# Notes:

### AFF teams: Use the space aff k file (tech/science good, overview effect).

# Enchantment K – 1NC

### Space policy is a dream that enchants the unknown like science fiction. In reality, the narrative of the 1AC presents contempt for the human body on Earth in search for technological salvation

**BAILEY ‘5** (Lee Worth, is an associate professor of religion at Ithaca College, “The enchantments of technology”, p.144-146, MinR)

The argument between advocates of robotic space travel and human space travel turn **around symbolism, fantasy, and the enchantment of humans in space**. In 1961, Joseph Weisner of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology reported to President Kennedy that space travel could be done with much less expense and danger with robotic craft. But the worlds imagination was captured by the enchantment of humans roaring into space. Kennedy saw this public fascination and ignored Weisner s advice, shifting NASA's focus from machinery to heroic astronauts. Robert L. Park sees this as evidence that the space program s potential advances in technology and science were secondary props, mere background for the real motive—display of political power. John Glenn's first orbit around the earth in 1962 was a technospectacle that overshadowed the far more advanced robot Mariner 2, which quietly flew by Venus at the same time (Park 77). The significance of human space travel is **highly symbolic and political**, **for it feeds our dreams** of pushing the frontiers of progress, mastering technolo-gies of dominion, and reaching for the stars of transcendent wonder. Dreams of space travel and colonization are filled with wild denial and speculation. They **display contempt for the human body**, ignoring its need for its natural earthly environment. Some argue that enchantments with space travel are wish-fulfillment dreams, at best religious and at worst greedy and destructive (Midgely 191). A 2003 editorial in the Washington Post called the space station and shuttle "celestial turkeys." Daniel Creenberg charged that the space station is a technologically barren project unjustified by science, diverting billions of dollars for jobs to politically favored states. He found that the American public, rather indifferent to the space station, would actually prefer down-to-earth expenditures on health, education, and pollution control (Greenberg A27). Space travel is a highly illogical enactment of the explorer myth, a spectacular political football, it seems, more than a serious technological experiment. The space walks undertaken by astronauts building the space station are an example of the difficulty, expense, and danger of human space flight. The 285-pound pressurized suits used during airless, radiation-filled space walks are cumbersome and dangerous. One rip in the suit could be fatal, and 235 miles above Earth, the work is exhausting and life-threatening. Dark and light pass quickly, and temperatures seesaw between three hundred degrees above and 250 degrees below zero. A pair of fifty-five-foot tethers is all that prevents an astronaut from drifting away into a deadly void. Dizziness and confusion result from zero gravity (Cabbage A12). Why do we do it? Is it the sheer inventive adventure of technological experimentation? The boldness of conquering new frontiers? The display of technological prowess? Whatever **the motivations**, they **are not rational**. Space stations are not simply costly but neutral things, objects flying high above Earth, defying huge odds and dangers, weakening astronauts' bodies for a purely logical purpose. The doubtful value of such technology has made many scientists deeply skeptical about space stations. But the emotional at-tachment of industrial cultures to providing meaning and hope, the adventure of space travel, national prestige, technological display, and employment for space industries are concealed motives behind too much of the expense of space travel. Caught in the clutches of the romance of space travel, industrial cultures are seeking salvation though technological spectacles—salvation from the **metaphysics of a meaningless, empty space** populated with soulless objects and randomly evolved lifeforms. The absurdity of the foundations are distressing, and constant excitement and Utopian promises based on technologies are needed to keep pumping up the dreams of saving humanity from its own shaky presuppositions. The **denial of numerous failures and** the costly, **dangerous threats** of massive technological projects such as **space travel are a romantic quest for salvation through science and technology**, requiring, like nuclear power, the denial of numerous inconvenient failures. The space cowboy’s ritual displays are a reversion to magical thinking, wish-fulfillment, Utopian dreams, and blind enchantments to compensate for the vast, meaningless, nihilistic machine that our techno-worldview imagines in outer space.

### The epistemology rooted in the 1AC is fabricated: our fascination with space come not from science, but from our dreams. We blur the lines of reality and simulation, which desensitizes us to violence and destruction

**Ben-tov, PhD from Stanford, 95** (Sharona, MA from Boston University and taught at Stanford University, 1995, The artificial paradise: science fiction and American reality, google books, p. 4-5 ctc)

Umberto Eco writes in his satirical vein that “the American imagination demands the real thing, and, to attain it, must fabricate the absolute fake.” When we tour the mechanical jungles of Disneyland, he adds, “Disney land tells us that technology can give us more reality than nature can.” Eco’s epigrams sum up a national mode of thinking, in which technology constitutes a “more real” world. A typical American attitude is that scientific knowledge and technological power do not merely influence reality but, in fact, define reality. James William Gibson, a historian of the Vietnam War, observes that science and technology are seen to give the United States “a highly privileged position of knowledge,” a kind of epistemological monopoly. In the eyes of its military and governmental elite, “the United States knows more about ‘reality’ itself, reality being defined in terms of physical science.” Aspects of the Vietnam War that could not be measured in terms of technological sophistication, such as makeshift but effective guerilla tactics or relationships within Vietnamese culture, were consistently discounted and overlooked – literally un-realized. When employing technology means possessing reality, a helicopter represents “more reality” than a hand dug tunnel or a poem. More recently, a study of the Persian Gulf conflict reveals how war has come to be regarded as experimental science. A general of the U.S Air Force has called Operation Desert Shield the “greatest laboratory experiment for force structure that we’ve ever had.” This statement means that war is literally part of standard experimental procedure. Experience gained in wartime flows back into the ongoing research programs of defense contractors, such as McDonnell Douglas and General Dynamics, verifying hypotheses about their weapons’ performance and giving rise to follow-up projects. Real violence and devastation can be made invisible simply by redefining war in terms of scientific method: “The function of experimental verification is above all ‘to keep the program going.’” Televised images of weaponry and bombings bore much the same relation to the Gulf war as Star Wars to SDI’s cold war project. But Nintendo war goes one step further. The most realistic movie still takes place in a cinema and assumes a passive audience. Futuristic video games, however, require active participation and can be played on the same TV set that broadcasts the bombing of Baghdad. They blur the line between computer simulations that civilians use for fun and those that soldiers use for training, between simulated death and real death, peace and war, machinery and life. These distinctions are simply swallowed up in the drive to “keep the program (or the game) going.” In the public mind, and in the scientific development and deployment of machines, the American national mode of thinking replaces the real world with the “greater reality” of cutting-edge technology. Science fiction’s power as a mass dream derives from this mode of thinking and supports it. The genre is not just a source of images that gratify national pride in U.S technology; it also reproduces the ideologies that formed modern technology, and science fiction’s very structure engages the reader in reenacting those ideologies. (The moment of suspended disbelief when a reader accepts the images of interstellar travel is also a moment of implicit, conspiratorial belief in the ideology of progress and a host of accompanying assumptions, as we will see,) Attitudes toward nature and technology that underlie U.S industrialization continue to receive reinforcement from science fiction – even when the text is deliberately written to oppose such attitudes.

### Alt: Reject the 1AC’s enchantment of space. Only a radical break can delegitimize current modes of thought

Csicsery-Ronay, ’91, (“The SF of Theory: Baudrillard and Haraway”, Istvan Csicsery-Ronay, Jr., Science Fiction Studies, Vol. 18, No. 3, Science Fiction and Postmodernism (Nov., 1991), pp. 387-404) KDJ

The urge to hope and to take pleasure in the possibilities offered by technological rationalization is evident throughout "Manifesto." Haraway links the cyborg to the concept of utopia; the essay, she writes, is written "in the utopian tradition of imagining a world without gender, which is perhaps a world without genesis, but maybe also a world without end. The cyborg incarnation is outside salvation history" (66). "Salvation history," the totalizing mythology that legitimates the patriarchal, capitalist, heterosexist quest for reunion with a Mother Nature it was alienated from at The Origin, represents for Haraway the conceptual prison circumscribing all political language, including many of the languages of feminist resistance. Every name within the global taxonomy of historical patriarchy conjures up the same system of relations. **Only a truly radical break** with fundamental differences especially **within nature/culture and body/mind-can offer a way out**: Perhaps, ironically, we can learn from our fusions with animals and machines **how not to be Man**, the embodiment of Western logos. From the point of view of pleasure in these potent and taboo fusions, made inevitable by the social relations of science and technology, there might indeed be a feminist science. (92) "Manifesto, "then, is a form of utopian writing, a program based on imagining an alternative reality that can serve as a model for action in reality-and furthermore, action that seeks to realize the model, cognate with the way SF seeks to literalize the metaphors of science. First, neither the program nor the alternative vision is protected from chance and history by the aura of myth (i.e., they are subject to reality); and second, both the program and the alternative actually exist in the present (i.e., we are cyborgs and we are learning to take responsibility for it). Thus the title of the essay is a rich pun, like "utopia" itself: for the thing to be achieved is already "manifest," albeit in inchoate form.

# \*\*\*Alt\*\*\*

## Rejection Key (feminist version)

### The representations of US technology serving as a savior that brings us to Earthly Paradise create destruction, violence, and destroy value to life. The alternative is to reject the technological framing of the 1AC.

**Jesser**, PhD in American literature, **’97** (Nancy, Summer 1997, http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mqr/act2080.0036.321?rgn=main;view=fulltext, “Dreams Worth Watching? Science Fiction and the Futures of Feminism”, Michigan Quarterly Review, vol. XXXVI, no. 3, ctc)

Sharona Ben-Tov's The Artificial Paradise: Science Fiction and American Reality argues that a dose of science will only make us sicker. In her introduction, Ben-Tov explains both the genesis of her project and its limits. She began with the premise that science fiction "constituted a national mode of thinking in the United States and [that it] was a major part of the apparatus determining what America means, as a cultural identity and as a system of production." It is not surprising that, like Russ, viewing George Lucas's Star Wars trilogy drives Ben-Tov to critique and analyze American technological dream worlds, especially when images of the Gulf War bear an eerie resemblance to the fantasy battles of Luke Skywalker. Nor is it surprising that such an originary moment would produce a critique of science fiction as "not just a source of images that gratify national pride in U.S. technology (e.g., the Gulf War)," but as a reproduction of "the ideologies that formed modern technology." According to Ben-Tov "science fiction's very structure engages the reader in reenacting those ideologies. Attitudes toward nature and technology that underlie U.S. industrialization continue to receive reinforcement from science fiction—even when the text is deliberately written to oppose such attitudes."Though she says she is not out to "condemn" science fiction, the major thrust of Ben-Tov's argument is that it cannot help but reenact and reproduce violent and destructive ideologies. She states that science fiction is "necessary and beneficial . . . our imaginations sorely need the means to integrate our feelings and dreams with the systems that shape our daily lives." **She argues for a feminist surveillance**. Her job, as a feminist, is to "comprehend thoroughly" the mythological apparatus which informs these American fantasies, so **that they might be** "handled, or **dismantled**, effectively." Ben-Tov's most effective work in The Artificial Paradise is in her analysis of science fiction's role in the "disenchantment" of the world and in the replacement of "our sense of wonder in the presence of nature" with "man-made wonder"; through technological fantasies our experiential basis moves from rainforest to Disney rainforest. Implicitly, Ben-Tov argues that myths which invoke technological control over nature as a path to paradise need to be replaced with myths of nature that invoke magic and reinforce "our collective wish for a spiritual experience of nature," a desire that is currently competing with and losing to the "scientific undoing" of the nature myth. Her argument is that if our relations with nature are going to be mediated by culture and the myths it produces, feminists are best served by imagining a spiritual connection with nature (what she frequently refers to as "numinous nature"). Since, as Ben-Tov acknowledges, our interactions are always culturally mediated, why not choose a myth that allows us "real" wonder, not its "artificial" counterpart? What keeps us from doing this? We are wedded to humanist notions of subjectivity. In her analysis of an Asimov short story, Ben-Tov argues that our "fears" of blurring the boundaries between subject and object result in our resistance to our own desire for reunion with nature: "no matter how much we may hunger for the lost enchantment of the mother-world, the possibility of being reabsorbed into Mother Nature is terrifying. It threatens us with losing our human identity. The suggestion that nature has come back to life menaces the pure, detached, Cartesian subject, the human self so painfully born in the denial of the mother-world." Even in the hands of a feminist science fiction writer, because of science fiction's inherent "commitment" to ideologies of modern science and technology, the genre cannot break free. In her reading of Ursula K. Le Guin's "Vaster than Empires and More Slow" Ben-Tov concludes that "[a]lthough the story calls for a bond of empathy with the Other and with nature, it breaks its own promise." Through her subsequent, and often quite convincing, readings Ben-Tov demonstrates how frequently, and relentlessly, science fiction texts using stories and images with "man-made wonder" and "Cartesian mind-body dichotomy" participate in the "American flight from history toward paradise, a flight that ironically takes us farther and farther toward a world in which the technological system defines all values." She shows how reading fiction like Vonnegut's Slaughterhouse-Five "casts some light on the mind-set behind the American paradise machine. The drive to make artificial realities is akin to the voyeuristic withdrawal from feeling and action. The difference is that the heterocosm [Ben-Tov's term for imagined alternative worlds] maker ultimately aims to transform the world-as-given into a reality of images." Science fiction, as a fiction of re-invention, is always bent on an escape from the "real world"; therefore it cannot promote wonder and awe in the face of "numinous" nature.

## XT – Demythologizing Key

### Rejection is crucial to find the substitute mythologies

**FARRER ’87** (Claire, professor of anthropology at California State University in Chico, August, “On Parables, Questions, and Predictions,” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1499890>, p. 283-285, MinR)

In our quest for the stars, in our race to live out scenarios only recently **the province of science fiction writers**, we have practically de- ified Science and her handmaiden, Technology. We look to one or the other to solve each problem that confronts us whether in the space program or in crop yields, in communication or in management. **We expect Science and Technology to be ultimate authorities and arbitra- tors of social life**. Like it or not, we must realize that the Utopia prom- ised in the conquest of space may well have a backside to which we do not usually attend when caught up in the rhetoric of Pioneer or Ex- plorer, launch or re-entry. Is this promised space age, with its implicit Utopia Omega, a new or the latest frontier? Perhaps. Bacon, Galileo, Copernicus, and Verne each imagined aspects of what we daily read in our newspapers or hear and see, in vivid color spectacle, on the nightly news. Perhaps we should look to the contemporary imaginers to provide some of the an- swers, and the questions too, that were provided in an earlier age by the classical scientists, or by the political WASPS, as Stoeltje shows us. Perhaps we should seriously consider a concept of our planet as the arid Dune imagined and developed by Frank Herbert; he gives us an- swers in ingenious still suits that capture and re-cycle our own body moisture. Perhaps this is a harbinger of the new science we must de- velop, much as an earlier age looked to Verne and "invented" subma- rines. Have we, as Herbert and other science fiction writers suggest, **invested too much in Science and Technology** without a concomitant consideration of the quality of life we are building as **we race with abandon** toward our new unknown frontier? Let us play a mind game for a moment. We are approaching the space frontier envisioned by Williamson, Young, and Stoeltje. What do we see? Not what can be seen today but what we think we will see in a few years or decades? I see a colony tethered by an invisible umbilicus to Earth, at least in the early years. Think about it for a moment. It is a Buckminster- Fuller-encapsulated-world orbiting our own tiny planet. People, like you and me, work and live there. Maybe some are chemists, producing substances that can be grown more expeditiously and profitably in space than here on Earth. Both Stoeltje and Williamson call our atten- tion to the powerful impetus of the profit motive. Will capitalism move us outward to space? Some in the artificial orbiting colony may be mili- tary strategists, probing for the new enemy while reminding us that the old enemies are not far behind. Probably some are administrators, mechanics, bureaucrats, and specialists of various ilk. What are the people eating? How are they supplied? Let us assume they grow their vegetal resources through hydro- ponics or some equally magical means. Perhaps they have learned to take nourishment in tablet or powder form. Perhaps our present meals embedded in elaborate social rituals have disappeared, as curi- ous a relic of the past as dinosaur bones are today. No problem. We already have the start of this technology. But what do they do for meat? Maybe they are all vegetarians. Yet even most vegetarians eat animal by-products for protein: cheese and eggs still require animals. Well, maybe they all eat a lot of tofu. Now that is interesting to think about for a moment. How can one convince a species that has eaten meat, even in thefar reaches of pre- history, that it is no longer good, necessary, delicious, prudent? Enter the philosopher or maybe the social architect, the folklorist, or the symbologist. Our social specialist must construct for us a system whereby meat is a sign of decadence associated with pollution of the Earth, not to be consumed in the purity of Space. There! We have a new totem, let us call it Tofu, and a new taboo, Meat. That isn't too difficult. While Young asks us to pity the Indians and buffalo of outer space, I ask you to help me **find the substitutes**. We will **redefine our own mythology** to justify our actions, scattering the contemporary representatives of Indians and buffalo as we go. Each of us asks each of you to **engage in a thought experiment and concentrate on what we, as a space-race nation, are doing and how we are justifying it**. Pity the Indians of outer space, the buffalo, and those of us who are poised to make the same mistakes on this frontier as were made on the last one. Heed Stoeltje's warnings.

### De-mythologizing EuroAmerican vision of space is key: we should embrace the Shadow World, not fear it.

**FARRER ’87** (Claire, professor of anthropology at California State University in Chico, August, “On Parables, Questions, and Predictions,” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1499890>, p. 289-292, MinR)

Do you listen to the words of contemporary mystics? Do you hear them saying they can heal through the power of mind and conjoined spirits? Do you listen to the words of various medical practitioners who are telling us to imagine the cancer gone, or the blood pressure owered, and it will be? Bateson5 wrote of mind and nature being a necessary unity, bringing our EuroAmerican vision more in consonance with a Native American one. **If we but imagine it, it can be**. Our former Cartesian dualism is moving toward an isomorphism. But an isomorphism representing what reality? I suppose each of us, at least for the present time, tries to make sense of our new reality, of the rapid shifts in technology, and the promised concomitant products, by relying on what we already know, what we have already seen or experienced, what we have already read, what we have already been told to expect. For me that means both a EuroAmerican world-view and a Mescalero Apache one.6 My EuroAmerican heritage tells me to go out, explore, colonize, cross that new frontier, be a brave pioneer or an entrepreneur of the cosmos. And, truth be told, I would dearly love to be included on a shuttle crew or be the anthropologist/folklorist on a colonizing expe- dition. But at the same time, my recently learned Mescalero Apache perspective tells me the Creator, or Creation, ordered the cosmos, giving each of us a proper place. It is dangerous, in this view, **to move out of your appointed space-time**. Unless ... unless you are a person of Power; but then your proper place is out of everyday reality and within that of Power, Supernatural, Creator, and Creation. An Apache seeks that Power, if at all, through isolation and introspection; even when it is foisted on one through strength of family tradition, it must still be actively sought. For a mere human, playing with Power is dangerous in the extreme. One must learn and define one's relation- ship to Power, always acknowledging that a mere human will never truly control Power but only share in its manifestations for a while. A EuroAmerican seeks power through the **manipulation of technology, politics, money, and rhetoric**. When we go from Power removed to power over or from Power glimpsed and modestly shared to power wielded for our own ends, we dare to become one with, and challenge, the gods. Science and Technology have assisted us in our challenge but we have not kept pace in our beliefs, in our social relationships to others and to the created universe. Our Folklore and Mythology are running poor seconds in the relay of Science and Technol- ogy. Men of knowledge, Singers, among the Mescalero Apache tell of the Shadow World and the Real World.7 The Real World is the perma- nent world of Power, Creator, Creation, Wisdom. We live on this Earth in the Shadow World, this illusory space-time that, by its very nature, is transitory. We have no memory of the Real World from which we came and to which we shall return. No memory of it, unless, that is, we are infants or the very old: those who have recently made the crossing, or who are about to do so again, have insight into what most of us can only imagine. Some among us, Singers particularly but others of Power as well, can make the journey at will; but even they prepare very carefully indeed. They do not stay long in the realm of the Real World, for to do so is to risk being unable to return to the Shadow World with the essential messages on behavior, conduct, thought, or belief that are so vital to our Shadow World existence. But even the most powerful leave something of themselves here in the Shadow World as they tread the well-worn but implicitly dangerous path between the two. Leaving what one cherishes here insures a pull back into the Shadow World. **To stay in the tempting and tantalizing Real World when one's proper place is in the Shadow World is to challenge the authority of Creator, Creation, Power, and Wisdom.** The crossing chiasm8 can be invoked by some and is stumbled upon by oth- ers. But no proper Apache in possession of logic and sensibility plunges willy-nilly into the realm of the Real World nor, once there, stays for very long. Yet we Anglos, with rather astonishing regularity, not only seek that Real World but insist we can plot it mathematically and reach it through our reaching for the stars. Recently there was a play entitled, "Your Arm's Too Short To Box With God." Apaches say "Just so" and do not even look at the boxing gloves while we EuroAmericans continually try them on for size. We continue to try on the ideas of space travel and colonization; a com- fortable fit is gained by casting these ideas in terms of frontiers despite the danger of that image that Stoeltje so cogently demonstrates. We adjust the fabric of our own minds to wrap around the new concepts, the new frontier. Pity the Indians and buffalo of outer space? Indeed! But pity the Indian's adversary, too. We will continue to seek the challenges and puzzlements of space whether or not we persist in the frontier image. We will adjust our vision and perception to encompass new horizons. Like Science in my opening parable, we are seductively drawn to the enigma of the new and unexplored and, like her, we do not always like what we find after having arrived. Stoeltje tells us that "folklore ... thrives in a web of forces directly connected to the larger world as well as to the intimate relations of the family and the tribe"; her statement should also remind us that taking Science to space is certainly no more than half of what we need. Some luggage is also essential; it is to be hoped that the luggage will not be the same social baggage that was dragged to the western frontier. The processes that populated the American West with EuroAmericans are being invoked as justifications to populate, or at least map and fence, outer space. Her reminders that **metaphor and myth are not processes, but rather charts for and explanations** of, should also make us cog- nizant that sociopolitical forces have no qualms in invoking folklore as the underpinning of process. The **manipulation of folklore to justify what we will do anyway is an old procedure** among human beings; **its antiquity, however, does not necessarily mean that it is right and proper**.

# \*\*\*A2: Aff Arg\*\*\*

## FW – 2NC

### Representations and epistemology of space policy must be problematized before consequences. Their framework desensitizes us to violent sacrifice for space fantasy

**FARRER ’87** (Claire, professor of anthropology at California State University in Chico, August, “On Parables, Questions, and Predictions,” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1499890>, p. 285, MinR)

Williamson asks us to be chary of rushing headlong into the cosmos, implying that our imperfect natures lean toward the ill as well as to- ward the good. We already have a demonstration, in the Western Frontier so aptly painted by Stoeltje, of our cavalier attitude toward that which we perceive as being empty and unowned. Our launching of Pioneer 10 **into space is likened to a rite of passage**. If we accept this analogy, we are now in a state of liminality-between this existence we know and another yet to be charted. We have imagined it: we have our voluminous body of space and fantasy literature. We have films whose images delight and confound us, helping us learn to accept new conditions (weightlessness and cramped quarters, for example) while blithely ignoring the social and temporal ramifications of those new conditions. It is one thing to be part of a five-member crew for a few days and quite another to be a member of a five hundred person crew for a few years or decades. Almost daily scientists and technologists describe yet another as- pect of our world to come, while I still await the promise of the GE Word of the Future I can remember seeing from a stroller at the 1939 New York World's Fair. We do possess fertile imaginations. We are poised on the brink of becoming-but becoming ... who knows what? The rite of passage is nonetheless a comforting image, even in the midst of the liminal, because we know, from being participants in this world and one of its cultures, that there is reincorporation at the other end of the passage. But what reincorporation can we look forward to in this Pioneer and Shuttle liminality? **Our stories influence our science which influences stories**, and so it continues, round and round. Jules Verne gave us all but the actual blueprints for submarines; George Orwell and Aldous Huxley pre- pared us for big government, doublespeak, and censorship (always for our own good, of course). As a result, I knew how to interpret what newscasters spoke of as "replacements" from Camp LeJeune for the 200 and more Marines who were killed as a result of the terrorists' suicide-attack in Beirut, Lebanon, before we made a strategic with- drawal. Replacements indeed! Is human life so unimportant that we can "replace" it, slotting in one person for another? Doesn't **this mentality lead us inevitably to see ourselves as replacements for whomever or whatever we may encounter in our race for the stars**? **There is real danger in these words** and the actions they empower. Perhaps instead we will have the good sense to listen carefully to what Native America is trying to tell us: that words have power; that speaking is tantamount to doing; that imagining can be equated with happening; that actions here have consequences there. Instead we make the potential **horrors of space acceptable through** the repetition of horror stories. A few years ago, news reports carried stories of Soviet cosmonauts having trouble with their fuel and rocket firing system such that their eventual return was in jeopardy. Stranded in orbit-surely this is purgatory and hell beyond the bounds of Dante's imagination, yet we already know the plot well. Are such Robinson Crusoes to be the martyrs of our new age? Is being stranded in space part of our developing folklore of what is to come? Will we make heroes of those who sip cyanide or inject themselves to escape the inescapable? We certainly make heroes and heroines of those who die tragically, as we did recently with the Challenger crew of seven. But we joked about the tragedy as well. Now we have a scenario so we may play the appropriate roles the next time we are called upon to witness (in endless replay) the fiery destruction of spacecraft. The media stressed the tragedy of losing a civilian teacher in what is termed the Challenger disaster; but most people to whom I spoke, or who I heard speaking of the event, expressed sorrow at each death- whether of a civilian, military, or government person. And in the same breath I would hear that any exploration leads to sacrifice on the part of some of the explorers. While the grief or horror is not lessened with each death, we nonetheless already have models of how to deal psychologically, emotionally, and in literary ways with such death. After all, we do have, and have had for centuries, the Icarus prototype to keep us mindful of the dangers of attempting to explore the imagi- nary.

### Method first: key to instrumental discussion of the plan

Bauerschmidt 07

(Frederick Christian, Ph.D. Duke University Graduate Program in Religion, Associate Director of Theology Loyola College, Major in Theology and Ethics, “The Politics of Disenchantment”, July 27, 2007, New Blackfriars Volume 82, Issue 965-966, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2001.tb01764.x/pdf>, IIN)

I beg the important question of whether it is helpful to speak of ‘‘modernity” at all.’ Certainly Weber presents us with no consistent theory of modernity, and uses the term “modem” in a variety of ways? Thus I will not address the question of “mysticism and modernity” but rather the narrower question of the relation of mysticism and disenchantment, while at the same time presuming that “disenchantment” is a powerful description of whatever this thing is that we call Being Modern, Being Disenchanted Weber claims that human history, at least in the West, has been the story of the progressive rationalization of life. Yet exactly what this claim amounts to is unclear since rationalization itself is a complex notion in Weber, divided as it is into value-rationality, which is concerned with ends, and instrumental-rationality, which is concerned with means: Value- rationalization might encompass the supplanting of custom or mores (sittlichkeit) by rationally derived ethical values (rnoralitiit), as in the moral philosophy of Kant. But it might also include something like Plato’s positing of the realm of the forms, for, according to Weber, value- rationalization involves “an increasing theoretical mastery of reality by means of increasingly precise and abstract concept^.''^ Instrumental- rationality, on the other hand, has to do with the development of methodical procedures for obtaining a goal, and thus can encompass everything from magical spells to utilitarian moral calculus to strategic business (or military) planning? For instrumental-rationality what counts is not the end that is sought but “**the methodological attainment of a definitely given and practical end by means of an increasingly precise calculation of adequate means.’**”

### Pure politics kills our ability to re-enchant the world – only leads to more violence

Bauerschmidt 07

(Frederick Christian, Ph.D. Duke University Graduate Program in Religion, Associate Director of Theology Loyola College, Major in Theology and Ethics, “The Politics of Disenchantment”, July 27, 2007, New Blackfriars Volume 82, Issue 965-966, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2001.tb01764.x/pdf>, IIN)

But where has the spirit fled? It has not simply been eradicated, because Weber’s narration of the process of rationalization turns out to be a dialectical one in which the history of the rational is chiefly registered as its overcoming of its antithesis through the “routinization of by “charisma” Weber means “a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional power or qualities.” Charisma is “specifically irrational in the sense of being foreign to all rules.” This means that it exists only in stutunuscendi; the teaching of a charismatic figure is not sustainable beyond his or her immediate, personal presence and thus always requires for its perpetuation subsequent rational regulation.= Thus one might say that the transmission of charismatic teaching i s parasitic upon rational routinization. On the other hand, there is a sense in which rationality is parasitic upon charisma, in that it finds its genesis in the overcoming of charisma through routinization. Charisma functions for Weber as a kind of safety-valve-a permanent possibility that sustains the hope that the bureaucratic state will not attain complete hegemony and that history will be constantly renewed through new infusions of charisma. Thus, Weber presents a vision in which the modern world has increasingly rid itself of the traces of its charismatic source in sectarian Protestantism and as a result has become spiritless and impersonal: Ge s e l l s chj i has replaced Gemeinschft, the state has replaced the polis. In the face of this, “religion has been shifted into the realm of the irrational”25 and thus into the realm of the apolitical. In the modern world, “[he who seeks the salvation of the soul, of his own and of others, should not seek it along the avenue of politics, for the quite different tasks of politics can only be solved by violence.” The public realm is now construed as the realm of constraint by violence, and religion has retreated to its origin in charismatic individuality. Mysticism is the example par excellence of charismatic individualism that can exist at a total remove from the “pragma of violence which no political action can escape.”” Weber writes: The unity of the primitive image of the world, in which everything was concrete magic, has tended to split into rationalistic cognition and mastery of nature, on the one hand, and into “mystic” experiences, on the other. The inexpressible contents of such experiences remains the only possible “beyond,” added to the mechanism of a world robbed of gods Where this conclusion has been drawn without any residue, the individual can pursue his quest for salvation only as an individual.”

### Method key to new politics

Wetzel, PhD. Philosophy The City University of New York, ’10 (Dominic, 2010, “Re-Enchanting the World: Religion, Desire and the Crisis of Modernity”, Sociology 2010, <http://ezproxy.msu.edu.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/763608053?accountid=12598>, Proquest, IIN)

Harvey Cox, in The Secular City: A celebration of its liberties and an invitation to its discipline, written in 1965, hugely influential with over a million copies sold, argued that the twin processes of urbanization and secularization, led by the forces of modern science and technology, had essentially created a „new man‟ whose needs could now be fully met by what science and technology had to offer. He categorizes religious and metaphysical thought as pertaining to the previous, less developed space-time of the town, themselves only partial advances over the „magical‟ space-time of country life. „Urban man,‟ on the other hand, is „rational‟, and has moved to a more developed phase of „disenchantment‟ with nature, which religious and „metaphysical‟ man (he equates the two) is still in thrall to. Dispelling the critics of modernization at the time who argued that, rather than liberating man, the one-dimensionality of the time resulted in a stunted „man‟ shut off from larger metaphysical and existential questions, Cox instead argues that this „urban man‟ has moved past these questions into a more fully realized post- millennial (ie kingdom-of-God-on-earth) city. This work epitomizes the wrestling with the two central processes of modernization - secularization and urbanization - that were happening in American and European society after World War II. Instead of viewing these processes as an “assault” on religion as many theologians and religious believers viewed at the time, he argued that these processes should be viewed instead as enabling a new freedom and embraced rather than lamented. They should be viewed as a new challenge to religion to fit itself within the new conditions and find its new role in aiding man in developing this modern version of the “city of god”. Secularization - the relegation of religion to the private sphere – and urbanization – the process facilitating this - should be embraced and celebrated. Written by a sociologically-oriented theologian himself, this popular work came to be viewed as a seminal work in secularization theory that represented a consensus that, for better or worse, secularization in the modern world was inevitable and here to stay.

### Science fiction shapes our view of reality

Kirby 3 (David A. Kirby, NSF Postdoctoral Fellow in Cornell University's Department of Science, “Social Studies of Science”, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Apr., 2003), pp. 231-268, http://www.jstor.org.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/stable/pdfplus/3183078.pdf?acceptTC=true)

Reasons for the lack of research on fictional media's impact on scientific epistemology are unclear. It would not be surprising to media scholars that fictional media can have an impact on scientific epistemology, especially since those who focus on visually oriented popular culture, such as fictional films and television shows, have established the impact of fictional media on other areas of epistemology.4 Social studies of science have shown that science as a knowledge-producing activity should not be exempt from influences that have been shown to impact other areas of knowledge production. Likewise, it should be evident that fictional media can have an impact on science, given that previous studies of scientific activity reveal the powerful role images and representation have played in scientific practice.5 For example, Michael Lynch (1990) illustrates the power of images in his study of visual displays and 'mathematization' in technical publications, especially with regard to images transformed into diagrams or models. Lynch (1990: 154) reminds us to 'recall that visual documents are used at all stages of scientific research'. Historians of science have also called attention to the persuasive capability of images and their role in the construction of scientific facts. Michael Dennis (1989), for instance, discusses the use of images for science communication in Robert Hooke's Micrographia (1665). Dennis (1989: 337, original emphasis) argues that for Hooke scientific representation 'worked as an interpretive method through the claim that there was no processing of the object, only a re-presentation[s ic] of the thing itself'. Ultimately, what these sociological and historical works illustrate is that all scientific representations are considered 're-presentations' of nature that provide rhetorical power for scientific claims, and thus, representation plays a significant role in the construction of scientific facts. Given the importance of representation in science, it should not surprise scholars of science and technology studies that highly visual and rhetorically persuasive media, such as fictional films and television, can be a factor in scientific epistemology. This potential impact becomes more apparent when we take into account additional elements that increase visually based media's capability to 're-present' nature and enhance their rhetorical power, including an aural component, highly advanced representational technologies (i.e. special effects), a complex system of signification, and a narrative framework designed to highlight the representation's 'reality' and to make opaque its construction.6 These additional components are especially strong in fictional media. The goal of this essay, then, is to explore the ways in which fictional media impact scientific practice.

## A2: Cede the political/FW

### Turn: the aff has fallen into the irrationality of apolitical emotionalism. We are the new political

Bauerschmidt 07

(Frederick Christian, Ph.D. Duke University Graduate Program in Religion, Associate Director of Theology Loyola College, Major in Theology and Ethics, “The Politics of Disenchantment”, July 27, 2007, New Blackfriars Volume 82, Issue 965-966, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2001.tb01764.x/pdf>, IIN)

Similarly, in Economy and Society, Weber identifies “mysticism and an acosmistic ethic of absolute goodness” as one of the chief forms of an “increased tendency toward flight into the irrationalities of apolitical emotionalism.”2g Mysticism is safe from the kind of transformation that ascetic Protestantism underwent, and in fact Weber sees mysticism and asceticism as fundamentally opposed (ideal) types of religion.3 Weber takes mysticism to be a distinctive type of experience: “that subjective condition which may be enjoyed as the possession of, or mystical union (unio mystica) with, the divine. ” ~ ’ Whereas the inner-worldly asceticism of Calvinism is rational in its essence, “[tlhe religious experience as such is of course irrational, like every experience. ’ ’ ~ ~ Weber recognizes that mysticism is often associated with certain ascetical practices, but while true asceticism values the rational ordering of life as a godly end in itself, in mysticism “rationalization is only an instrument for attaining the goal of contemplation and is of an essentially negative type, consisting in the avoidance of interruptions caused by nature and the social milieu.” With its negative valuation of rational order, mysticism seems to provide an invulnerable refuge for the spirit.

### Can’t separate the K from policy. The aff’s politics are meaningless

Bauerschmidt 07

(Frederick Christian, Ph.D. Duke University Graduate Program in Religion, Associate Director of Theology Loyola College, Major in Theology and Ethics, “The Politics of Disenchantment”, July 27, 2007, New Blackfriars Volume 82, Issue 965-966, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2001.tb01764.x/pdf>, IIN)

On the other hand, as indicated above, Weber most often saw mysticism as simply a reaction to the disenchantment of modem life-a retreat into the “irrationalities of apolitical emotionalism”-and thus not a viable option for those whose vocation was to the intellectual integrity demanded by the modern world. It was more a pathology of modernity than any kind of realistic alternative for one’s life. However, it was a pathology with which both society and the individual could live, provided it was managed with the right therapies. One might well be a mystic and a politician, so long as each identity was kept within its proper sphere. In Weber’s own life, whatever tendencies toward mysticism and acosmic brotherhood that he might have had were kept firmly in the private sphere; his own politics were conservative and nationalistic.” In the end, Weber’s presentation of “mysticism”-understood as a radically apolitical faith grounded in the charismatic individual’s private experience-as the only viable religious option in the face of the world’s disenchantment serves to define its antithesis-politics-as the sphere of coercion through the rational administration of violence. Just as the Orientalist images of the East tell us more about Europe than they do about Asia, so Weber’s understanding of mysticism tells us more about his understanding of politics than they do anything else. The construction of mysticism as the “other” of politics shows us the simultaneous construction of politics as the spiritless management of force.

## A2: Perm – 2NC

### Our search to reunite the mystical and political disenchants the world making state-sponsored violence inevitable

Bauerschmidt 07

(Frederick Christian, Ph.D. Duke University Graduate Program in Religion, Associate Director of Theology Loyola College, Major in Theology and Ethics, “The Politics of Disenchantment”, July 27, 2007, New Blackfriars Volume 82, Issue 965-966, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2001.tb01764.x/pdf>, IIN)

What is it that makes us “modern”?’ When we think of ourselves as “modern people” -and thus distinguished from medieval or ancient or primitive peoples what are we in fact saying about ourselves? I wish to explore the suggestion of Max Weber that an important element in our being denizens of modernity is the “disenchantment” of our world. Further, I wish to explore some of the connections between Weber’s notion of disenchantment and his understanding of mysticism as a response to this disenchantment, in order to argue that the relegation of religion to “the mystical” is not so much a response to disenchantment as it is the condition for the very possibility of disenchantment. In Weber’s sociology, mysticism becomes the irrational “other” of the rational, bureaucratic use of coercive force that we, in our disenchanted world, call “politics.” In his work we can see clearly a process whereby the categories of the mystical and the political mutually create each other in such a way that mysticism-a private and irrational religious experience--becomes the only viable future for religion, and politics-the rational administration of territory through violence-becomes statecraft. In this respect, Weber seems a paradigmatic modem interpreter of religion and politics, one whose interpretive categories continue to shape our discourse. Finally, I will argue that the power of Weber’s story of disenchantment can be seen in current political and liberation theologies, even when they explicitly seek to reunite the “mystical“ and the “political.”

### The aff celebrates a gendered approach to solve. Reinforces hostile gender relations which implicates our relationship from science and nature

**Ben-tov, PhD from Stanford, 95** (Sharona, MA from Boston University and taught at Stanford University, 1995, Google Books: The artificial paradise: science fiction and American reality, pages 10-11, ctc)

Feminist theory is essential for understanding the dream of nature in science ﬁction—what it is and what it has to do with science. Feminist historians and philosophers of science explore how the Scientific Revolution changed the Western perception of nature from that of an animate, semidivine mother to inert, dead matter. Carolyn Merchant discusses how Francis Bacon, the earliest technological utopian, celebrates man's ability to appropriate nature's creative power. Expanding on the notion of appropriation, I show that utopia and science ﬁction appropriate the qualities of the nature myth, enacting at the literary level what science and industry were effecting in actuality. Evelyn Fox Keller's work, dealing with values that were accepted and rejected during the formation of the scientific method, provides an explanatory background for the hostile attitude toward nature that pervades science fiction's mythology. Feminist analysis shows that scientific writing, from its earliest beginnings, relies on a strong metaphoric use of woman and sexual power relations. By examining metaphors of femininity and masculinity, feminist philosophers criticize the gender politics of the relationship between science and nature. I use this critique to interpret science fiction's metaphors, especially to show science fiction's construction of alienated nature—nature that is inevitably both female and monstrous. Finally, departing from the consensus of feminist writers on science ﬁction, I argue that feminist science ﬁction really cannot change science fiction's ideological structure or its construction of an alienated feminine nature. What feminist science ﬁction does, if read carefully, is to display key differences in the way that the feminine gendered subject. “Mother Nature's daughter." fits into the ideological framework designed by and for "Mother Nature's sons.” The question at the heart of feminist science ﬁction seems to be something like: "If nature is feminine and human is technologically capable masculine, then how do I qualify to run this spaceship?" Without intending to, feminist science ﬁction tells a story about women's relationship to nature and to technology. The feminist version of alienated nature shows women's struggle with the cultural identification of woman-as-nature and the painful psychological effort to create a sense of female selfhood compatible with women’s use of technological power. It is my view that the cultural fears and anxieties present in science fiction’s mass dream could be assuaged and resolved if a feminist science – such as Sandra Harding, Evelyn Fox Keller, and Donna Haraway envisage – were to become established. At many points throughout this book, at which science fiction seems to indicate problems in Western cultural psychology and the manifestations of those problems in our science and technology, I have suggested how feminist science may offer solutions.

## A2: Falsifiability/Truths – 2NC

### No truth in their claims: we ignore actual science in our pursuit of space mythology

**FARRER ’87** (Claire, professor of anthropology at California State University in Chico, August, “On Parables, Questions, and Predictions,” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1499890>, p. 287-288, MinR)

Our literature, even that produced by scientists, has warned us of such events, directly and indirectly. We have been told **all is not as it seems**; **we cannot trust science to give us facile answers**, as some of us would prefer. The relativistic physics mentioned by Young has been around since the very early years of this century, but only recently have lay people become familiar with its non-mechanistic principles. The Dancing Wu Li Masters,2 The Tao of Physics,3 as well as The New Back- ground of Science,4 all tell us a story different from what we have grown to expect from scientists. They tell us of the unpredictability of high en- ergy physics, of field theories, of quantum mechanics, of people's in- terference with experiments simply by being and observing. They tell us that the most regular is based upon chaos-perhaps with an order but perhaps not. They tell us of the transience of our most cherished axioms. Heady stuff indeed, so heady that we try to ignore it, continu- ing to build our models on what Heisenberg demonstrated (see, for example, Capra, Jeans, or Zukov) eighty years ago to be simple belief rather than intractable science. **Once we empower a model, a theory, a belief, or a story, we persist in acting it through despite mounds of evidence to the contrary**. We may have a false image of the frontier, know it is false, yet continue to act upon its premises as though they were true.

### We end up constructing truths to prove the ritual of technology is real

**BAILEY ‘5** (Lee Worth, is an associate professor of religion at Ithaca College, “The enchantments of technology”, p. 138, MinR)

Most importantly, however, the film illustrates that **space travel is a ritual**. Like the old western films of unreal mythic cowboys, space travel repeats archetypal themes of heroic domination with a new, more exotic technological setting in space. Such virtual reality is a hodgepodge of ancient myth and folklore with snazzy high-tech props, tricks of the cinematic trade. The ritual is needed to reaffirm the enchantment of space as the latest frontier and the hope for success at overcoming numerous difficult technical problems in a highly dangerous environment. The ceremony affirms belief in the validity of power struggles in space and the importance of space technology to overcome the enemy. The assumption that the paranoid power struggle demands extensive space technology as well as macho power trips totally neglects the question of preventing such dangers with sensible diplomacy. Space travel is more a symbolic assertion of political power than of technological urgency. Such fictions are **obviously not about objective facts**, but they portray the drama of technology as if it were possible. Nor are such stories merely subjective fantasies, since they are collective dreams and are **made to seem factually plausible** in some movie studio. Technological space operas like this inhabit the place prior to the subject/object dichotomy, where its distinctions are ignored to portray the fascinations of the technological dreamworld, made to seem real by the power of film technology. Like an old cowboy myth, human space travel is a ritualistic display of basic technopower.

### Their methodology of positivism is flawed and takes us away from reality

Gourdon 2 (Côme Carpentier de Gourdon, the Convener of the Editorial Board of the WORLD AFFAIRS JOURNAL, July-September 2002, World Affairs, Vol. 6, Number 3, <http://www.ciaonet.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/olj/wa/wa_jul02_goc01.html>)

Indeed our global village is in a state of intense moral confusion. Current religions and ideological systems are often perceived as having lost their relevance, if only because they are more frequently factors of strife rather than tools for building concord. In the last few years some momentous epistemic revelations have emerged to challenge and unsettle a few of the most cherished certainties on which modern civilisation was built. In this article we will describe briefly some of those harbingers of change which entail profound transformations in the mental and physical structures of the present globalised system, affecting virtually all areas of thinking and action by modifying the most basic notions we entertain about our beings, roles and destinies. Rather than repeating well known socio-political and economic statistics and assessments about the state of the planet and the fate of mankind, we will focus on the evolving scientific knowledge and on a few of its technological implications that are likely to shape the upcoming generations in one way or another. The double role of humans as keepers of an ageless spiritual and technical inheritance and as explorers of the infinite cosmos implies that we should try to weave the warp of traditional culture and the woof of scientific inquiry into a seamless texture, for all matter is ‘stuff’ whereas ‘reality’ is both a fabric and a text. Otherwise it looks as if the yarn of our evolution could unravel and the script of our evolutionary story disintegrate into meaninglessness. The need for a creative synthesis requires us to go beyond the familiar precepts of Cartesian dualistic methodology, just as mathematics and physics have had to grow respectively beyond Euclidian geometry and Newtonian mechanics in order to accommodate the advances made by Rheimann et Bolyai on the one hand and by the relativity and quantum theorists on the other. The evolution in our awareness of reality is so rapid and so profound that we have not yet built a coherent theory capable of taking all the new facts into account. While physics is gravitating every year closer to the elusive, long-sought unified field cosmological model, our epistemological structures are still largely shaped by concepts prevalent at the beginning of the twentieth century and are hence inconsistent with the sharpened vision of psychic and material reality that is forcing itself on us. As a result of the disconnection between insights and theories, the gap is widening between scientific knowledge as manifested in our budding technological abilities on the one end and our socio-political, cultural and economic institutions and practices on the other. Unsurprisingly our societies are evincing symptoms of schizophrenia, reflected in the increasingly frequent outbursts of individual and collective insanity and in the widespread signs of alienation that have become all too obvious and shocking.

### The aff’s idea of reality is oversimplified

**Durr 2** (Hans-Peter Dürr, Ph.D. in Physics, physicist, July-September 2002, World Affairs, Vol. 6, Number 3, <http://www.ciaonet.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/olj/wa/wa_jul02_goc01.html>)

As has happened so often in our history, we human beings fall into an old temptation: if we once succeed in grasping a little corner of the ‘truth’, then we take this corner for the one and only, whole truth. We regard all the affairs of the world only under this aspect of truth, and force whatever does not quite fit into this strait-jacket to come within this ‘truth’ with intelligence, cunning eloquence, and also with unconscious or conscious deception and coercion. This impulse arises not only from our stupidity and impatience, but also from the understandable and advantageous wish to reduce the impenetrable complexity of the world around us to something that is simpler and thus more easily perceivable and graspable for us. Thanks to these simplified conceptions of reality, and its intrinsic evolution, we succeed in alleviating the uncertainty of the future in many details, an uncertainty which we constantly feel as an existential threat, and indeed may have to experience and suffer as dramatic, painful, lethal reality at any moment. Indeed, it seems as if we might be able to improve and refine our primitive images of reality step by step until it finally allows us to eliminate all ‘uncertainty’. But we should realise, to always know exactly what awaits us in the future would be of almost no advantage to us. On the contrary: the one large, comprehensive uncertainty would be replaced by an even more depressing certainty of manifold failure, for which the certainty of a few scattered successes would hardly compensate us. However, the situation is altered fundamentally if, as many of us unquestionably believe, we humans really have the ability to act intentionally, and do not just imagine we do. Then we have in principle, by means of our knowledge and appropriate behaviour, the potential of avoiding the negative consequences predicted as being certain, and hence could increase our chances of survival substantially. In addition, we can attempt to force desirable consequences by deliberate manipulation of the world in which we live. Knowledge thus becomes an instrument of power, and gives rise to the hope, by progressive refinement, to sucessfully master, control, and finally ‘get a grip on’ the future in an ever greater degree. In many cases, although usually only for a short time, we appear to succeed in this. Power derives its strength from simpleness, from the bunching of forces, not from their differentiation. But power is also transitory because of this simplicity. The momentary success of the ‘search for truth’ deludes us into fundamentalism. The grain of truth is inappropriately taken as absolute. Today, science and technology in combination with economics represent such a fundamentalism in a certain sense. My article ‘Episteme in the Natural Sciences and our Experience of Reality’ (earlier presented as a lecture at the Austrian Academy of Sciences) seeks to face the question of how scientific insight and our scientifically-based knowledge relates to our most general and comprehensive experience of reality. The question is what can we really know? In considering it, a fundamental barrier to scientific knowledge will become visible: knowledge is limited in principle. This should not be evaluated as entirely negative. Knowledge is not everything. Limits to knowledge reopen areas that are only accessible to a believer; belief can mean more than temporary ignorance, more than a substitute in the absence of knowledge.

### Just in denial: their belief in falsifiability is the status quo

Wetzel, PhD. Philosophy The City University of New York, ’10 (Dominic, 2010, “Re-Enchanting the World: Religion, Desire and the Crisis of Modernity”, Sociology 2010, <http://ezproxy.msu.edu.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/763608053?accountid=12598>, Proquest, IIN)

Those who advocate piecemeal reforms, much less celebrate the “desecularization of the world” or the “blurring” of the sacred and the secular without stopping to examine thoroughly just what blurred forms are taking shape, or those who harangue about the need for the imposition of the empirical and evidence-based criteria of modern science are in denial, I would argue, about the current cultural “crisis” at hand. What is needed is a renewal of the radical Enlightenment, an attempt to re-think what it means to create and think, an “overcoming” of modern stagnance (what Nietzsche termed decadence) - the sense that “its all been done before,” - and move instead to a more Spinozian self- affirmation of being; to the production of new festivals; new forms of community 292 structures and communal being; new ethics of sexual freedom (Jakobsen and Pellegrini 2004); acceptance of our “animal” nature (Nietzsche 2000); a renewed somatic engagement with the “flesh of the world” (Merleau Ponty) and more ecologically sustainable infrastructures and economies; or face further productions of regressive, irrational social structures based on fear, resentment, radical dispossession and nihilism. One place to start in re-imagining such a radical Enlightenment, I argue, should involve a “spontaneous”, non-deterministic relation to the “cultural object” that makes up the huge upsweep in apocalyptic and charismatic religious movements, which seeks to discern their contradictions as well as the resistances of their “negative utopian” desire, towards the possibility of channeling it towards some more radically imagined direction.

## A2: Consequences First

### Modern science and technology, and the craving for the mystic disenchant the world making life meaningless

Wetzel, PhD. Philosophy The City University of New York, ’10 (Dominic, 2010, “Re-Enchanting the World: Religion, Desire and the Crisis of Modernity”, Sociology 2010, <http://ezproxy.msu.edu.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/763608053?accountid=12598>, Proquest, IIN)

The belief and desire for enchanted charismatic practices seems to indicate a strong discontent and disenchantment with the modern world. Husserl‟s insight in the Crisis of European Sciences (1970) that the idealization and abstraction of mathematics from the realm of the lifeworld, beginning with ancient geometry and increasing with Galileo and the development of the modern sciences and technology, has resulted in a sense of science's removal from and lack of consideration for the lifeworld and the embodied practices of everyday life. All is means with no consideration of ends, ie means becomes ends. Consequently, this “loss” of the lifeworld as mediated through the rationalized experience of modern science and technology – the “bureaucratic rationality” of the “totally administered society” is experienced as a painful sense of disorientation within the body politic. This sense of disconnection and disenchantment from a rationalized, idealized world helps, I think, partially to explain the attraction of charismatic practices. Practices that offer the chance to dispel or bracket the rationalized world and its frameworks of “meaning” (or “meaninglessness”), and engage in what feels like a more somatically connected and grounded approach – to health (healing masses), history (prophecy), truth (the bible), good and evil (angels, devils and exorcism), and ecstatic, somatic release (speaking in tongues, being “slayed” in the spirit). Yet, I believe, these practices ultimately do not succeed in attaining what they aim for, and in this regard I disagree with Harvey Cox‟s (1995) contention that they should be viewed as a legitimate, “authentic” experiences of “primal” or “primordial” spirituality. Given the biblical literalism that inspires the practices, it is hard to believe in their “authenticity,” without swallowing as well the rest of the theological perspective that comes with it, which, increasingly with the “third wave” of Pentecostalism, is driven neo-Calvinist 288 worldview of dominionist theory, shaking off “experiential” charismatic concerns or the traditional “separatism” of traditional dispensational fundamentalism for the pursuit of power and domination in the image of God on earth.

#  \*\*\*Link \*\*\*

## Link – Space

### Our idea of space exploration is rooted in a science fiction narrative, hindering our ability to make proper decisions about it.

Sheehan 07

(Michael, Sheehan graduated from Christian Brothers Academy in New Jersey in 1973 and the United States Military Academy (West Point) in 1977. Sheehan has a Master of Science in Foreign Service from the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service as well as one from the United States Army Command and General Staff College. Center of Law and Security, “The International Politics of Space”, pg 17-18, HH)

Agreed meanings emerge from a contested intellectual environment in which the interests of the antagonists are central in their attempt to define reality. The acquisition of knowledge itself ‘is a societal process, based on incentives, motives and interests of individuals in a natural and societal environment’. Thinking in these terms is important when trying to understand space politics. Decisions for and against space-related policies, and even decisions about whether to have such policies, are shaped by world views and beliefs about what space does, or might, represent. This can be seen in debates over whether to allow weapons to be placed in space, or what sort of regime should govern human activities on the moon. In this regard, post-structuralism would seem to have a particularly useful part to play in the analysis of the international politics of space. This is not simply due to its function as a critique of alternative conceptions such as realism. The critique of modernity by post-structuralism is therefore particularly appropriate in considering the various claims made on behalf of space exploration and utilisation, of deconstructing the processes by which certain ways of thinking about space emerged and became seen as valid, while others did not. It is in the world of ideas that post-structuralism provides the greatest purchase. Post-structuralism contests the idea of rationally derived, incontestable social or scientiﬁc truth. From a post-structuralist perspective, action takes place within a pre-existing structural and narrative framework. This structure in turn sets limits as to what is considered possible. At the functional level the postmodern world is an age of compressed space and time. Satellite technology and the looming menace of nuclear tipped long-range ballistic missiles have helped to produce a world where flows of information, capital and ideas are almost instantaneous, while trade, military power and populations move about the world at undreamt of speeds. Again, this is an area where post—structuralist approaches to the study of international relations are particularly relevant, as is the inside outside distinction between domestic and international politics, which plays out somewhat differently in the inside/outside issues of post-sovereignty represented by human activities beyond the Earth’s atmosphere. Gender theory is also an approach from which the study of space policy would beneﬁt, both in terms of including gender analysis as an approach and of making women’s experiences part of the subject matter. Women were strikingly absent from the early superpower space programmes, the ﬂight of Soviet cosmonaut Valentina Tereskova in 1963 being the exception that proved the rule, and only in recent years has the subject of women in space begun to be systematically analysed. The gendered nature of early astronaut selection is all the more striking given the public image of space exploration as representing the best of humanity, at the cutting edge of progress. It took 20 years before the ﬁrst female American astronaut followed her male compatriots into space, and a further 20 years elapsed before a female astronaut was commander on a space mission.“ In the dramatic era of the superpower space race, there were plenty of women who met most of the NASA selection criteria, and the US Air Force even initiated a programme to identify suitable female astronaut candidates. However, in December 1959 the programme was cancelled. Potential female astronauts were ‘the right stuff, the wrong sex’.“7 just as there are numerous international relations theories that can provide purchase on the international politics of space, there are also a number of different ways of conceptualising space that have been signiﬁcant since the 1950s. Space has typically been viewed in terms of three perspectives; as a sanctuary, as an environment and as a theatre of war. This is a useful way of thinking about space as a whole and in addition, the three categories have some intellectual correlation between IR approaches characteristic of poststructuralism, liberalism and realism. The exploration of space can be seen as being of value to all humanity, not only in terms of the technological advances required in order to be able to explore it, and the ‘spin off’ from such technologies to other aspects of desired progress, but also because unexplored space represents a dominion of unclaimed knowledge in itself.“ Since ancient times humans had wondered about the nature of space and looked to it as a source of explanation and prediction of terrestrial unknowns. Space in this sense is a value, ‘the final frontier’ a realm to be explored for the secrets it can slowly reveal to humanity.

## Link – Space Colonization

### Attempts at space colonization is actually a search for god-like cosmic powers

**BAILEY ‘5** (Lee Worth, is an associate professor of religion at Ithaca College, “The enchantments of technology”, p.139-140, MinR)

In 1977, the dream of human colonies in space was articulated by Gerard O'Neill in his book The High Frontier: Human Colonies in Space. O'Neill's plan is simultaneously Utopian and cynical. He proposes large rotating donut-shaped satellites that would create artificial gravity by their rotation. He paints Utopian pictures of a happy population enjoying an edenic garden of play (Ferris 124-49). But this dream naively imagines rapid solutions of numerous difficult problems, such as how to get the heavy materials up there. With absolutely no evidence, O'Neill explains that we could find cheap and abundant materials on the moon, asteroids, and planets, which assumes easy, cheap rocket transportation. The moon has oxygen, O'Neill fantasizes, and asteroids have carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen, and petrochemicals. He did not yet know that the moon is so dead that returning astronauts are 110 longer required to undergo decontamination to prevent bringing hostile microorganisms back- to earth. Plants would create oxygen also, he imagines, before the evidence from Biosphere 2, which showed a net loss of oxygen. He guessed that the first "Island One" would cost $98 billion and would sell electricity to earth, two other wild extrapolations since disproven by shrinking NASA budgets. Why build human space colonies in the first place? O'Neill argues that earth's growing population, energy, resource, and pollution crises will soon push the planet to its limits. This might stimulate more authoritarian governments to manage resources and fight wars over them. This is his cynical side, solved by his Utopian vision. Space colonies could provide new habitations for a crowded earth and increase human pleasures (62). More pleasure and freedoms—the sounds of Utopian dreams. He envisions these colonies to be in place around 2005 (17). That last guess illustrates his wildly triumphal expectations of our ability to solve big problems and ignores the massive costs and dangers. He is aware of some problems for his Utopia, however, such as the effect of zero-gravity on the human body: motion-sickness, loss of blood volume, drowsiness, depression, degeneration of bones, loss of bone marrow, and weakened muscles, including the heart. But he had no evidence that his circular space stations would actually create artificial gravity and not only dizziness and nausea. (Potential astronauts have to endure tests on a rotating machine they call the "vomit comet.") Perhaps these problems would even shorten life in space. They would make return to earth's gravity deadly unless corrected—walking would be difficult, he sees, and weak hearts would fail (46). Cosmic radiation and sun flares are another serious problem, and fires on board could be catastrophic (115-17). Worst of all. O'Neill's fascination with dreams of technological progress rejects a shift to a sustainable economics on earth, because he thinks it would have to be authoritarian. But he blithely ignores work on pollution cleanup, energy-use reduction, population control, and equitable wealth distribution as paths to preventing ecological crises. And why assume that social problems such as authoritarianism would be left behind on earth? **His science-fiction inspiration is obvious, and he imagines humans to have a godlike creative powers**, but he denies that his plan is Utopian: "I offer no Utopia" (61). Space colonies are "admittedly a technological fix, but humans are unlikely to change" (231). This blend of naive teclino-optimism. cynical fear, and refusal to work on earthly problems is a common set of enchantments among techno-fix enthusiasts. Their dreams have little to do with objective reality, nor are they simply subjective fantasies, since they are collective and age-old. Space colonies are a dreamv enchantment flying in the hvperspace of space cowboys, riding off into the sunset of the new frontier, leaving irritating real problems behind. O'Neill 's fantasies are **more about reaching for godlike cosmic powers** with technological dreams than they are about practical engineering and economics.

## Link – Space Weapons

### Turns the case: the Star Wars myth of space weapons will always fail while creating conflict

**BAILEY ‘5** (Lee Worth, is an associate professor of religion at Ithaca College, “The enchantments of technology”, p.146-147, MinR)

Hot on the heels of space station projects arc plans for blatantly aggressive weapons in space, destructive satellites, laser cannons, and satellite-destroying robots. Some nations have military tools in space, such as high-resolution reconnaissance satellites and the Global Positioning System (GPS). Both are available to the public to some degree, so other countries can share a system rather than attempting to destroy it, yet access can be denied to belligerent groups. Entire military systems depend on the GPS. The U.S. military is proceeding full-speed-ahead with research on visionary advanced space weapons systems. The National Missile Defense ("Star Wars") debate over an idea for a missile-shield, the cost of which was initially estimated at $8.3 billion, represents only the start of a larger category of space weapons on the drawing boards. The Pentagon is sponsoring several research centers with ideas such as kinetic energy rods that could be dropped from space mid penetrate a half-mile into the earth to hit a bunker, laser cannons that could melt key satellite or earth technologies, microsatcllitcs that could be programmed to bump a larger satellite out of commission, and microwave pulse devices to zap sensitive electronics (Hitt). The failure of projects such as the Star Wars missiles to work effectively does not inhibit the Pentagon, where such **setbacks are seen as indicators of the need for more research**. The argument that space wars would be like shooting a rifle from San Francisco to knock a baseball off the top of the Empire State Building does not deter these dreamers. The problem of cheap mylar balloons accompanying nuclear missiles as decoys is still an unanswered embarrassment. Exorbitant costs are seen as political challenges. The spaceplane that would fly up to low space orbits then drop down quickly again is another highly desired but struggling project. NASA's X-33 experiment with flying in space ended in failure. Such setbacks do not deter researchers such as Col. Doug Beason. who says. " Like any weaponry in a mature technological arsenal, it all depends on how much money you want to spend."' Beason calls the next revolution in military hardware "the Buck Rogers kind of thing'" (qtd. in Hitt). Clearly, military researchers and some politicians are convinced that "who-ever doesn't control space in the next conflict will lose." Senator Bob Smith says. " Space is our next manifest destiny'" (qtd. in Hitt). We are on the verge of the weaponization of space. If the warrior spirit prevails, the old cowboy enchantment with conquering the frontier **using the latest weapons will take a huge new costly and dangerous step.** However, **their development is not inevitable**. Passionate fears and drives for domination rather than seeking diplomatic solutions to conflict create these weapons. Such technologies come from below the subject/object divide, like a classic western-frontier cowboy show. They are important, expensive, and dangerous embodiments of earthlings' fears and passions for domination, ultimate control. spectacular display, power, and unrestrained frontier exploitation. Space stations and weapons are not simply objects "out there," built by subjective desires; **they are ritual displays of enchanted cosmological conquests**, new versions of technological "magic" in orbit.

### Specifically to weaponization, our cultural misunderstanding of space is the real drive for the extension of terrestrial weapons into space.

Sheehan 07

(Michael, Sheehan graduated from Christian Brothers Academy in New Jersey in 1973 and the United States Military Academy (West Point) in 1977. Sheehan has a Master of Science in Foreign Service from the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service as well as one from the United States Army Command and General Staff College. Center of Law and Security, “The International Politics of Space”, pg 17-18, HH)

How should we think about space? It makes a difference how we do, because although we as humans live in a physical universe, much of the ‘world’ we inhabit is intersubjectively constructed through our mutual understandings of what constitutes reality. We act in terms of our beliefs, values, theories and understandings of the ‘reality’ we perceive. It is also important to remember that the way in which such a consensus on understandings of reality is constructed is not an entirely innocent exercise. As Cox pointed out in relation to the production of theory, ‘theory is always for someone and for some purpose’.\* By ﬁrmly establishing a speciﬁc perception of outer space, a dominant narrative helps to shape a particular reality. We perceive outer' space in a particular way, as a particular kind of realm, in which certain types of activity are possible, even expected, while others are frowned upon or speciﬁcally forbidden. When there are alternative conceptions available, a particular visualisation is likely to favour the interests of some states more than others. In 1957 space was essentially a tabula mesa, a blank page on which humanity was free to write whatever it chose. But it brought with it pre-existing values and behaviour pattems. The major powers who ﬁrst entered outer space had policies and belief systems structured by the ‘lessons’ of previous decades, and particularly by the catastrophe of the Second World War and the bitter peace that came to be called the Cold War. In the decades that have followed, policy makers, scientists and advocates of space exploration have contested opposing understandings of the meaning and purpose of outer space for humanity. The image we have of the extra—terrestria1 realm ought to be such a contested terrain, for what we perceive space to be shapes our views of how it should be exploited, and this has very real implications for political, economic and environmental development on Earth. 6 Perceptions of space and International political theory it was only with the advent of the ﬁrst satellite that space became an ontological reality directly experienced by mankind. But even prior to that point it had never been truly a vacuum in terms of the way that it was perceived by humanity. Space was both an environment in which many possibilities it was only with the advent of the ﬁrst satellite that space became an ontological reality directly experienced by mankind. But even prior to that point it had never been truly a vacuum in terms of the way that it was perved E by humanity. Space was both an environment in which many possibilities could be imagined and a fruitful source of metaphorical meaning, such as freedom, opportunity and inﬁnite possibilities, and its multitude of possible interpretations included those that were ambiguous or incompatible.‘ For millennia humans had speculated about the nature of what lay beyond their world, and had habitually placed the realm of the gods that they worshipped in the dimension that lay out of sight above their heads. The night skies were a place of beauty and mystery, and these cultural understandings of space have played a part in maintaining resistance to certain developments in the use of space, most notably the extension of terrestrial weapons and warfare beyond Earth’s atmosphere. Such a development can be seen as threatening what the Dutch call vergankelijkbeid, the transitory nature of what is beautiful and magniﬁcent.‘ The desire to maintain space as a war-free sanctuary certainly existed immediately prior to the beginning of the space age. As early as 1952 the International Congress on Astronautics voted to ban its members from using astronautical research for military purposes.’ The idea of preserving certain geographical areas as demilitarised sanctuaries has a historical pedigree as old as the space age itself. An entire class of arms control agreements, the ‘non-armament treaties’ have been concluded over the past ﬁve decades, designed to ‘prevent military competition from being introduced into an area that had hitherto been free of such activity’.‘ This group of treaties includes the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, but the ﬁrst such agreement had come as early as 1959, with the Antarctic Treaty. All the agreements were based on the belief that it was both desirable and possible to maintain certain parts of the human environment as sanctuaries in terms of military activity. Advocates of space militarisation have been very aware of the power of these conceptualisations. One such advocate noted that the idea of preserving space as a sanctuary from militarisation is commonly held, and that ‘in using the term “sanctuary”, critics of the military use of space mean not only a place of refuge or asylum, but a sacred and holy place secure from the baser instincts of men. No wonder military programs such as Star Wars or antisatellite (ASAT) warfare have elicited such a strong reaction’? Even President Eisenhower’s science adviser felt that the launch of Sputnik l by the Soviet Union in 195 7 had stirred ‘atavistic, subtle emotions about cosmic mysteries’ and ‘an instinctive, human response to astronomical phenomena that transcend man’s natural lcen’.' The ambiguity and incompatibility of differing interpretations however lent itself to political exploitation. While the United States agreed with other states that space belonged ‘to all mankind’ for example, what it understood by this phase was no more than the celestial equivalent of the idea of the ‘freedom of the seas’,’ while other countries invested far greater philosophical and political meaning into the concept - and assumed that the United States did the same. The ambiguity and conﬂicting motivations that have historically surrounded space exploration mean that it is not always E the case that there is a single or simple explanation for particular space programmes or missions. In discussions of space policy, idealism and realism continue to clash. The debates remain potent, because apart from the brief American Apollo expeditions to the Moon between 1969 and 1972, human beings have remained locked in low-Earth orbit even a half century after the beginning of the space age. To date only 24 human beings have ever viewed their planet from the deep space beyond Earth orbit, and the difference in perspective between Earth orbit and deep space is tremendous.

## Link – Asteroids

### Our need for asteroid protection is based on science fiction

Mellor 7 (Felicity Mellor, Lecturer in Science Communication at Imperial College London, “Colliding Worlds: Asteroid Research and the Legitimization of War in Space, Social Studies of Science” 37: 499, 2007, http://sss.sagepub.com/content/37/4/499.full.pdf)

The size of asteroid posing the greatest threat was just one of several points of contention between the civilian and defence scientists. In their own histories of the impact threat, the civilian scientists repeatedly drew attention to these disagreements, rhetorically creating a distance between the two groups even as they worked together to promote the new conception of asteroids as a threat demanding a technological response. Clark Chapman (1998), for instance, reported that there were tensions over calls for a nuclear defence even as early as the Snowmass Workshop. He attributed the delay in publishing the report of the workshop to objections raised by planetary scientist George Wetherill, who was concerned that calls for the placing of nuclear explosives in space might destabilize US/Soviet relations. Similarly, astronomer Duncan Steel (1995: 234) recalled that the members of the Detection Committee had been ‘outraged’ by a paper presented at the San Juan Capistrano conference by Nicholas Colella, a Lawrence Livermore scientist who had called for the development of a multimilliondollar satellite-based detection system, and that Lowell Wood had been ‘roundly booed’ after criticizing NASA space missions in an afterdinner speech. Steel said that he found the Interception Workshop ‘very interesting and stimulating’, but that it was also ‘bizarre in that some of the presentations paid little regard to the laws of physics and less to any laws of economic reality’ (Steel, 1995: 232). According to Steel, some of the talks were ‘wildly in error’ and David Morrison had complained that the defence scientists lived in a ‘parallel universe’ and that they seemed to draw on science fiction rather than the laws of physics (Steel, 1995: 234–35). They did indeed draw on science fiction, but, as we will see, so too did the civilian scientists. The size of asteroid posing the greatest threat was just one of several points of contention between the civilian and defence scientists. In their own histories of the impact threat, the civilian scientists repeatedly drew attention to these disagreements, rhetorically creating a distance between the two groups even as they worked together to promote the new conception of asteroids as a threat demanding a technological response. Clark Chapman (1998), for instance, reported that there were tensions over calls for a nuclear defence even as early as the Snowmass Workshop. He attributed the delay in publishing the report of the workshop to objections raised by planetary scientist George Wetherill, who was concerned that calls for the placing of nuclear explosives in space might destabilize US/Soviet relations.

## Link – Capitalism

### Engaging in capitalism only increases the disenchantment

Bauerschmidt 07

(Frederick Christian, Ph.D. Duke University Graduate Program in Religion, Associate Director of Theology Loyola College, Major in Theology and Ethics, “The Politics of Disenchantment”, July 27, 2007, New Blackfriars Volume 82, Issue 965-966, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2001.tb01764.x/pdf>, IIN)

The exemplary inhabitant of this disenchanted world of means without meaning is the bureaucrat who fulfills his function competently and efficiently without inquiry into the ultimate meaning or purpose of his role. Thus Weber writes that in the modern world, the homo-politicus, as well as the homo-economicus, performs his duty best when he acts without regard to the person in question, sine ira et studio, without hate and without love, without personal predilection and therefore without grace, but sheerly in accordance with the impersonal duty impose by his calling, and not as a result of any concrete personal relationship. He discharges his responsibility best if he acts as closely as possible in accordance with the rational regulations of the modem power system.’ Or, as Weber says in his famous essay on “Politics as a Vocation” The honor of the civil servant is vested in his ability to execute conscientiously the order of the superior authorities, exactly as if the order agreed with his own convictions. This holds even if the order appears wrong to him and if, despite the civil servant’s remonstrance’s, the authority insists on the order. Without this moral discipline and self- denial, in the highest sense, the whole apparatus falls apart.” The bureaucrat is one who occupies himself with the rational efficiency of means, not the question of ends. Or rather, the bureaucrat is one who has segregated his manipulation of means and his concern for ends into separate “life spheres.”” In his personal relations he may be vitally concerned for the moral significance of his actions, but his public role (and the salary he receives for fulfilling that role) requires that he be concerned not with significance but with efficiency, not with ends but means. What is the arena, the “life sphere,” in which the bureaucrat enacts his role? It is the state or the market. Though Weber equivocates on this point, as he does on so many, the general tenor of his image of the iron cage implies that the modem bureaucratic state and the culture of rational capitalism have consumed the agora, so that one who takes up a public role must do this in the space define by modem politics and economics. This is important because for Weber both the state and the market are defined not by their ends (i.e., it is not the pursuit of a particular goal that makes a state a state or a market a market) but by their means. For my purposes I will bracket the important question of the market and its relationship to the state (i.e. of economy to society) and focus on the state. What then, we must ask, are the distinctive means that define the state? For Weber the answer is clear and simple: violence. In the definitions of basic sociological terms at the outset of Economy and Society Weber says that a ‘ruling organization’ will be called ‘political’ insofar as its existence and order is continuously safeguarded within a given territorial area by the threat and application of physical force on the part of the administrative staff.’’ More pointedly in “Politics as a Vocation” Weber says that “the state is a relation of men dominating men, a relation supported by means of legitimate (i.e. considered to be legitimate) violence.”2’ It is the state’s monopoly on physical force as a legitimate means that defines it. The bars of the iron cage turn out to be the threat of violence, or perhaps the allure of being the one who administers that violence.“ The bureaucrat, the new minister of the public realm, is the one who rationally-sine iru et studio-carries out this task. No wonder the world seems disenchanted.

## Link – Tech

### Tech is only science fiction: Our focus on tech imposes human control over the environment

**Ben-tov, PhD from Stanford, 95** (Sharona, MA from Boston University and taught at Stanford University, 1995, Google Books: The artificial paradise: science fiction and American reality, pages 8-10, ctc)

An old saw about science ﬁction complains that it is neither science nor ﬁction. Put another way, what does the genre have to do with science and with ﬁction? An interesting question lurks behind this one: Does the genre suggest that science and ﬁction have something to do with each other? To look at the literary and scientiﬁc contexts, I have combined two areas: one is American literary and cultural criticism. and the other, feminist philosophy and history of science. Science ﬁction belongs in the American context that Leo Marx has deﬁned: the conﬂict between pastoralism, the ideal of America as a vast garden, and the rhetoric of the technological sublime, which justified industrialism and technological expansion. Marx's classic study, The Machine in the Garden. shows that even as Americans chose industrialization over the agrarian ideal. we never gave up the fantasy of returning to the garden, despite its historical impossibility. American **attachment to the myth of the garden** has made hopefulness a national characteristic, expressed and sometimes deﬂated in our literature. Unlike the texts that Marx surveys, however, science ﬁction does not try to temper hopefulness with history. Instead. it tries to create immunity from history. It reveals a curious dynamic: the greater our yearning for a return to the garden, the more we invest in technology as the purveyor of the unconstrained existence that we associate with the garden. Science national mode of thinking boils down to a paradox: the American imagination seeks to replace nature with a technological, man-made world in order to return to the garden of American nature. (Kurt Vonnegufs Slaughterhouse-Five beautifully illustrates this paradox.) A related context for science ﬁction is the technological utopia. I have drawn on Howard Segal's admirable book, Technological Utopianism in American Culture, which places the technological utopia in the tradition of American thinking about the Machine. Not surprisingly, **science ﬁction and the technological utopia have much in common**. beginning with the fact that both are literary productions offering American visions of the machine. outside the canon of American literature. They both reflect the ideology of progress. They share similar assumptions about scientific rationality and technological expansion and much similar imagery. Marx's framework and the technological utopia provide science literary context in American culture. Finally. science ﬁction has to be understood in the context of the mythology of the American frontier. interpreting two major novels by way of the work of Richard Slotkin, Annette Kolodny, and Myra Jehlen, I have gone farther than is customary in articulating the relationships between nature, technology, and the frontier in science fiction. It is not enough to say that science ﬁction is like the western or is unlike it or is influenced by it. Science ﬁction combines frontier mythology with myths about collective technological power. It does so in an effort to define an American (white) identity, using the frontier myths to connect two aspects of American experience: the natural wilderness and the technological system. What is the connection between the frontiersman (I use the gendered term advisedly) and the scientist? How can we "civilize" the solitary frontiersman's violence into collective technological power over nature? How can we "naturalize” the technological system so that it becomes a second nature for Americans? These are the questions that place science ﬁction in the context of popular frontier mythology. Science ﬁction also reveals, in surprisingly vivid detail, that such mythic technological projects as spaceflight, immortality, and artificial reproduction are authentic American dreams.

## Link – Progress/Utopia

### Utopian desire foster destruction through science and technology, radical and more earthly ideals act as repository

Wetzel, PhD. Philosophy The City University of New York, ’10 (Dominic, 2010, “Re-Enchanting the World: Religion, Desire and the Crisis of Modernity”, Sociology 2010, <http://ezproxy.msu.edu.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/763608053?accountid=12598>, Proquest, IIN)

Paul Boyer, in When Time Shall Be No More (1992), in his study of the paradox of the history and remarkable resurgence of apocalyptic thought and its deterministic, literal understanding of the world, provides, I think, an important clue to its flowering. He argues that fundamentalist thought has thrived in the absence or retreat of the radical aims of progress associated with Enlightenment thought. With the absence of these aims, varieties of fundamentalism, with their strong claims, have filled the void – providing purpose and meaning for those without any. Or, one might say, the failure of the Enlightenment has “produced” varieties of fundamentalism, or that its adherents have “produced” it as a way to channel their “negative utopian desire” as a form of “bricolage” – making do with what is available. While a critique of the assumptions of inevitable progress have certainly been necessary, if not inevitable, given the aggrandized role and power of modern science and technology for destruction – clear in the 20th century‟s history of world wars, failed utopian communist regimes, the threat of nuclear destruction, and the mobilization of science and technology in creating an often conformist, standardized, bureaucratized world, dare we give up the belief and expectation in the possibility of progress, or the radical secular imagination, itself? (Blumenburg 1985) The growth of conservative, politicized religious movements with strong, rigid belief systems seems to be directly linked to the decline of progressive social movements offering competing ideals, 290 practices and community structures. For better or worse, I argue that the power of apocalyptic thinking is linked to the powerful potential of “transcendental” or “ascetic” ideals to inspire action, linked as it may be as well at the same time to other, more earthly realities such as guilt or masochism, as well as its role as a repository of anger and desire.

## Patriarchy Mod – 2NC

### The attempt to use technology in space to create immortality leads to the destruction of the female.

**Jesser**, PhD in American literature, **’97** (Nancy, Summer 1997, http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mqr/act2080.0036.321?rgn=main;view=fulltext, “Dreams Worth Watching? Science Fiction and the Futures of Feminism”, Michigan Quarterly Review, vol. XXXVI, no. 3, ctc)

According to Ben-Tov, Vonnegut is not writing science fiction. He presents "extreme" cases of the "mind-set behind American science fiction" in order to expose it. After using Vonnegut to reveal science fiction's dangers, Ben-Tov turns to what she calls "myths of the final frontier" in which American science fiction writers map outer space technologies. Ben-Tov's science is a "dream of limitlessness and a quest for immortality," and technology's gods in the form of cities, armies and space projects "transcend all natural limits, and are immortal by definition." Science fiction serves the final takeover of nature by "using metaphors that equate technological power with nature's generativity." It "persuades us that we can replace nature with our technological selves." Ben-Tov's book, as it moves to "comprehend" the functioning of the mythological apparati in the American imagination, makes clear the necessity for dream watching, especially for women and others who are deeply affected by the technological gaze. How can feminists intervene in this objectifying and death-dealing process? Some feminist critics and science fiction writers have suggested that women can disrupt and control science fiction so that it can be a tool for "reinventing" nature, to use Haraway's term. For Ben-Tov, such endeavors are usually broken promises. Most of her study repeatedly presents science fiction as a carrier, consciously or unconsciously, of a diseased attitude toward nature; it seems to offer little that is emancipatory. Her attitude toward both science fiction and American society is understandable within the context she proposes—a genre in which "the ideologies of early modern science are 'built into' the science fiction text through its use of the Earthly Paradise myth"—and at its built-in level the genre does not change. And so, science fiction continually adapts contemporary themes, whether they are feminist beliefs or speculations on gene research, to the older, invariant ideological structure. Ben-Tov clearly marks this appropriation of nature by constructing SF wonder as anti-woman and anti-feminist. She expresses, and she is not alone among feminists to do this, sadness that "our society lost the basis for transcendent experience by losing the relationship with numinous nature. The myth of nature is the magic that has gone out of modern life." In her analysis of each of these fictions, though they each have differing foci, she constructs a coherent picture of a popular imagination that seeks to control generative nature (and the female body that represents it). The relentless repetition of this desire is couched in psychological terms. At the root of these addictive and compulsive repetitions lie utopian desires, which Ben-Tov sees as desires to control and manipulate the world-as-given. Her reliance on some notion of a moment when our connection to nature as a mystery was possible, when transcendent experiences of a "numinous" nature were available to human beings, when shamans were the only scientists we had, might result in a defeated and despairing quietism or nostalgia. If the very stories science fiction writers attempt to shape in order to make sense of our current state of affairs can only serve to replicate that state of affairs, what can we do? For Ben-Tov, women's science fiction and its heroines are always conflicted, divided between a desire to be the Mother or the nature goddess (the objectified) or the master of technology (the subject). For her, it is the nature of science fiction, bound as it is to a logic of female differentiation, that condemns women, and women writers, to this harmful dichotomy. The bifurcation must resolve in either the character's worship and essentialization, or her participation in control and mastery. Ben-Tov and Haraway are both engaged in the spiral dance to disrupt global corporate capitalism and its sexist, racist apparati for social control. Haraway would rather be a cyborg, Ben-Tov would rather be a goddess. Haraway puts it like this: "The cyborg myth acknowledges our technicized natures, not to deny the modern world's technological character but, rather, to use it for feminist purposes. How is this possible?" For Ben-Tov it is clearly not possible. That is perhaps because she locates the technological within the modern, as though prior to Bacon, et al. there was no technology and humans had a relationship with nature which allowed us to really experience it, and along with it spiritual wonder and awe. Furthermore, even if such a time existed, how can we re-establish it here in America and everywhere under the umbrella of American influence—i.e., the known universe? Her answer is, "we return to the enchanted garden by retrieving our subjective experience of living nature. We don't have to turn back the clock to accomplish this. Instead, we can recreate our connection to nature within the framework of modern science." She then invokes James Lovelock and his Gaia myth. This solution has to be problematic for feminists, or at least this feminist, because it is so clearly associated with returning to a feminized mythology of nature.

### Extinction

**Reardon, 93**- [Betty, Women and peace: feminist visions of global security, p.31]

A clearly visible element in the escalating tensions among militarized nations is the macho posturing and the patriarchal ideal of *dominance*, not parity, which motivates defense ministers and government leaders to “strut their stuff” as we watch with increasing horror. Most men in our patriarchal culture are still acting out old patterns that are radically inappropriate for the nuclear age. To prove dominance and control, to distance one’s character from that of women, to survive the toughest violent initiation, to shed the sacred blood of the hero, to collaborate with death in order to hold it at bay—all of these patriarchal pressures on men have traditionally reached resolution in ritual fashion on the battlefield. But there is no longer any battlefield. Does anyone seriously believe that if a nuclear power were losing a crucial, large-scale conventional war it would refrain from using its multiple-warhead nuclear missiles because of some diplomatic agreement? The military theater of a nuclear exchange today would extend, instantly or eventually, to all living things, all the air, all the soil, all the water. If we believe that war is a “necessary evil,” that patriarchal assumptions are simply “human nature,” then we are locked into a lie, paralyzed. The ultimate result of unchecked terminal patriarchy will be nuclear holocaust. The causes of recurrent warfare are not biological. Neither are they solely economic. They are also a result of patriarchal ways of thinking, which historically have generated considerable pressure for standing armies to be used.

## Biopower – 2NC

### Space policy is like propaganda: it legitimizes the state’s power

Sheehan 7 (Michael Sheenan, Professor of International Relations, University of Swansea, “The International Politics of Space”, 2007, <http://bib.tiera.ru/dvd64/Sheehan%20M.%20-%20The%20International%20Politics%20of%20Space%282007%29%28248%29.pdf>, ZA)

Power is an essential ingredient for effective action in international politics. As a phenomenon, it combines all the components of national strength, tangible and intangible, real and potential, into a unity. The measure of power determines the extent to which a state can exert influence in global politics; it determines the capacity to influence, to manipulate and to control. Power is often understood as being synonymous with the capacity to threaten or exert force, particularly military force. However, power defined as the ability to influence outcomes in a desired direction is a more complicated and nuanced phenomenon than simply the ability to impose one’s will by force. With states, as with individuals, the ‘charismatic appeal of authority’ is also important, and a reputation for power or perception as being strong, can also be significant. It was recognised early on that in the peculiar circumstances of the Cold War, the superpower struggle for power would be very much a struggle for the control of people’s minds, of their perceptions of reality.1 In this battle over perceptions, propaganda was central. Propaganda can be defined as the use of symbols in an effort to manipulate the beliefs, attitudes or actions of other people, or to propagate a particular doctrine or practice. Seen in this light, it is easy to appreciate the symbolic importance of activities in space. Being at the cutting edge of technology, achievements in space can be presented and interpreted as a symbol of human progress, and a validation of a particular social and economic system. The realist scholar Morgenthau, for example, pointed to the importance of prestige, which he defined as a ‘reputation for power’, and which could be a tool for achieving larger political goals. When states pursue policies designed to increase their prestige, they are seeking to confi rm an evaluation of strength, excellence, even superiority. In Karl Deutsch’s terms, ‘prestige is to power as credit is to cash’.2 Recognition of these elements may be sought domestically, particularly when national morale is deemed to be low after an historical reverse, but it is their recognition and acceptance externally by other actors in the international system that is most important.

### Destruction of all life

**Foucault 78**- Professor of the history of systems of thought, at the college de france

(Michel, “The History Of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1”, 1978, p. 143.)

If one can apply the term bio-history to the pressures through which the movements of life and the processes of history interfere with one another, one would have to speak of bio-power to designate what brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge-power an agent of transformation of human life. It is not that life has been totally integrated into techniques that govern and administer it; it constantly escapes them. Outside the Western world, famine exists. on a greater scale than ever; and the biological risks confronting the species are perhaps greater, and certainly more serious, than before the birth of microbiologv. But what might be called a societv's "threshold of modernity" has been reached when the life of the species is wagered on its own political strategies. For millennia, man remained what he was for Aristotle: a divine animal with the additional capacity for a political existence: modem man is an animal whose politics places his existence as a living being in question.

# \*\*\*Implications\*\*\*

## Error Replication – 2NC

### Turns case: this myth is like Icarus. The plan will fulfill its fate in catastrophe.

**BAILEY ‘5** (Lee Worth, is an associate professor of religion at Ithaca College, “The enchantments of technology”, p.122-124 MinR)

In Stanley Kubrick's classic 1964 film Dr. Strangelove, the pilot of the ill-fated B-52 that cannot be stopped from dropping its nuclear bomb is named "Tex." He connects the enduring mythic cowboy of American legend with the high-tech world of military bombers and their apocalyptic missions. This darkly comic warrior **fulfills his fate by suicidally riding a nuclear bomb** down onto a Soviet base waving his cowboy hat, yelling "yahoo!" This tragic image satirizes the enchantment of the cowboy spirit in the history of North American aviation and space technology, the space cowboy who braves new frontiers with the "right stuff," driving the **latest fast, hot, and deadly technology** to the edge of frontier-space and **the edge of catastrophe.** The western cowboy is a mythical creature, made not by cows but by technology. He means far more for North American culture than a realistic western plains rancher herding cattle. For the most part the cowboy is a fantastic, larger-than-life archetypal hero. Part Jesse James, part John Wayne, and part Matt Dillon, this legendary- character, originating in industrial society's nineteenth-century mythology, was made mythic because of the gun, a newly mass-produced repeating pistol. What would a mythic cowboy be without his six-shootin' iron strapped to his side? Nothing but a humble cow herder.

## No Aff Impact – 2NC

### Disenchantment kills all meaning in the world

Bauerschmidt, professor of theology, ’07 (Frederick, 2007, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2001.tb01764.x/pdf>, “The Politics of Disenchantment”, ctc)

Another way of describing this change is as a loss of metaphysical vision. What religious belief provides, and what the modem world has lost, is “a unified view of the world derived from a consciously integrated and meaningful attitude toward life.”14 This desire of reason to see the world as a “cosmos” is undercut by reason’s own rationalization of the world. Disenchantment means that “there are no incalculable forces that come into play, but rather one can, in principle, master all things by calculation.”’~ However, the key feature of a disenchanted world is not simply the absence of gods and demons, but the loss of the world as “cosmos”-the loss of meaning. As instrumental reason progressively strips the world‘s processes of their magical qualities so as to more methodically manage them, these processes “henceforth simply ‘are’ and ‘happen’ but no longer signify anything.”

## No V2L – 2NC

### The affirmative’s narrative of the 1AC is an attempt at a heterocosmic and scientific utopia that destroys Mother Nature. Trying to destroy feminine nature and embracing only human reason will render all life bare.

**Ben-tov, PhD from Stanford, 95** (Sharona, MA from Boston University and taught at Stanford University, 1995, Google Books: The artificial paradise: science fiction and American reality, pages 19-20, ctc)

Nature is an animate, feminine, and numinous being. She manifests in an unmediated way as natural generativity. the lush fertility of the garden, or she can assume the shape of a feminine genius. Whatever her form. Mother Nature always inspires wonder. Hers is a divine power: her generativity is numinous, or magical. Love, harmony, abundance, and eroticism are also associated with the Earthly Paradise. These are the qualities that science ﬁction will alter and turn upside down, making a witches’ brew of the garden‘s bouquets. From Romance to Utopia: The Lady Vanishes It is no accident that utopia can mean either a tale or a real experiment in living. According to Richard Gerber, a critic of utopian ﬁction, the idea of utopia was not only a product of the Renaissance‘s “new social consciousness, but also the proper outcome of the humanist theories of literature applied to society in general."" Humanist poetics, the theories about the writing of poetry promulgated by Renaissance humanists gave the Renaissance romance a new significance, one that prefigured the ideology of early modem science. The poetics of earlier eras held that the function of poetry was to imitate nature, or to illustrate metaphysical truths. But according to humanist poetics, poetry created an autonomous world detached from nature. Sir Philip Sidney, author of the substantial romance Arcadia, called the poets creation “another nature,” a man-made world superior to the original. In fan, Sidney imagined the poet bringing forth a “golden world” to devalue nature's brass. Onely the Poet. . Jifled up with the vigor of his own invention, doth grow in effect into an other nature: in making things either better than nature bringth foorth, or quite a new, formes such as never were in nature.... Nature never set foorth the earth in so rich a Tapestry as diverse Poets have done. . . her world is brazen, the Poets only deliver a golden. Sidney‘s poetics endowed the poet with the power to do better than nature, the selfsame power by the scientists of New Atlantis. The poet's creation is a heterocosm: an alternative cosmos, a man-made world. The heterocosm made possible the conception of fictional and real-life utopias.“ For if the Earthly Paradise garden was not a poet‘s imitation of nature but, instead, his own independent invention, then it logically followed that human beings could independently realize the pleasant qualities of the Earthly Paradise. By applying the theory of the heterocosm to society in general, the utopian attempted to create an improved human condition that owed nothing to powers outside human reason and will. A man-made system, utopia, appropriated the abundance and social harmony of the garden and replaced Mother Nature as their source. In utopia the lady vanishes: the figure of feminine nature no longer enchants the Earthly Paradise. The aesthetic price of casting the lady out of the garden is high. Having eliminated the garden's genius, utopia loses the mythic force that makes the Earthly Paradise such attractive reading in the romance. Although utopia is realized on earth, it has an abstract, lifeless quality. All its perfections are reducible to a plan. While the enchanted garden springs from deep within the human imagination, utopia is “a device. a construct." Every utopia is scientific, because it is constructed on the basis of a scientific analysis of social conditions." Utopia's heterocosm is rationalized. Every detail has been reasoned out. No mysteries go unexplained, as the reader plods through the utopians' typical speeches

## Knowledge Production – 2NC

### The ontology of the aff is rooted in the cyborg: we approach problem solutions through constructions and separate the body and the mind. Destroys life and knowledge

Csicsery-Ronay, ’91, (“The SF of Theory: Baudrillard and Haraway”, Istvan Csicsery-Ronay, Jr., Science Fiction Studies, Vol. 18, No. 3, Science Fiction and Postmodernism (Nov., 1991), pp. 387-404) KDJ

For an open future even to be conceivable at least two things are required: the dissolution of the myths of time that have informed western technology and mythology (from innocent origin, fall out of nature, and apocalyptic reunion); and the emergence of a conception of virtual timespace, where many possibilities might be realized fatelessly. Such a reformulation of cultural timespace, and necessarily also of conceptions of human freedom, cannot come about by theoretical fiat. The theorization of an open future depends on a condition of existence that can no longer be seen as essential, self-enclosed, and infinitely self-productive. For Haraway that condition exists at the site of the cyborg. Haraway finds the name for the new conditions in one of the most revered of SF conventions. Traditionally, the cyborg is an ontologically mongrel creature that combines mechanical-artificial elements with organic and natural ones. SF has never been exclusive about this category: it includes a wide range of types, from the supermechanized Borg of the recent Star Trek, to Anne McCaffrey’s heroic-romantic "Ship Who Sang," to the tragic genetically-altered spacepilots of Cordwainer Smith's "Scanners Live in Vain." Recent literary SF favors the cyborg perhaps above all other themes; the cyberpunk genre can be defined by its vision of a dystopian future saturated by cyborg technologies. Historically, the cyborg has stood for the radical anxiety of human consciousness about its own embodiment at the moment that embodiment appears almost fully contingent. Cyborg anxiety has stood for a panic oscillation between the "human" element (associated with affections, eros, error, innovation, projects begun in the face of mortality) and the "machine" element (the desire for long life, health, physical impermeability, self-contained control processes, dependability, and hence the ability to fulfill promises over a long term). The classical SF cyborg is a site of panic psychology (to borrow a term from Arthur Kroker), the exaggeration of the body/intellect dualism into a form of literary prosthesis. The cyborg generates and absorbs dread, precisely because human beings, without knowledge of the original conditions of our construction, have no way of knowing the degree to which body and mind can be considered distinct (if they can at all); and we have no other way of approaching the problem than through our constructions-i.e., our mental and physical combinatory models, our cyborgs. These are inevitably parodic, since they already assume the difference we ask them to test. The classical cyborg contest thus reverses the terms of Platonic dualism, in which the body is linked with illusion and mutability, the mind with the perceptions of eternal values. The cyborg is a creation of the culture of artificial immanence, of exteriorization of knowledge with respect to the knower (Lyotard), in which the creations of the intellect are directly translatable into technological embodiment. The intellect therefore comes to represent the superbody, the body transformed in the mind's image of the invulnerable and maintainable life-support system; while the archaic organic body comes to represent the scene of tragic knowledge of eternity through mortality, the necessary precondition for value-generating sacrifice. Thus, classically, the cyborg has fit into one of two niches: the Superman or the tragic technological monster. Traditionally, the cyborg is recuperated for "humanity," demonstrating-usually through sentimental nostalgia( "human envy")-the superior value of God's favorite creature just the way He made him.

## A2: Science Good

### No link: we manipulate science to give us the wrong conclusions

**FARRER ’87** (Claire, professor of anthropology at California State University in Chico, August, “On Parables, Questions, and Predictions,” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1499890>, p. 288-289, MinR)

We are led to the conclusion that we must construct a new mythol- ogy, a mythology that partakes heavily of the old mysticism. The new mythology for a new age suggests that **control-by-technique is only the illusion of control**. Is the natural world really subdued and made to perform when performance knows no bounds? Those who point us toward the new mythology tell us it is hard to think the unimaginable, even when it is manifest in its detritus. They tell us of new worlds in- side the formerly smallest units; these are worlds about which most of us can scarcely dream. They imply that there may be larger worlds be- yond the bounds of the world we think we know. They prepare us to kill the old king myth while crying, "Long Live King Myth!" Young reminds us of the harmony inherent in the world-as-is and the value some place on the harmony of the self within and with the universe rather than the mastery of the universe by the self. Ignoring this tenet was part of the motivation that allowed our EuroAmerican ancestors to "open" the West, the old New Frontier. Seeing ourselves as masters or husbanders, the EuroAmerican model, **leads to very different perceptions** than does seeing ourselves as a portion of an organic whole, as do most Native Americans. Truly it becomes senseless to exploit and deplete one portion of Creation when we ourselves are an equal portion. It is as though we hacked off one of our own limbs to satisfy a growling stomach; perhaps it is satisfying in the short term but totally ruinous in the long one. When God is displaced from Heaven by our habitations in the heav- ens, will we re-locate sacred space on Earth? Will we become more like the Indians of the American Southwest when we, too, come to the real- ization that all is intimately connected and that we are simultaneously being connected and a part of the connection as well? Will we demonstrate the truth of many Native American philosophies and cosmolo- gies that maintain we live in but a shadow of the real world of Power and the Supernatural? Will we ever learn what the Zunis state to be true, that inner and outer realities are but segments of each other which we parse in our minds? The heroine of my parable, **Science**, **never sought to assume the burdens we place upon her**. She merely questioned and tried to explain on the basis of her past knowledge and experience. Yet we **deny her the significance of experience** unless it comes packaged in EuroAmerican realities; she must **ignore the reality** predicated upon different premises. She must shoulder the responsibilities not only of Technology but **also**, it seems, of **Folklore**.

### Constant search for science ruins value to life

Gourdon 2 (Côme Carpentier de Gourdon, the Convener of the Editorial Board of the WORLD AFFAIRS JOURNAL, July-September 2002, World Affairs, Vol. 6, Number 3, <http://www.ciaonet.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/olj/wa/wa_jul02_goc01.html>)

It can be predicted that many of the world’s religions will oppose the rapid, eco-technologically inspired changes in ethical values and social rules but we doubt that such resistance, however principled, will be effective in the face of the tidal wave that is sweeping over us. It is indeed unlikely that the new opportunities made available to improve health, extend life and increase prosperity will be blocked by ethical and religious concerns simply because the temptations will be too strong, despite and sometimes alas in view of the negative, even fateful implications of those advances for the human condition. We ought at this point to enumerate the extremely powerful new weapons that are already in existence or are likely to be manufactured soon but will not, for want of space. However we can say with certainty that the harmful potential of the chemical, electromagnetic, biological and other futuristic weapons is greater and more insidious than everything we have known so far. Human nature leaves scant reasons to doubt that those capacities for destruction will be employed sooner or later, possibly cancelling all beneficial effects of the knowledge we are gaining. Soon those ongoing breakthroughs will affect day-to-day reality with their fantastic promises but also with their apocalyptic threats. It is too late to turn back on the path of discovery but any invention is also a metaphysical transgression. Our sole chance is to redeem the technology with wisdom, the Sanskrit ‘Paravidya’, the Semitic ‘Hokmah’, the Latin ‘Sapientia’ which we sum up in the word ‘Cosmosophy’ as the ‘conjunctio oppositorum’, for "science without conscience is the ruin of the soul" as the French Renaissance scholar Rabelais pointed out nearly five centuries ago.

## A2: Overview Effect

### Going to space does not transcend anything. Rather, it is an excuse for expanding conquest into space

Csicsery-Ronay, ’91, (“The SF of Theory: Baudrillard and Haraway”, Istvan Csicsery-Ronay, Jr., Science Fiction Studies, Vol. 18, No. 3, Science Fiction and Postmodernism (Nov., 1991), pp. 387-404) KDJ

Classical science fiction, in Baudrillard's view, was characterized by the constant elaboration of the theme of expansion-of human production and exploration, of colonial culturation, of adventure. All of these can be translated into projections of the Earth. Once the actual technology of space-exploration and colonization crosses a certain threshold, the Earth ceases to be a source of centrifugal expansion and becomes the object of centripetal collapse. The implosion of SF occurs simultaneously with the implosion of terrestrialism, with the virtually total coding, mapping, and saturation of the physical world and the world of signs. For Baudrillard, the effect of the "conquest of space" was to bring an end to terrestrial reference and a de-realizing of human space. The recurring icon of this implosion of meaning in Baudrillard's work is the satellite/space capsule, a work of technological wizardry that essentially reproduces the banality of the human habitat in outer space-the two-rooms-kitchen-bath-and-shower launched into orbit. The "conquest" leads not to transcendence, but to the absorption of the cosmic ocean-and the cosmic Earth-into the satellite: The conquest of space constitutes in this sense an irreversible threshold in the direction of the loss of the earthly referential. This is precisely the hemorrhage of reality as internal coherence of a limited universe when its limits retreat infinitely. The conquest of space follows that of the planet as the same fantastic enterprise of extending the jurisdiction of the real-to carry for example the flag, the technique, the two-rooms-and-kitchen to the moon-same tentative to substantiate the concepts or territorialize the unconscious-the latter equals making the human race unreal, or to reversing it into the hyperreality of simulation. ("The Orders of Simulacra"1 58, verbatim) What Baudrillard considers the traditional charms of science fiction-projection, extrapolation, excessive "pantography"-become impossible, because space no longer offers a scene for overcoming fundamental differences. SF will consequently no longer be romantic narrative of expansion and colonization; it will rather "evolve implosively in the same way as our image of the universe. It would seek to revitalize, to reactualize, to rebanalize the fragments of simulation-fragments of this universal simulation which our presumed 'real' world has now become for us" (311, above).

### They’ve got the process wrong. The motivation behind seeing the “big picture” from above will lead us crashing back down like Icarus

**BAILEY ‘5** (Lee Worth, is an associate professor of religion at Ithaca College, “The enchantments of technology”, p.125-126 MinR)

Modern atheists who put their faith in technological progress have not really abandoned sky mythology. When balloons and airplanes began to allow humans to edge upward into the heretofore inaccessible blue heights, sky myths continued to mingle with technological development in significant ways. Sky mythology is not simply imaginative icing on the practical realities of technological history; **its images and fantasies motivate the development** of technological systems, and we find them behind airplanes and rockets. Far from rejecting myth, sky technologies embrace its dreams and fly machines in search of those dreams. But these fascinations are highly ambiguous. A Greek myth long ago told of the dangers of the sky enchantment. The Icarus Enchantment In ancient Greek myth, Icarus was the son of Daedalus, the clever inventor. Daedalus built the labyrinth for King Minos in Crete, where the legendary Minotaur is imprisoned. Later, however, the angry Minos imprisons Daedalus and Icarus in their own labyrinth. Freed by Minos's daughter Ariadne. Daedalus makes for himself and his son wings of feathers and wax so they can escape the island before Minos catches them. As they prepare to fly, the father warns his son not to fly too low, lest the sea splash his wings and weigh him down. Nor should he fly too high, for tile sun will scorch them. Above all, Daedalus warns his beloved son to follow him closely and not be diverted by the celestial creatures above. Taking off, they' pass the islands of Delos, Paros, and Samos safely. But the daring Icarus becomes overconfident as he soars through the air, neglecting his father's admonitions. Thrilled with his newfound power to soar high above the Mediterranean, he flies too high, so near the sun that he scorches his feathery wings, and the wax melts. Terrified, he plummets into the sea (Ovid 187-90). This ancient myth portrays an ageless psychological pattern: the archetypal constellation of flying and falling. Flying can be symbolic of romantic, Utopian visions of ambitious achievement, and this was so even when real flying was impossible. Flying evokes the tendency to strive for the highest goals imaginable, to "reach for the stare" or stretch one's limits to the outermost. **Flight for Icarus and Daedalus is an escape from imprisonment**. The enchantment of escape from problems is characteristic of the adventurous wanderer, like the adolescent cowboy or pilot, heading off into the sunset, leaving behind the responsibilities of a family. **Flying also implies the mental capacity to imagine richly and think philosophically, envisioning the "big picture" as from above**, seeing the farthest horizons and stretching die mind to reach beyond. **Icarus symbolizes the age-old yearning for apotheosis—becoming godlike, omnipotent, omniscient, surveying the world from above, the ultimate creator and savior**. Flying is approaching the infinite. The glory of technological flight easily embraces the archetypal Icarus enchantment.