# Notes:

**Just a compilation of some camp cards to get a general gist of how to answer the enchantment K.**

# \*\*\*AFF\*\*\*

## AFF – Science Progress Good

### Science is not characterized by a grand march to progress – their caricature of Enlightenment values gets it exactly backward.

Bronner 4 — Stephen Eric Bronner, Distinguished Professor of Political Science and a Member of the Graduate Faculty in Comparative Literature and German Studies at Rutgers University, 2004 (*Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement*, Published by Columbia University Press, ISBN 9780231126090, p. 21-23)

Something will always be missing: freedom will never become fully manifest in reality. The relation between them is asymptotic. Therefore, most [end page 21] philosophes understood progress as a regulative ideal, or as a postulate, rather than as an absolute or the expression of some divine plane or the foundation for a system.14 Even in scientific terms, progress retained a critical dimension insofar as it implied the need to question established certainties. In this vein, it is misleading simply to equate scientific reason with the domination of man and nature.15 All the great figures of the scientific revolution—Bacon, Boyle, Newton—were concerned with liberating humanity from what seemed the power of seemingly intractable forces. Swamps were everywhere; roads were few; forests remained to be cleared; illness was rampant; food was scarce; most people would never leave their village. What it implied not to understand the existence of bacteria or the nature of electricity, just to use very simple examples, is today simply inconceivable. Enlightenment figures like Benjamin Franklin, "the complete philosophe,"16 became famous for a reason: they not only freed people from some of their fears but through inventions like the stove and the lightning rod they also raised new possibilities for making people's lives more livable. Critical theorists and postmodernists miss the point when they view Enlightenment intellectuals in general and scientists in particular as simple apostles of reification. They actually constituted its most consistent enemy. The philosophes may not have grasped the commodity form, but they empowered people by challenging superstitions and dogmas that left them mute and helpless against the whims of nature and the injunctions of tradition. Enlightenment thinkers were justified in understanding knowledge as inherently improving humanity. Infused with a sense of furthering the public good, liberating the individual from the clutches of the invisible and inexplicable, the Enlightenment idea of progress required what the young Marx later termed "the ruthless critique of everything existing." [end page 22] This regulative notion of progress was never inimical to subjectivity. Quite the contrary: progress became meaningful only with reference to real living individuals. Enlightenment thinking did not mechanically identify progress with the chronological passing of time or, usually, mere technological development. It was instead always seen as entailing a moral commitment to expanding self-awareness and the possibilities for exercising judgment. This was as true for Immanuel Kant, who viewed progress from the standpoint of the species, as for Moses Mendelssohn, who identified it with the increasing capacities for self-reflection by the individual. Both saw the root of progress in the growing possibilities for criticism and the development of human capacities. Progress thus became the rallying cry for attacking the privileges and dogma associated with the status quo. It was undoubtedly what led Diderot to exclaim that freedom would only be realized when the last aristocrat had been strangled with the entrails of the last priest. The outburst was revealing but so were the words of Tom Paine who probably best expressed the general position of the philosophes when he noted in 1795 that "the vanity and presumption of governing beyond the grave is the most ridiculous and insolent of all tyrannies. Man has no property in man, neither has one generation a property in the generations that are to follow."

## AFF – Space Narrative Good

### ( ) Space can now de-construct the master narrative – things have changed since the early era of exploration

Launius ‘8

Roger D. Launius is chair of the Division of Space History at the Smithsonian Institution's National Air and Space Museum in Washington, D.C. Between 1990 and 2002 he served as chief historian of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Dr. Launis’ MA and Phd were with major fields in American frontier and military history.

A Chapter in the Book: Remembering the Space Age – Chapter 17 – “American Spaceflight history’s Master Narrative and the Meaning of Memory” – http://www.nss.org/resources/library/spacepolicy/Remembering\_the\_Space\_Age.pdf

Finally, who has the right—not to mention the power—to interpret the past? It seems obvious that the fierceness of the discourse over the possible narratives of the past has arisen from the desire to secure a national identity of one nation, one people, coupled with a concern that the bulwarks of appropriate conceptions may be crumbling. viewing history as largely a lesson in civics and a means of instilling in the nation’s citizenry a sense of awe and reverence for the nation state and its system of governance ensures that this debate over narratives will be vicious and longstanding. the dominant master narrative of spaceflight fits beautifully into this approach to seeing the past. It is one of an initial shock to the system, surprise, and ultimately recovery with success after success following across a broad spectrum of activities. It offers general comfort to the american public as a whole and an exceptionalistic, nationalistic, and triumphant model for understanding the nation’s past.86 Small wonder that this story of spaceflight emerged as the narrative so dominant from the earliest days of the space program. It offered a subtle, usable past for the nation as a whole. but that master narrative of both spaceflight and the larger american history began to break down with the rise of the new social history of the 1960s.87 by the 1980s the consensus, exceptionalistic perspective on the american past had crumbled throughout academia, but it had not done so among the broader public and in the cultural institutions that sought to speak to the public.88 In this setting it would seem that the alternative spaceflight narratives could emerge to challenge the master narrative, creating for their individual and individualistic followings a uniquely boutique but satisfactory interpretation of space exploration’s history.

### ( ) Their Space K’s are epistemologically flawed – it *used* to be that space was an extension of modern violence – but *NOW* things have fundamentally changed.

Collins ‘8

Martin Collins is a curator at the Smithsonian Institution's National Air and Space Museum in Washington, D.C. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Maryland and is the author/editor of several books on space history and on science, technology, and society in the twentieth century, including Space Race: The US-USSR Competition to Reach the Moon (1999). A Chapter in the Book: Remembering the Space Age – Chapter 11

“A Second Nature rising: Spaceflight in an era of representation” – http://www.nss.org/resources/library/spacepolicy/Remembering\_the\_Space\_Age.pdf

And the blowback is this: spaceflight as application helped make this world. But spaceflight as exploration, particularly human exploration, encountered and encounters this condition somewhat differently. granting human spaceflight’s grounding in Cold War real politik, that experience gained credibility because exploration as a culture trope drew strength from Western meta-narratives and explorers as universal human subjects. If human exploration is only a narrative and not a meta-narrative in competition with other narratives, then space exploration as an exemplification of enlightenment values fades. The exploration narrative still resonates, but in a much diminished way. and this ties back to Boorstin’s concern that image-ness threatened to change the very nature of politics—from a field of experience built on elite actions, metanarratives, and enlightenment rationality to one in which these elements are transformed and conjoined with the ontology of everywhere semiotics. This insight offers an analytic hint: traditional explanatory modes that rely on interest groups and elite power to account for the history of human spaceflight in the last 40 years miss the changed foundations (as presented in critical theory and other literatures) of politics and culture. The Moon journeys, it may be argued, exemplify the modern temperament; the subsequent years of human spaceflight illustrates the intrusion of the postmodern into the modern, a marker of “second nature,” of the complex ways in which spaceflight and culture have been mutually reconfigured.

### ( ) Things *have* changed – Exploration is no longer a meta-narrative. It now reshapes violent institutions.

Gerovitch ‘8

Slava Gerovitch is a Dibner/Sloan Postdoctoral Researcher at the Dibner Institute for the History of Science and Technology at MIT and a Research Associate at the Institute for the History of Natural Science and Technology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. A Chapter in the Book: Remembering the Space Age – Chapter 12 – Creating Memories: Myth, Identity, and Culture in the Russian Space Age

http://www.nss.org/resources/library/spacepolicy/Remembering\_the\_Space\_Age.pdf

In the post-Soviet era, discourses of the past and of the present interact in complex ways. As the historian Martin Collins points out, the Global age that we live in has both changed the cultural perception of spaceflight and shifted priorities for the Space age. The meta-narrative of exploration no longer dominates the public image of spaceflight, and new large-scale space projects tend to involve global satellite communication systems, rather than ambitious human spaceflight endeavors. Instead of leading humanity away from earth into the enchanting Unknown, space projects now connect disparate parts of earth, changing the very terms in which we discuss culture in general and Space age culture in particular.89 Collins draws our attention to the semiotic nature of new discursive regimes: cultural symbols do not simply represent things, they act. They create a “second nature” environment in which new identities emerge and a new form of cultural power competes with and reshapes old political and institutional structures. Thus culture cannot be seen as a mere gloss on the rough surface of the crude machinery of technological innovation, economic pressures, and political decision-making. Culture is an actor in its own right—an instrument of innovation, a tool of profit-making, and the stuff politics is made of.

## AFF – Overview Effect

### Their critique misses the boat—technology is intrinsic to human social systems. Space exploration is crucial to establish a different system state that remaps the interface between humanity and technology—the Overview Effect internal link turns the critique.

Frank White, author of six books about space exploration, founder of the Overview Effect Institute, frequently speaks at conferences about space exploration, holds a B.A. from Harvard College and an M.Phil. from Oxford University, 1987 (“Overview Systems,” *The Overview Effect: Space Exploration and Human Evolution*, Published by Houghton Mifflin Company, ISBN 0395430844, p. 82-84)

Human systems are among the most sophisticated organizational forms evolved to date for institutionalizing intelligence and conscious self-awareness on Earth. They possess the primary properties of other systems, as well as special properties that make them unique.3 Human social systems, like other systems, evolve. They follow the patterns of equilibrium, change, and transformation and the building up of more complex out of simpler forms. They can also fail to adapt to new situations and become extinct, as the history of past civilizations illustrates.

The **distinguishing property** of human social systems is that they **create and use new technologies as a tool of social evolution**. In fact, a human system can be **defined** as a group of human beings **evolving together as a whole system** and **using technology to do so**.

The word *technology* is derived from the Greek root *technologia*, meaning “systematic treatment.” Technology is a systematic treatment of any problem or endeavor, which means that machines and labor-saving devices are only **one type**. Such physical technologies as automobiles, computers, airplanes, and robots represent one dimension of the technology-creating tendencies of human systems.

For a civilization to arise, a human social system must manage energy effectively. Physical technologies create the means of doing so and lay the foundations for utilizing energy to create information and knowledge. However, while physical technologies provide the basic elements of the process, others are brought to bear to complete the picture.

Mental technologies represent systematic approaches to the problems of everyday life in a human social system. They include such diverse inventions as legal systems (a technology designed to maintain social order), psychotherapies (a technology designed to enhance the functioning of individual human systems), and economies (a technology designed to regulate transfers of goods and services). They are bodies of knowledge built up over long periods of time, so all-pervasive that we hardly notice how they, like physical [end page 82] technologies, **constantly change to meet new demands and needs**. However, they must change in order to remain relevant and useful and for societies to evolve.

The creation of spiritual technologies is an effort to maintain and sustain a link to the spiritual experience of the universe, generating a relationship with an ultimate oneness, “the Universe,” or “System of Systems.” These often show up in society as organized religions and religious practices, which are only the “exoteric” or public aspect of spiritual technologies. Throughout human history, there has also existed a more private or “esoteric” tradition that is less well known.

Because purpose is an essential integrating component of social systems, spiritual technologies play a vital role in defining human purpose and feeding values, norms, and beliefs into the domain of mental technologies for everyday use, while also balancing the often traumatic impact of physical technologies on societies.4

At various times in history, different technologies have been the primary drivers of social evolution. The advent of Christianity during the Roman Empire had tremendous impact as a spiritual technology. The empire’s efforts to integrate the new information represented by Christian thought into its existing mental technologies failed, helping to bring down a civilization that great armies had been unable to defeat. Today, physical technologies appear to be the driving force of social evolution on Earth. Rapid developments in the domain of physical technologies are triggering fundamental transformations in the area of mental technologies and generating a compensatory response in the spiritual domain.

Physical technologies are altering the environment in which all systems on the planet exist, thereby supporting both adaptation and evolution. As the environment is altered, radically new information is fed into most systems on Earth, causing some to move into higher system states and evolve while others fail to adapt and instead devolve. If human systems reacted only to pressures from the environment, they would probably become erratic and highly unstable, because the outside pressures are changing all the time.

In fact, the evolutionary direction of a system is guided by elements inherent in the system as well as influences from the environment. In a living system, the information in a species’ gene [end page 83] pool constitutes one element of its internal distinguishing properties. In a human social system, the inner drive is found at the interface between the physical, mental, and spiritual domains.

Here, the system defines its own **fundamental “view of the world”** as a combination of **physical, mental, and spiritual knowledge**, and this is where the success or failure of a social system is determined. What happens at this “human technologies interface” is far more **important** than might be imagined, because it is **here** that value systems are formed as the foundation of a culture’s unique sense of vision and purpose.

Where vision and purpose are lacking, the interface becomes **unstable**, and the system **loses energy in trying to define itself**. Managers of the system spend their time **tinkering with subsystems and feedback loops** when the problem is with **the value system at the interface among them all.**

A human social system holding to the same ideas for too long will experience itself as being **stuck**, or stagnant, and can remain in that state only briefly. It must then either go into a decline or produce events and opportunities designed to call forth a sense of **vision and purpose**, moving it into **a different system state**. These situations are often perceived as a crisis, but they are equally **an opportunity**, and **they often result from exploration**.

These “metaideas” and “metaexperiences” may be much grander and more comprehensive than any that went before, or they may be fundamental challenges to the system’s continued existence. In any event, the social system must rearrange itself, or transform, to take in the new idea or meet the challenge.

The Overview Effect, seeing and feeling the unity of the Earth, is a **metaexperience**. The whole Earth symbol is a metaidea based on that experience. The multiplicity of human systems on Earth cannot absorb these ideas and experiences without going through **a fundamental transformation**. Physical, mental, and spiritual exploration of **all kinds** functions as **an ongoing generator of metaideas and metaexperiences**, **restoring vision and purpose to a social system**, thereby **supporting its evolution**.

### Our defense of space exploration plays an important role in the diffusion process—even if none of us ever go to space, our case is a valuable contribution to the dissemination of the Overview Effect.

Frank White, author of six books about space exploration, founder of the Overview Effect Institute, frequently speaks at conferences about space exploration, holds a B.A. from Harvard College and an M.Phil. from Oxford University, 1987 (“Disseminating the Overview,” *The Overview Effect: Space Exploration and Human Evolution*, Published by Houghton Mifflin Company, ISBN 0395430844, p. 68-73)

Still, it **may not be necessary** for an entire society to feel the full impact for a shift in consciousness to take place. The astronauts and cosmonauts are representatives of the species, and in them we have the most powerful experiences of spaceflight being felt by a tiny sample of the whole population. The impact of their communication may seem insignificant—as Skylab astronaut Ed Gibson said, their talking about it is like a “drop of dye in the ocean,” but the diffusion of dye into a liquid changes its composition and color. Their messages to us may work similarly to **change our perspective over time**.

In fact, diffusion is a good way to understand how new ideas are disseminated into societies. Communication researchers have noticed that there is a familiar pattern by which new ideas or practices are adopted by society as a whole. The pattern applies in the same way to issues ranging from the adoption of the smoking habit to the abolition of slavery.

According to this “diffusion of innovation” theory, people fall into five basic groups in terms of adopting new ideas or practices. The percentages of the population they represent are innovators (2.5); early adopters (13.5); early majority (34); late majority (34); and late adopters (16).

New information coming into a human social system from the environment is processed in a sequence, starting with the innovators and concluding with the late adopters. Not everyone deals with new ideas the same way, and everyone does not adopt them immediately.

The innovators are the first to take up the new idea; they then pass it on to the early adopters. Once these two groups make an idea their own, it is on its way to becoming a part of mainstream [end page 69] thought. No one, including innovators, takes on something unknown right away, skipping straight to the adoption or confirmation stages of the process. They have to hear about it, become interested in it, evaluate it, try it, then adopt it and confirm its value.

The adoption curve rises slowly in the beginning, when the innovators and early adopters are going through the process, accelerates rapidly until about half the population has adopted, and increases at a slower rate while the later adopters come aboard. When about 20 percent of the population has taken up the innovation, the curve becomes virtually unstoppable.3

The most important audiences are the innovators, early adopters, and early majority, since their absorption of the message brings it to “takeoff” stage.

The astronauts are the superinnovators of the space age. Other innovators are those involved in national space programs, space interest groups, and other pro-space activities. The early adopters and early majority are just beginning to emerge in regard to the Overview Effect and other ideas discussed here.

It is through this diffusion process that the experience of spaceflight is translated into an idea that has a powerful effect on society as more and more people are reached by it. Just as people who had never seen a slave could become adherents of the abolitionist cause, so can those who have never been in space support a vigorous space exploration program.

Hearing an astronaut speak, seeing a film, or looking at a poster of the whole Earth begins the adoption process by bringing awareness of the overview to the audience. These experiences are not as deep as being in space, but the impact is broader because a film or poster can be replicated more easily and less expensively than the experience itself.

In certain instances, people who are made aware of the overview go through transformations just as powerful as those of the astronauts and in unpredictable ways. I call people who have achieved astronaut awareness without going into space Terranauts. Consider the case of Ray Bright, the inventor of “bioflight,” an approach to gymnastics, space travel, and life itself based on an understanding of what it means to live in a three-dimensional reality. In 1979, Bright was working as a gymnastics instructor at Chico State College [end page 70] in California. He had the insight that whenever we jump into the air, even just a food off the ground, we are *flying*—if we see it that way. With the right attitude, and a little more equipment, such as a trampoline, we can fly even better. In space, well…

Bright had already worked out many of the basic ideas behind bioflight, but the way the final piece fell into place is an excellent example of dissemination of the Overview Effect.

An article in *Air & Space* magazine states,

He [Bright] describes the experience as akin to satori, the Zen state of enlightenment. “I was looking at the famous NASA photo of the Earth floating in space. It’d been made into the front of a greeting card, and the word ‘Home’ was printed on the part of the photo that was just black space. Of course, the idea was that ‘Home’ meant Earth—but suddenly, I saw *space* as home, because in space, everything I’d been trying to do my whole life in terms of movement would be possible. In space, gymnastics wouldn’t be gymnastics—it would be flight. Human flight. Ultimate flight. Bioflight.”4

Bright’s approach is used not only to teach people basic gymnastic techniques, but it is also being considered as a potentially useful training method and space sickness prevention technique for astronauts before they go into space.5

Martin Rutte, a management consultant in Toronto, is another Terranaut. He tells of the transformation that he experienced on hearing a talk by Edgar Mitchell.

There were about two or three thousand people there, and he was standing alone on the stage … Behind him, on a rear-view projector, was the picture he saw coming back from the moon, of the Earth with black all around it. He spoke about his experience of seeing that, and I was riveted on the picture. When he talked about coming back and what it was like to look at that and how it altered his life forever, that he saw that we were one planet and we were one universe—there was one instant when it went “click” and I just got it. I knew exactly what he was talking about. I think it was the first time I had that kind of global consciousness directly.6

According to Rutte, the insight penetrated deep and continues to influence his work as a consultant to corporate executives seeking to define a vision and purpose for their organizations. [end page 71]

He later commented on my article “Space Exploration and Human Evolution,” “It was all there and I knew exactly what you were talking about. It was just ‘bang,’ an explosion in me.”7

Now he is integrating the ideas of the Overview Effect, the Copernican Perspective, and the Universal Insight into the training he conducts with his clients. Once again we see how the insights that had been the exclusive property of astronauts and cosmonauts begin to diffuse into society as a whole.8

I also told Gary Enersen, a management consultant in San Francisco, about my work on the Overview Effect, how my initial awareness of it had emerged during a cross-country flight. Enersen said that he had had a similar awakening and later sent me the notes he had written after his experiences and a description of a personal meditation exercise based on the Overview Effect that he had developed.

Enersen’s notes from his cross-country flight reveal an experience much like my own.

In the “supernatural” look at our life and our Earth, one of the greatest feelings we can get is to fly on a commercial jet plane. The view in the window is to look at perennial clear skies — always so at the horizon level and above, regardless of what may be happening below…

We are able to view from the “upper level” of the world beneath us in the more true perspective than when on land, which is merely our customary lower level. Neither is this the “higher” level, which the astronauts see during orbit, or farther away during moon travel.

This “commercial upper level” is the one we can relate to most easily because it is not too high to lose our *normal* perspective, yet it’s high enough to regain proper perspective about “our land of toil” in relation to the universe.

Enersen has found that he is better able to help clients make bolder plans and take more confident action on a range of practical subjects having nothing to do with space as a result of acting from a higher-level perspective shift.

These examples suggest that while it is not possible to fully replicate the Overview Effect without going into space, **similar experiences are available to us all**. They can then be used as foundations for personal growth and transformation. That idea is being [end page 72] taken up in various quarters. In California, for example, a group is working on several space habitation projects, including a theme park that will provide visitors with a version of the spaceflight experience.

## AFF – Epistemology Focus Bad

### Policy change is necessary to alleviate real and on-going suffering. Abstract claims of “epistemology” and “ontology” and non-impacts like “technological rationality” are ivory-tower constructions that condemn millions to death

Jarvis 00 (Darryl, Senior Lecturer in International Relations – University of Sydney, International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism, p. 128-130)

Questions of Relevance, Rhetoric, Fiction, and Irrationalism While Ashley's rhetoric serves to effect a number of political moves, it also helps conceal a series of blatant weaknesses implicit in his poststructural theory. The first of these we might identify as the rhetorical invention and reification of fictitious enemies, a mechanism that not only validates Ash­ley's project but gives it meaning. Frequently, for example, what Ashley purports to be attacking turns out to be a fictitious, or at best grossly exaggerated, entity. In his adoption of the "megahistorical unit, moder­nity," for example, Ashley presupposes an homogeneous, coherent phe­nomenon able to be studied—a suggestion most would find outrageous. As Tony Porter notes, "giving coherence to such a phenomenon requires doing violence to its diversity." Enlightenment thought can no more be reduced to a symmetric intellectual tradition or historical moment than can postmodernism." Indeed, emasculating such an intellectual potpourri of ideas whose only similarity is dissonance seems peculiar considering Ashley's persistent commitment to venerate difference and discursive practices. To suppose that liberalism, Marxism, conservatism, fascism, leninism, or assorted other -isms that fall under the modernist rubric are contiguous is as preposterous as conflating Derrida with Foucault, Lyotard, and Baudrillard. Yet the hubris of Ashley's entire poststructural theory rests on such simplification and not only with the concept of modernity. Positivism, realism, or technical rationality, for instance, are all reduced to overly simplistic caricatures, assumed ubiquitous, and dis­tilled into three or four rudimentary propositions that Ashley then sets about deconstructing. Technical rationality simply becomes nonreflexive problem-solving; positivism, a system of thought that divides subject from object and fact from value; while realism is reduced to the ontolog­ical presumption of the state-as-actor. While simplicity has unquestion­able heuristic value, crude reductionism for the sake of political opportunism is plainly defamatory. Rather than parsimonious theory, what Ashley delivers is a series of fictitious straw men, theoretically fabri­cated along with crude ontological and epistemological presumptions that render them congenitally deformed and thus susceptible to Ashley's poststructural interpretivism. In reality, of course, no such caricatures exist. Positivists, realists, and modernists alike are considerably more complex, divergent, and reflexive than Ashley would have us believe. In the case of realism, for example, Ashley conflates the writings of Kenneth Waltz, Robert Keohane, Stephen Krasner, Robert W. Tucker, George Modelski, Charles Kindleberger, and Robert Gilpin, disregarding the disparate set of professional and political perspectives that makes each one distinctive and debate among them fero­cious." However, it is on the basis of these exaggerated caricatures that Ashley's raison d'être for poststructural theory and political transformation ultimately rests. Perhaps more alarming though is the outright violence Ashley recom­mends in response to what at best seem trite, if not imagined, injustices. Inculpating modernity, positivism, technical rationality, or realism with violence, racism, war, and countless other crimes not only smacks of anthropomorphism but, as demonstrated by Ashley's torturous prose and reasoning, requires a dubious logic to make such connections in the first place. Are we really to believe that ethereal entities like positivism, mod­ernism, or realism emanate a "violence" that marginalizes dissidents? Indeed, where is this violence, repression, and marginalization? As self- professed dissidents supposedly exiled from the discipline, Ashley and Walker appear remarkably well integrated into the academy—vocal, pub­lished, and at the center of the Third Debate and the forefront of theo­retical research. Likewise, is Ashley seriously suggesting that, on the basis of this largely imagined violence, global transformation (perhaps even rev­olutionary violence) is a necessary, let alone desirable, response? Has the rationale for emancipation or the fight for justice been reduced to such vacuous revolutionary slogans as "Down with positivism and rationality"? The point is surely trite. Apart from members of the academy, who has heard of positivism and who for a moment imagines that they need to be emancipated from it, or from modernity, rationality, or realism for that matter? In an era of unprecedented change and turmoil, of new political and military configurations, of war in the Balkans and ethnic cleansing, is Ashley really suggesting that some of the greatest threats facing humankind or some of the great moments of history rest on such innocu­ous and largely unknown nonrealities like positivism and realism? These are imagined and fictitious enemies, theoretical fabrications that represent arcane, self-serving debates superfluous to the lives of most people and, arguably, to most issues of importance in international relations. More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflects our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating the­ory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in epistemological and ontological debate, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge." But to suppose that this is the only task of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of intellectual elitism and displays a certain contempt for those who search for guidance in their daily struggles as actors in international politics. What does Ashley's project, his deconstructive efforts, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, oppressed, and des­titute? How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the casualties of war, or the emigres of death squads? Does it in any way speak to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the policy and practice of international relations? On all these questions one must answer no. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to suppose that problem-solving technical theory is not necessary—or is in some way bad—is a contemptuous position that abrogates any hope of solving some of the nightmarish realities that millions confront daily. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, "So what?" To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this "debate toward [a] bottomless pit of epistemology and metaphysics" be judged pertinent, relevant, help­ful, or cogent to anyone other than those foolish enough to be scholasti­cally excited by abstract and recondite debate." Contrary to Ashley's assertions, then, a poststructural approach fails to empower the marginalized and, in fact, abandons them. Rather than ana­lyze the political economy of power, wealth, oppression, production, or international relations and render an intelligible understanding of these processes, Ashley succeeds in ostracizing those he portends to represent by delivering an obscure and highly convoluted discourse. If Ashley wishes to chastise structural realism for its abstractness and detachment, he must be prepared also to face similar criticism, especially when he so adamantly intends his work to address the real life plight of those who struggle at marginal places. If the relevance of Ashley's project is questionable, so too is its logic and cogency. First, we might ask to what extent the postmodern "empha­sis on the textual, constructed nature of the world" represents "an unwar­ranted extension of approaches appropriate for literature to other areas of human practice that are more constrained by an objective reality."" All theory is socially constructed and realities like the nation-state, domestic and international politics, regimes, or transnational agencies are obviously social fabrications. But to what extent is this observation of any real use? Just because we acknowledge that the state is a socially fabricated entity, or that the division between domestic and international society is arbitrar­ily inscribed does not make the reality of the state disappear or render invisible international politics. Whether socially constructed or objectively given, the argument over the ontological status of the state is of no par­ticular moment. Does this change our experience of the state or somehow diminish the political-economic-juridical-military functions of the state? To recognize that states are not naturally inscribed but dynamic entities continually in the process of being made and reimposed and are therefore culturally dissimilar, economically different, and politically atypical, while perspicacious to our historical and theoretical understanding of the state, in no way detracts from its reality, practices, and consequences. Similarly, few would object to Ashley's hermeneutic interpretivist understanding of the international sphere as an artificially inscribed demarcation. But, to paraphrase Holsti again, so what? This does not make its effects any less real, diminish its importance in our lives, or excuse us from paying serious attention to it. That international politics and states would not exist with­out subjectivities is a banal tautology. The point, surely, is to move beyond this and study these processes. Thus, while intellectually interesting, con­structivist theory is not an end point as Ashley seems to think, where we all throw up our hands and announce there are no foundations and all real­ity is an arbitrary social construction. Rather, it should be a means of rec­ognizing the structurated nature of our being and the reciprocity between subjects and structures through history. Ashley, however, seems not to want to do this, but only to deconstruct the state, international politics, and international theory on the basis that none of these is objectively given but fictitious entities that arise out of modernist practices of representa­tion. While an interesting theoretical enterprise, it is of no great conse­quence to the study of international politics. Indeed, structuration theory has long taken care of these ontological dilemmas that otherwise seem to preoccupy Ashley."

## AFF – V2L Focus Bad

### Their moral decision-making is evil

ISSAC 02—Professor of Political Science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale (Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

## AFF – Yes Truth

### Theoretical criticism doesn’t disprove our specific claims --- factual statements about space require technical expertise to disprove

Yudkowsky 6 (Eliezer, Research Fellow and Director – Singularity Institute for Artificial Intelligence, “Cognitive Biases Potentially Affecting Judgment of Global Risks”, Forthcoming in Global Catastrophic Risks, ed. Bostrum, 8-31, http://www.singinst.org/ourresearch/publications/cognitive-biases.pdf)

Every true idea which discomforts you will seem to match the pattern of at least one psychological error. Robert Pirsig said: "The world's biggest fool can say the sun is shining, but that doesn't make it dark out." If you believe someone is guilty of a psychological error, then demonstrate your competence by first demolishing their consequential factual errors. If there are no factual errors, then what matters the psychology? The temptation of psychology is that, knowing a little psychology, we can meddle in arguments where we have no technical expertise - instead sagely analyzing the psychology of the disputants. If someone wrote a novel about an asteroid strike destroying modern civilization, then someone might criticize that novel as extreme, dystopian, apocalyptic; symptomatic of the author's naive inability to deal with a complex technological society. We should recognize this as a literary criticism, not a scientific one; it is about good or bad novels, not good or bad hypotheses. To quantify the annual probability of an asteroid strike in real life, one must study astronomy and the historical record: no amount of literary criticism can put a number on it. Garreau (2005) seems to hold that a scenario of a mind slowly increasing in capability, is more mature and sophisticated than a scenario of extremely rapid intelligence increase. But that's a technical question, not a matter of taste; no amount of psychologizing can tell you the exact slope of that curve. It's harder to abuse heuristics and biases than psychoanalysis. Accusing someone of conjunction fallacy leads naturally into listing the specific details that you think are burdensome and drive down the joint probability. Even so, do not lose track of the real-world facts of primary interest; do not let the argument become about psychology. Despite all dangers and temptations, it is better to know about psychological biases than to not know. Otherwise we will walk directly into the whirling helicopter blades of life. But be very careful not to have too much fun accusing others of biases. That is the road that leads to becoming a sophisticated arguer - someone who, faced with any discomforting argument, finds at once a bias in it. The one whom you must watch above all is yourself. Jerry Cleaver said: "What does you in is not failure to apply some high-level, intricate, complicated technique. It's overlooking the basics. Not keeping your eye on the ball." Analyses should finally center on testable real-world assertions. Do not take your eye off the ball.

## AFF – No Error Replication

### ( ) Error-replication arg wrong – assumes Space

Ashworth ‘10

Stephen Ashworth is a long-standing Fellow of the British Interplanetary Society. He works in academic publishing in the Voltaire Foundation, part of Oxford University – Towards the Sociology of the Universe, part 1 – “A Review of Dickens and Ormrod, Cosmic Society – 18 December 2010 – http://www.astronist.demon.co.uk/space-age/essays/Sociology1.html

Similarly, the charge that space advocates are indulging in “escapism” is rich indeed, coming from authors who insinuate on every page that all the desperately difficult problems of world development, wealth distribution and security will magically disappear after the installation of “alternative forms of consciousness” and “popular control”. In reality, dreams of escaping into a socially just society which does not suffer from these problems are far more fantastic than the plans of would-be space colonists, which deal with the world as it is, not as an unattainable utopia. The word “fix” is another favourite in Cosmic Society. A “fix” is a botch-up job: a mere “sticking-plaster”, a temporary, unstable solution to some social or economic problem (p.49-78, 113). The impression created is that such a solution is of no value because it merely creates new problems which then have to be solved in their turn – an example given is that the use of satellites has given rise to dangerous space junk (p.66-67, 153-154). Here again, the use of a misleading word is being offered as a substitute for argument, because the argument by itself would be too weak for the authors’ polemical purpose, and would attract tiresome counter-arguments. Obviously, one would not necessarily expect technological solutions to social or economic problems to be permanent, if they were introduced during a period of rapid technological change such as the one we are living in now. A long-established spacefaring civilisation would clearly routinely clear up its space junk or avoid creating any in the first place, but in order for us to progress to that stage we first have to see the problem and experience sufficient motivation to work out a solution appropriate to our current institutional and technological level. Later on we may find that our solution, that “temporary fix”, breaks down, and will feel the need to move on to the next higher level of solution. But because our authors have no interest in the likely end-point of this iteration, they therefore have no patience with the painstaking, step by step, evolutionary means which are the only ones through which it can be approached, and so those means must be denigrated as a “fix”.

## AFF – A2: Biopower

### Democracy checks

**O’Kane, 1997** (“Modernity, the Holocaust, and politics”, Economy and Society, February, ebsco)

Chosen policies cannot be relegated to the position of immediate condition (Nazis in power) in the explanation of the Holocaust. Modern bureaucracy is not ‘intrinsically capable of genocidal action’ (Bauman 1989: 106). Centralized state coercion has no natural move to terror. In the explanation of modern genocides it is chosen policies which play the greatest part, whether in effecting bureaucratic secrecy, organizing forced labour, implementing a system of terror, harnessing science and technology or introducing extermination policies, as means and as ends. As Nazi Germany and Stalin’s USSR have shown, furthermore, those chosen policies of genocidal government turned away from and not towards modernity. The choosing of policies, however, is not independent of circumstances. An analysis of the history of each case plays an important part in explaining where and how genocidal governments come to power and analysis of political institutions and structures also helps towards an understanding of the factors which act as obstacles to modern genocide. But it is not just political factors which stand in the way of another Holocaust in modern society. Modern societies have not only pluralist democratic political systems but also economic pluralism where workers are free to change jobs and bargain wages and where independent firms, each with their own independent bureaucracies, exist in competition with state-controlled enterprises. In modern societies this economic pluralism both promotes and is served by the open scientific method. By ignoring competition and the capacity for people to move between organizations whether economic, political, scientific or social, Bauman overlooks crucial but also very ‘ordinary and common’ attributes of truly modern societies. It is these very ordinary and common attributes of modernity which stand in the way of modern genocides.

## AFF – A2: Patriarchy

### War is the root cause of patriarchal domination and call for women’s rights is used by the right to justify military intervention – Prefer our impacts

**AFP 04** (Agence France Presse, December 10, 2004, http://www.worldrevolution.org/news/article1702.htm)

Raped, treated as the sexual 'booty' of war or slain by indiscriminate bombings, women are too often the first victims of conflict, Amnesty International charged Wednesday in a report demanding legal redress. The London-based human rights group called for action by the International Criminal Court to halt oppressive violence against women. "Patterns of violence against women in conflict do not arise 'naturally' but are ordered, condoned or tolerated as a result of political calculations," its secretary general Irene Khan said in introducing the 120-page report on women in war. Not only are women "considered as the legitimate booty of victorious army," the report said, but "the use of rape as a weapon of war is perhaps the most notorious and brutal way in which conflicts impact on women." "Women's bodies, their sexuality and reproductive capacity are often used as a literal battleground," it said. Khan, the first women, the first Asian and the first Muslim to head Amnesty International, told AFP in an interview that "it's quite interesting to see that women rights have been used as justification for military intervention, in the cases of both Iraq (news - web sites) and Afghanistan (news - web sites)." But, she added, "on the ground the situation changes very little in favor of women ... In the case of Afghanistan we have seen no improvement. "Warlords are occupying parts of the territory and see women as commodities for trading, to settle land dispute. Abductions and forced marriages are about as bad, if not worse, than at any time in Afghan history. "Warlords are not being pulled out, they're not being prosecuted, they're not being investigated for the crimes that are openly committing." Even where women are not deliberately targetted, they are the main victims of so-called collatoral damage, whether caused by "precision" bombing or landmines, the report said. "In Iraq in 2003, US forces reportedly used more than 10,500 cluster munitions containing at least 1.8 million bomblets. An average failure rate of five percent would mean that about 90,000 unexploded munitions are now on Iraqi soil." The report urged the International Criminal Court to "pick up and prosecute one or two high-profile cases because that will send the message that violence against women cannot continue in such an impunity, which is the norm today." The court, headquartered in The Hague (news - web sites), began operating in July 2002 and is mandated to try genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes. Kahn acknowledged the way ahead would be tough, but said she hoped the report would generate pressure for change. Women and children make up 80 percent of the world's 40 million refugees, but they have no voice, and injustices go unpunished," she added. "If you take the example of the Korean women, the comfort women in Japan, who were used as sex slaves during the second world war, even now they're still battling for the recognition of their case," Khan said. The report detailed widespread rape in conflicts around the world, including the Darfur region of Sudan, Colombia, Nepal, Chechnya (news - web sites), India and, earlier this year, in the tiny Pacific territory of the Solomon Islands. Tens of thousands of women and young girls were raped during the conflicts sweeping the Democratic Republic of Congo (news - web sites). "Ten years on from the genocide in Rwanda, where violence against women was a central element of the strategy to eliminate a particular ethnic group, little or nothing seems to have been learned about how to prevent such horrors," the report said.