopted the modern American discourses of identity politics and minority rights. The first issue of *Other* Wise, an Olympia, Washington, zine devoted to alien-identified families, describes the childhood of its editor, who was "mostly a normal kid —except for one thing. Tucker had a Secret that she was hiding behind her pigtails and skinned knees. . . . Lots of nights Tucker went to bed scared and had nightmares about people learning her Secret and not liking her anymore because of it."

We can see in this growing movement a co-optation of most of the themes in minority politics discourses, such as negative media imagery that encourages prejudice against "real aliens, not the tentacled monstrosi­ties from movie studios" (Estron 1996: 5). There is even an organization called etado, the Extra-Terrestrial Anti-Defamation Organization (Alex­ander 1997). A book called e.t. 101 (Jho 1990) counsels those coming to terms with their alien identity. Other publications use the jargons of abuse survivors, parents of special needs children, and homosexual outing. Just as the abductee Leah Haley's children's book *Ceto's* New *Friends* (1994) introduces children to alien visitation (much as *Adoption Is Forever* and *Heather Has Two Mommies* counter for children the stigma of other un­conventional families), in the same way a page from *Other Wise* no. 3 urges parents of hybrid children to "be honest with them about their heritage" and tells us, "Hybrid kids are fun, but challenging. Some of the challenges can be: strange sleep-wake cycles (corresponding to day length on another planet), weird taste in foods, and something called 'hybrid vigor,' which translates to 'very busy, into-everything kid.'" (As with Steiger's question­naire, one is reminded here of quizzes designed to alert parents to their teenagers' drug use, which merely list symptoms of adolescence.)

Inevitably, if unintentionally of course, this is partly an acquisition by "unmarked," nonethnic, mainstream Americans of the moral authority of an oppressed minority. I have been told repeatedly that abductees are likely to have Native American or "Celtic" ancestry—that is, whites with these ancestries. Celtic, of course, is not an ethnonym used in Irish American communities, while abductees of Native American ancestry almost never have enough of it to be involved with Native American communities or to experience racism as a visible minority. Being an abductee or hybrid is one of the few ways an American WASP can be ethnic.