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\*\*\* A-to Cap K – Space Specific \*\*\*

Space-Specific – 2AC Cap K Slayer

( ) \*\*\*“Rejection Alt” never solves space. The perm is an ethical alt to excessive capitalism, and is the only solution.

Martin ‘10

(Robert Martin, RVI English Representative – RVI is Renaissance Vanguard International, an organization founded on Communitarian and Distributist principles, “Centrifuge Capitalism” – Amerika – Jun 21st, 2010 – http://www.amerika.org/politics/centrifuge-capitalism/)

Centralization and capitalism are necessary for any intelligent civilization, yet *in excess* drains the base population of any sustenance whatsoever, leaving them unemployed, homeless and starving at worst. The answer to this event is not a swing on the pendulum all the way onto total equality fisted socialism out on a plate for everyone who isn’t rich, that would be devastating for organization, but is a more natural ecosystem type of financing of a near-barter economics with different values and currencies for localized entities and more buoyant monetary for inter-localities – only monetizing where absolutely necessary. Without the higher economics that goes beyond small barter communities, there could be no space programs, or planetary defences providing the technology or the organization necessary to survive extinction events or fund a military etc, it’s critical for the structure of the super-organism – yet too much and some individuals inside of it become so padded from outside reality that they completely ignore the world around them. Centralization is pseudo gravity of the political variant, it sucks everything down into a point, and through this it creates a civilization, a planet of its own amidst a world of other civilizations all coalescing out of species of life at a specific evolutionary capacity. Global modern day capitalism, in its most destructive phase, is made out of a ‘substance’ that cannot overcome itself to produce wealth through its centralization, as far as it has gone now. But it is possible, if many ‘planets’ ‘stars’ or everything that makes up a wealthy locality all evolve to revolve around a central core, then this will produce a kind of ‘active centralization’ where the dead and cold rock of debt is stripped apart of its structure and is made into pure wealth, pure value and then jetted out of the core of civilization, thereby producing wealth on a higher niche via fusing the negative debt with the unseen gravity of its social environment. Evolution is at a somewhat constant rate and afflicts every gene and meme in existence at varying energies, if we don’t adapt to our environment then we will be at the mercy of the ourselves alone, likewise if we don’t adapt ourselves we will be at the mercy of our environment alone. Although good for some, for the future it is severely disabling and cannot allow for space exploration. Capitalism, like every theory, is memes, therefore it can be improved by alternating the frequencies and wavelengths of its usage, it can be evolved to be more collective, to refertilize the environment so that individuals can once again contribute back into the centralization instead of a ‘once in a civilization opportunity’ where we have one big boom and the rest is dumped in the toilet for the peasants to feast. Like these active galaxies, absorb that which gets too centralized and jet it out as high energy wealth across the void of space, this jet then crushes the inert clouds, or communities, around it into fusing stars of their own. Modern capitalism needs a *black hole* at its centre, therefore the individuals at the core of its centrifuge will be spaghetified and will have their organizations and corporations torn apart into sub atomic values that then are then fused into exotic wealth able to drive civilization into space and into creating new homes on distant planets for our species. The centralization, combined with its spin, acts as a funnel to the higher castes of society that are then able to create beyond themselves enough that we can produce strong civilizations, culture, technology and mechanization. So remember you shit eating socialists, don’t throw the baby out with the bathwater or your people will not have an intelligent future at all, regressing into your economic swamps is not a viable solution.

Cap K – Space-Specific – very good cards for the Aff Frontline

( ) Their link reverses the error – they assume ALL space missions MUST entrench cap. This cements violence and crushes the radical potential of pure space endeavors.

Parker ‘8

(Martin Parker is reader in social and organisational theory at the University of Keele. He holds degrees in anthropology and sociology from the Universities of Sussex, London and Staffordshire and previously taught sociology at Staffordshire – Review of: Cosmic Society. Towards a Sociology of the Universe

Peter Dickens and James Ormrod – The Sociological Review, 56:4 – http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2008.00811\_1.x/pdf)

But there is an odd thing about the sort of Marxist Freudian telescope that Dickens and Ormrod use here. After recounting various more collectivist cosmologies, they suggest that contemporary capitalism has produced a sovereign individual who only sees their own restless narcissism reflected in the stars.The ‘humanization’ of space then involves the universalization of a selfish and insecure character, and a set of social relations that support an unequal status quo. Fair enough, but can space travel and exploration provoke other forms of thought too?What Dickens and Ormrod label as childish narcissism might be articulated by radicals of a less materialist (or realist) bent as ‘revolutionary romanticism’. Risking glibness, this is perhaps what distinguished young Hegelians from historical materialist Marxists.No wonder that Dickens and Ormrod tend to see popular science, utopianism and science fiction as a distraction, precisely because they look to them like escapism. These authors are more attentive to structural constraint than imaginative possibility. Now there is no particular reason to argue that (for example) all science fiction is radical, any more than we might suggest all utopias are good places. However, many radicals (and liberals too, such as Durkheim and Mannheim) have suggested that imaginings of other times and spaces have been central to the possibility of change, and hence a contributor to cracks in whatever hegemony reigns. To put this another way, I suppose that one of the other senses of the ‘humanization’ of space might be that there is no space left for the sublime, for the sense of the insignificance of the human standing on the moon, blotting all of earth out with his gloved thumb. In other words, that a sociology of space of the kind that Dickens and Ormrod propose might end up leaving no space left to think about, because it is now already filled by humans, and the machinery of the actually existing. Nonetheless, this is an extraordinarily interesting book, and it deserves a cheaper paperback edition in order that the ideas can be more widely read. Though my temper may be more speculative than theirs, I (and Kurt Vonnegut, I think) agree entirely when they conclude that ‘the ultimate aim of this must be a relationship with the universe that does not empower the already powerful.’ (190)Where we might disagree is the role of ‘fantasy’ in shaping a future that might achieve such an aim.

( ) The Cap K and ethics args are NEVER a reason to reject space projects. The Neg must demonstrate a workable alt first.

Ashworth ‘10

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

But for them any kind of space development is in no sense a priority. On the contrary, their emphasis throughout this book is on analysing and criticising the present-day liberal democratic market capitalist social and economic system (“capitalism”) which, originating in Europe some half a millennium ago, has now spread worldwide via colonisation and via links of global warfare, trade, communications, politics and tourism. Here another asymmetry with the pro-space movement is apparent. When Zubrin wants to go to Mars, he describes in detail how he proposes to achieve this. The same is true of O’Neill in regard to space colonies, Schrunk et al. in regard to the Moon, Ashford in regard to space tourism, Bond, Martin et al. in regard to Barnard’s Star, and so on. One may disagree with the goals or the means, but one is left in no doubt as to what they actually are. Cosmic Society, by contrast, is based on “critical realism” (p.41-42), which in practice means it focuses overwhelmingly on destructive criticism, not on constructive proposals. The political project which Dickens and Ormrod promote in this book is merely to prevent capitalist expansion into space, while the means of achieving this negative goal are only hinted at in vague terms. In chapter 1, abstract cosmologies which only privileged elites can understand are judged to be “a bad thing” and “undesirable” (p.45, 48). But a theory of the universe which everyone in the lay public can feel at home with and yet which is also true to the mathematical complexities of cosmological reality is not offered, and neither do our authors even express a view as to whether such a theory is possible. In chapter 2 the mechanisms of “the contemporary global capitalist society” are described; our authors clearly disapprove of the existing social and economic arrangements but have nothing to offer in their place beyond vague hints of “alternative forms of consciousness” (p.77). They conclude: “the humanization of outer space is a product of economic and social crisis and [...] a means of reasserting hegemonic authority” (p.77). “Space technology itself plays a central role in disseminating a hegemonic Western culture [...]. There is, however, always hope for resistance, and for the moment it is to organic intellectuals within the Global Network and similar organizations that we must look for critical new visions of our relationship with the universe.” (p.78) In other words, they feel free to condemn Western democratic capitalism for its supposed failings and express hope, not for its correction or improvement through the institutions which exist for that purpose, but rather for “resistance” as if it were some inflexible tyranny like that of Nazi Germany, even though they have only the haziest ideas whether a better alternative might exist or what it might look like. To that end, the repeated use of terms like “crisis” and “class hegemony” set up an implication that all this capitalist imperialism must be completely swept away and replaced with a socialist utopia. This is finally made explicit, towards the end of the book, when reporting with approval the views of authors who believe that “a great mass of people subordinated to global capital and global power” constitute “a powerful counter-force resisting and eventually overcoming capitalist imperialism” (p.181-182). This is a bold step to take, because the historically aware reader (or even a sociologist in the dictionary sense of the term) will immediately object, firstly, that capitalism has proved itself by far the most efficient economic system yet seen, having liberated the populations of the developed world from hunger, disease and ignorance, and secondly, that violent revolutions have in the past installed totalitarian dictatorships. Mention of Marx, Lenin and Luxemburg as examples to follow (p.182) hardly instils confidence. These obvious objections are not addressed in the book.

( ) Going to Space internal link turns all your Cap arg – the Alt won’t solve and exploration might.

Ashworth ‘10

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

Yet their motivations are surely charitable ones? They have the relief of poverty and suffering at heart. They call for the humanisation of space, if it happens at all, to “emphasize collective responsibilities on Earth” and “to improve the lot of the dispossessed” as an alternative to “being founded on the interests of capital, and individualist fantasies” (p.190). Are these not worthy sentiments? But such a change of tack is moot until somebody can demonstrate a way of organising the economy which is both more generous to those at the bottom of the social scale, and capable of replacing our modern liberal democratic market capitalist society without losing its immense productiveness – as well as pensioning off the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And, as we have seen, Dickens and Ormrod have no such alternative to offer. While they like to suggest that they do have an alternative, the implied vision of violent overthrow of the existing social order (p.181-182) and imposition of a repressive Leninist state (complete with psychiatric prisons for political dissidents) would clearly fail disastrously on all three counts. To that end, I have a suggestion. According to historical materialists such as Marx and Engels, “social change is driven not by ideas but by the material, productive forces that characterize a society” (p.50). A good example of this happening in practice is the marginalisation of war since 1945, as noted above (though ignored by the authors of Cosmic Society). Speaking then as a historical materialist (and growing a bushy beard to suit), I propose (not altogether flippantly) that a fairer society will emerge when changes in the material forces of production demand it. Vague appeals to “resistance” and to “alternative forms of consciousness” are irrelevant, according to Marx and Engels; what counts here is a change in the technologies and organisation of production. Clearly, that cannot be planned in advance. But one certainty is that production in space, using the natural raw materials and energy of space and of other worlds, will be significantly different from production on Earth, and therefore, according to Marx and Engels, will trigger changes in social relations.

( ) In the space context, Cap isn’t inflexible or violent, and the Neg has no workable alt.

Ashworth ‘10

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

Could socialism – the traditional antithesis to capitalism – possibly be the answer? Though neither it nor communism (nor indeed alternative consciousness) were deemed important enough to make it into the index (while capitalism and its “see also” entries account for 24 lines of page references), there is a mention on page 6 of “socialist space programmes” which, we are told, the authors do not wish to ignore. Despite that reassurance, little more is heard about them, and the authors’ views on the Soviet space programme remain tantalisingly hidden – apart from the fact that it “emerged from a history of Russian cosmism, which saw space exploration as central to the progressive future of the Soviet people” (p.79-80). But the preoccupation here, the reader is told, is with “capitalist space development”, exploring “the relationship between the humanization of outer space and the central dynamics of capitalism rooted in inequality and alienation” (p.6). Crucially, whether any other social dynamics are possible is another question that is not addressed, leaving a vague implication that of course there must be a better alternative, but it is either so obvious as not to require any specific mention, or so obscure that nobody has the slightest idea what it might be. This technique of argument by loaded implication is a general stylistic feature of Cosmic Society. For example, the authors are happy to talk about the crises and contradictions which sadly afflict capitalism and imperialism (e.g. p.63, 67, 77, 179), but are silent on the crises and contradictions of, say, socialism (which on p.6 was implicitly linked with the Soviet Union). Since what they call capitalism is alive and well (and in fact so dynamic that it has created all the problems lamented in this book), while countries founded on socialist principles have either collapsed (the Soviet Union) or abandoned them for capitalist ones (China, Eastern Europe), perhaps they thought the crises of capitalism were so little-known that they would be of more interest? Meanwhile, the question whether a social system can exist which is not subject to what “critical realists” call crises and contradictions is again left unspoken (argument by implication). The reader is clearly being invited to believe that there is, even though our authors cannot tell them anything more about it, for it is purely hypothetical. One tantalising hint appears during a discussion of science fiction, in which sometimes “Travel into outer space therefore represents an opportunity to start a socially just, perhaps even socialist, society” (p.159). Would such a utopian state emulate socialist societies on Earth – with a secret police, forced labour camps for dissidents, shortages of consumer products, and compulsory political meetings? Dickens and Ormrod’s otherwise incisive analysis fails to address this highly relevant question. A variation of this stylistic technique is a deliberately misleading choice of words. Continuing with the example just given, if capitalism suffers repeated crises, or if it contains internal contradictions, how can it have survived to the present day in such rude health? The answer seems to be that when Dickens and Ormrod (basing their discussion on Marx and Engels, p.50) use the word “crisis”, they actually mean no more than change, and when they speak of capitalism having “contradictions”, they mean no more than that our economic system is subject to the sorts of pressures which drive change. Thus: “The global market is proving increasingly unable to contain the many contradictions of capitalism” (p.179) actually means: the global market is developing in response to pressures for change. While the use of words such as “crisis” and “contradiction” may not help in elucidating economics, it does surround the economic system with a superficial aura of unsustainability and illegitimacy, which perfectly suits the authors’ polemical purpose. Thus an adaptable system which is responsive to changing circumstances is made to sound as if it were on the brink of collapse, without the inconvenience of actually having to produce arguments in support of such a dubious hypothesis. Similarly, slipping in the term “late capitalism” (meaning modern democratic capitalism, p.127) supplies the implication that the authors know how soon capitalism will be superseded by a different economic system, when in reality clearly they do not. The constant use of the word “capitalism” itself, unqualified by any adjective such as “democratic” or “liberal”, misleads readers by inciting them to fall into line with the authors’ assumption that the system is completely unregulated by governments answerable to a popular electorate. The authors can then offer “popular control” as a better alternative (p.123) without having to address difficult questions about the degree of popular control already in place, the practical limits of such control, or about where the optimum social balance between legislation and a free-market capitalist economy might lie. Obviously, in reality the capitalist system is highly regulated by governments.

Space Reps Good – discourage Capitalism

( ) Space Reps promote altruism – these are the opposite of material selfishness and cap

Mirmalek ‘9

Zara Mirmalek – Postdoctoral Associate Science, Technology, and Society Massachusetts Institute of Technology – Dreaming of space, imagining membership: The work conduct of heroes – Management &amp; Organizational History 2009 4: 299 – DOI: 10.1177/1744935909337753

In contrast to the dearth of media representations of actual time and work relationships there is a great deal of emphasis on rewards and identity: who gets what for working where. Though all of these aspects share the quality of exaggeration, the degree varies greatly. Media representations of organizations and their members frequently highlight those organizations that bestow significant rewards either in terms of social status or wealth (or both). Even material rewards that appear to serve only as contextualizing information can provide an indelible association between rewards and organizational identities. One of the most effective disseminations of an organizational identity conferred with material rewards is that of the stockbroker. Many people have pointed to the film Wall Street (1987), a film that brought the phrase ‘greed is good’ into common parlance, as an example of a popular representation of work that inspired people to pursue brokering. The film is a Faustian tale of a 20-something male, the film’s protagonist, who pursues a Wall Street titan in his mid-40s, Gekko, who possesses the material and social attributes the young stockbroker dreams of attaining. After briefly encountering moral ethical dilemmas, the protagonist chooses to engage in deceit and larceny in order to perform successful work for Gekko. In the decades following the film’s release, the audience reception of Wall Street has been frequently commented upon, particularly following huge market losses or public exposures of unlawful work conduct onWall Street (Money Never Sleeps 2000; Weiser 2008). The actor who played Gekko, Michael Douglas, was surprised that many people were inspired by his greedy and immoral character. Contradicting his expectations, fans thanked him for inspiring them to become stockbrokers. ‘I wouldn’t mind if I never had one more drunken Wall Street broker come up and say, “You’re the man!”’ (Guardian 2007). Although the film ends with the aspiring stockbroker turning Gekko over to Federal investigators, and himself being sentenced to a short jail term, many people embraced and were guided by the material rewards bestowed upon successful stockbrokers – high-rise apartments, private jets, gold cufflinks, and a tall blonde girlfriend. A 26-year old multimillionaire convicted of money laundering and securities fraud (Telegraph 2008), Douglas Jordan ‘the Wolf of Wall Street’ Belfort has said that the movie changed his life – once he saw it he knew that he wanted to be like Gekko, the ultimate Wall Street rich guy. Examples of the social impact of Wall Street provide a demonstration of the relationship between media representations of work and rewards with actual accounts of individuals who have sought to inhabit those media representations in their everyday lives. In this way we can also think about the social rewards that draw people to particular kinds of work. One distinction between material and social rewards is that the former appears more obvious, subject to less interpretation, than the latter. Towards identifying and interpreting material rewards, it appears self-evident that making a million dollars a year is something to which most people might aspire. But with social rewards, matters are less self-evident and appear more subjective. Social rewards are defined here as attributes, qualities, or character traits granted to an individual for the particular work in which they are engaged. Examples of social rewards include ways in which an individual might be described (e.g. intelligent, courageous, heroic, brave, powerful, nerdy, or overbearing) or the manner in which they might be treated (e.g. with respect, reverence, or deference). Media representations of space exploration work, teaching, scientific discovery, or inventing, tend to foreground the social reward of being perceived as intelligent, selfless, heroic, or independent. Material rewards are less often represented. In fact, films about space exploration tend to moralize that scientists seeking to commercialize their discoveries reap only disaster. Taking this a step further, media representations often show scientists as successful only if they are selfless and heroic. The film Battle Beyond the Sun (1962) involves a race to Mars between two nations that represent the former USSR and the United States. The American astronauts in the film acknowledge that the race itself is not good for the environment but they were compelled to persist for the sake of scientific discovery. In contrast, the stated aim of the former USSR astronauts is planetary domination. Ultimately, the American scientists come out ahead, not by landing on Mars but by choosing humanity over scientific discovery; they put aside their own interests to save the lives of their rivals. Many MER mission members expressed having inclinations towards membership with an organization such as NASA since first looking up at the sky and dreaming of space exploration as a child.Without fail, this origin story has been used to introduce what appears to be a necessity, or a destiny, for particular individuals to pursue space exploration. Rocket scientists, astronauts, space explorers, and journalists repeat this account with little variation on theme of a youthful gaze at starry skies, and the power of imagination over reality; this list includes: Wernher von Braun (Wright 1993); NASA’s Mars Pathfinder mission manage Donna Shirley (Shirley and Morton 1998); astronauts Scott Carpenter (Carpenter and Stoever 2004), Brian O’Leary (1970), and Sally Ride (Wade 2003); journalist Marina Benjamin (2003); and, the first female space tourist Anousheh Ansari (2008). In this narrative, the author tells of a suspension of belief, not knowing specifically how they were going to get to the stars but knowing through hopes and dreams they surely would. And in this narrative there is another story, one affirms the work practice of setting a goal without full knowledge of the system by which one will need to carry it out. By their own accounts, many of the mission members were greatly influenced by popular culture, literature and films, as well as oceanic and interplanetary explorations. A few members even said that it was specifically the organization of NASA that they wished to join, because it represented the highest achievement of intellectual exclusivity. Some also pointed to thesociocultural contexts of their childhoods as influencing their decision to work in space; many of them were born before the birth of NASA (1958) and had experienced the cold war, Sputnik, and NASA’s lunar landings. References to motion pictures and literature, fiction and non-fiction, were common place in conversations and comments made by the MER mission members. Literary influences were significant and included authors Isaac Asimov, Arthur C. Clarke, and Jules Verne. Moreover, there were more than a few scientists who were science fiction authors – one scientist had published what was considered by other members to be the best science fiction book about Mars exploration (Landis 2000). And, films that were most often quoted included Apollo 13 (1995), Ghostbusters (1984), a film about scientists as heroes, and Star Wars (1977). Dreams of space exploration authored by Jules Verne and Kim Stanley Robinson were practically required reading, sources of cultural knowledge that were present both in casual conversation, jokes, and naming schemas for mapping Martian terrain. In conversations where fantastical technologies were accepted as being just one good design away, imaginative and sometimes unrestrained possibilities similar to those found in science fiction were offered in consideration of phenomena discovered on Mars. These references led me to reflect on the ways in which popular depictions of space exploration contributed to scientists’ expectations in terms of social rewards and guiding work practices. Through film, television, news stories, and science fiction literature, the organization of NASA has been constituted as a domain for heroes, for people who can and will conduct work that defies nature and is accomplished in spite of nature (Benjamin 2003; Kilgore 2003; Kevles 2003; McDougall 1985; Weitekamp 2004; Wolfe 1979). Hero status is typically conferred upon individuals for spontaneous acts of courage, kindness, *or generosity that compromise one’s own well-being, acts that may require acting against what is conventionally said* to constitute the instinct for self-preservation. Both individuals and organizations can be identified as heroes. For an individual, this might include running unprotected into a burning building to save someone trapped inside or sitting inside a small container positioned atop tons of explosive rocket fuel and being catapulted skyward at approximately 17,000 miles per hour. The work of space exploration, whether or not one leaves Earth, can be dangerous and harmful to the human body. Furthermore, harm to the human body can be considered both physical and emotional, affecting the individual and their social group (family, co-workers, the public). Organizations can also be realized as heroic by supporting the work of heroes. And this brings us to media representations of NASA’s most famous organization members: the astronauts. Howard E. McCurdy (1997) described NASA’s earlier cultivation of a culture of competency through the use of its most magnetic members, the astronauts, as representative of the organization’s own attributes. Most accounts of the early days of the space race and the first astronauts hardly ever fail to mention NASA’s arrangement with Life magazine that granted the magazine exclusive access to the Mercury astronauts and their families (Wolfe 1979). Hard-working, self-sacrificing, dare-devil, golden-boys were heavily promoted to inspire public support for the organization. Later, in the late 1970s, NASA drew on another kind of astronaut to shape its public image when it hired the African American actress, Ms Nichelle Nichols, who portrayed Lieutenant Uhuru on Star Trek to be an astronaut recruiter. Ms Nichols was recognized by the first African American woman astronaut in space, Dr Mae C. Jemison, as the inspiration for her career (Kilgore 2003).

Space Projects do not entrench Capitalism

( ) Plan is the OPPOSITE of entrenching capitalism – space missions work against capitalism’s dream of subordination.

S.P.P. ‘11

(“Capitalism 2011: Space exploration takes place in sheds while libraries are closed” – Socialist Party of Portsmouth – Feb 16th – http://socialistpartyp.wordpress.com/2011/02/16/capitalism-2011-space-exploration-takes-place-in-sheds-while-libraries-are-closed/.)

In this age of austerity when capitalist governments are cutting education budgets, closing libraries and making further education ever more unreachable, the likelihood of mankind progressing through the bold scientific feats typified by the achievements by Gagarin and Jahn are null to void. Yuri Gagarin was a son of a peasant family from the Urals. Jahn was the son of a working family from Vogtland. Following the cuts in education and scientific research could a child born in Stratford, Portsmouth or the Bronx even dream of following in their footsteps? This is why the closest thing that capitalism can conjure to a manned mission to mars, the most ambitious voyage of exploration ever conceived by mankind, is to place 6 men in a hamster cage in a Russian warehouse. As socialists, we should respect the achievements of men like Sigmund Jahn and we should not hesitate to proclaim that while capitalism is looking to save itself by crushing the living standards and life opportunities of working people; an alternative society with the values of progress, science and bold endeavour for the betterment of humanity at its heart is not only possible, but could allow us all to reach out into the stars.

( ) Space policies serve to *decrease* market power – we entrench a notion of government that’s the opposite of capitalism.

Launius ‘8

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

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

It might be argued that spaceflight represented an expression of national power in the context of the “positive liberal state” offered the world by the united States. In essence, this position celebrates the use of state power for “public good.” Human exploration of the solar system was always viewed as reasonable and forward-looking and led to “good” results for all concerned, or so adherents of this master narrative believed. Without perhaps seeking to do so, Apollo offered an important perspective on a debate that has raged over the proper place of state power since the beginning of the republic. as one historian remarked about this philosophy of government, the state would actively “promote the general welfare, raise the level of opportunity for all men, and aid all individuals to develop their full potentialities.” It would assert active control in this process, seeking improvements to society “both economic and moral, and they did not believe in leaving others alone.”9 The Democrats of the 1960s believed in activist government, and examples on the part of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations abound. this translated into an ever increasing commitment to the use of the government to achieve “good ends”—the war on poverty, the peace Corps, support for civil rights, numerous great Society programs, space exploration, and a host of other initiatives are examples. These all represented a broadening of governmental power for what most at the time perceived as positive purposes.

\*\*\* A-to Cap K Alts \*\*\*

Cap K – Alt Answers – Space-Specific

( ) Alt will fail – all of their impact calc is moot without a workable alt
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Maybe there are in fact useful natural resources in space, mind-expanding vistas, opportunities for future human discovery and growth? Maybe capital growth is the only social mechanism capable of driving society forward across difficult technological barriers to access these new opportunities? Maybe society must continue to grow at the present time, if it is not to risk falling into decline? But Dickens and Ormrod do not want to discuss these aspects of reality. Understandably so, for it might suggest that capitalism was leading us towards a worthwhile destination, and that would contradict their ideological purpose. Speaking personally, I have no difficulty at all with people who have no interest in spaceflight, and I am sure many pro-space advocates would agree with me. There are many worthwhile causes and interests in the world, far too many to engage with in a single lifetime, and I do understand that other people have different priorities. I do not feel the need to ascribe to them a “kind of personality disorder”. But then I am heir to the 18th-century Enlightenment, which promoted tolerance and pluralism as well as exploration, technology, human progress and, yes, capitalism. Dickens and Ormrod seem to belong to a very different intellectual tradition. Yet their motivations are surely charitable ones? They have the relief of poverty and suffering at heart. They call for the humanisation of space, if it happens at all, to “emphasize collective responsibilities on Earth” and “to improve the lot of the dispossessed” as an alternative to “being founded on the interests of capital, and individualist fantasies” (p.190). Are these not worthy sentiments? But such a change of tack is moot until somebody can demonstrate a way of organising the economy which is both more generous to those at the bottom of the social scale, and capable of replacing our modern liberal democratic market capitalist society without losing its immense productiveness – as well as pensioning off the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And, as we have seen, Dickens and Ormrod have no such alternative to offer. While they like to suggest that they do have an alternative, the implied vision of violent overthrow of the existing social order (p.181-182) and imposition of a repressive Leninist state (complete with psychiatric prisons for political dissidents) would clearly fail disastrously on all three counts.

( ) \*\*Solvency for our Space Advantages is much better than solvency for your Cap K Alt
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And the desired implication is unashamedly blatant when the plans of space advocates – often accompanied by detailed calculations and designs, and well supported by the historical precedent of globalisation – are dismissed as “daydreaming” and “fantasies” (p.141; 74, 190), while the authors’ own preferred future – which they are only able to allude to in the vaguest possible terms and which has highly discouraging historical precedents – is a “hope” and an “aim” (p.78; 190) towards which “alliances” are “forged” (p.189, 190). Thus the relative plausibility of these two future scenarios is reversed, not by reasoned argument, but by the choice of loaded words to describe them. Similarly, the charge that space advocates are indulging in “escapism” is rich indeed, coming from authors who insinuate on every page that all the desperately difficult problems of world development, wealth distribution and security will magically disappear after the installation of “alternative forms of consciousness” and “popular control”. In reality, dreams of escaping into a socially just society which does not suffer from these problems are far more fantastic than the plans of would-be space colonists, which deal with the world as it is, not as an unattainable utopia.

Cap K – Rejection Alt Specifically Fails

( ) Rejection Alts don’t hurt capitalism one bit – they just re-ify it.

Alternative Economics ’10

(Angel Economics is blog devoted to an alternative economic systems– this card is internally quoting Mark Fisher who teaches and serves as a visiting Fellow at the University of East London, Goldsmiths, University of London, and the City Literary Institute. Review of 'Capitalist Realism' by Mark Fisher – Monday, 25 January 2010 – http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:\_DlKHx-B88QJ:angeleconomics.blogspot.com/+deep+AROUND%281%29+space+AROUND%2815%29+capitalism&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=firefox-a&source=www.google.com)

Putting this in other words: insofar as anti-capitalism is merely expressed or performed or displayed, it is not, truly, anti-capitalism. Fisher himself is perfectly clear and indeed very illuminating on this (indeed, it is the basic thesis of the book): “Capitalist ideology in general, Zizeck maintains, consists precisely in the overvaluing of belief- in the sense of inner subjective attitude – at the expense of the beliefs we exhibit and externalize in our behaviour. So long as we believe (in our hearts) that capitalism is bad, we are free to continue to participate in capitalist exchange. According to Zizeck, capitalism in general *relies on this* structure of *disavowal*” (13). (Pursuing this line, Fisher makes a telling critique of the anticapitalist movement which came to prominence in Seattle (and which still exists, in different forms): “[S]ince the form of its activities tended to be the staging of protests rather than political organization, there was a sense that the anti-capitalism movement consisted of making a series of hysterical demands which it didn’t expect to be met” (14) One would bridle at this kind of comment if it came from a lesser viewpoint. As it is, it is fortifyingly perceptive.)

Dedev/Communes/Low-Growth-Style Alts all fail

( ) Dedev and Low-growth style alts fail in the Space Context – this also internal link turns all of their Cap-Sustainability claims.
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There are thus two plausible end-points to our current phase of growth: collapse back to a pre-industrial level (the supernova burns out), or continued growth taking us onto a sustainable level of technological maturity (the baby grows up). The difference between these two future courses is immense. In terms of population, the carrying capacity of Earth for human populations is greater than the current 6 or 7 billion, but not very much so, perhaps a few tens of billions (depending on the technologies available). Any retreat to medieval levels of technology would cut this figure by a factor of ten, probably down to less than a billion. But the carrying capacity of the Solar System is at least a million times greater than that of a high-tech Earth, and that of the Galaxy at least a billion times greater again than that of the Solar System. The present-day situation of human society is therefore that it finds itself at a cross-roads of unparalleled significance. If growth is not maintained, then, unless they can reignite that growth phase, our descendants are forever restricted to planet Earth. But must they necessarily fall back to a medieval or even more primitive level? Could industrial civilisation survive for a while in a zero-growth phase at around its present-day level of development, and if so, for how long? In any discussion of mankind and space, this is a key question which must be addressed. Certainly, pre-industrial civilisations have survived with little change over millennial timespans, but to what extent does industrial technology change this picture? And what about million-year timespans? The only types of industrial civilisation we have observed so far have been that based on capitalist economics, and that based on socialism, in which a political ideology takes over the role of capital. Capitalist societies would seem to be expansionary in their very nature: they are defined by the self-multiplying power of capital. But could a socialist society, one with a suitable ideology which was sufficiently severely imposed, preserve zero growth indefinitely? I think not, because societies evolve in an unpredictable manner. Governments which have tried to maintain control in, say, Tokugawa Japan (1603-1868) or Soviet Russia (1917-1989) have failed in their goals of stability (Japan) or planned growth (Russia), and modern liberal democracy works by limiting its ambitions and ceding much power to the economy at large. Even a global dictatorship, which unlike those two historical examples would by definition not face competition from abroad, would, I think, be unable to control all the disruptive political, technological and economic forces emerging unpredictably worldwide over centuries and millennia. The result would then be either the breakout of a new phase of growth, or decline and collapse. In view of the likelihood of long-term adverse climate change (whether triggered by industrial pollution, or asteroid impact, or an outbreak of super-vulcanism, or the return of ice-age conditions, or solar variations), and in addition the persistent threat of global high-tech conflict (whether spreading destruction by nuclear weapons, or computer viruses, or genetically engineered organisms, or microscopic or macroscopic robots), decline would be the more plausible outcome. Nevertheless, the question as to how long a global zero-growth industrial civilisation could survive in a stable state on one planet is an interesting one, though not one that is likely to attract unbiased analysis by modern sociology. What, however, if growth is maintained? Surely Earth will become overburdened and that growth will lead to environmental and social collapse? The point here is that, while the resources of Earth are limited, those of the Solar System are very much greater. Growth in population sizes and in the usage of energy and raw materials may therefore continue for a number of centuries into the future, provided that two conditions are met: \* Material growth on Earth levels off; \* Material growth in space and on other planets takes over the upward trend. Is this not equivalent to saying that Earth must settle down with a zero-growth society before space development begins? No, so long as the terrestrial and extraterrestrial economies are linked. While this remains true, it will be possible for investors on Earth to invest capital in extraterrestrial development, and receive dividends back from that development. While most Earth-dwelling people will remain on the mother planet, there will also be flows of people, goods and ideas between Earth and her colonies, which must also have a profound economic effect. A net inflow of value to Earth is in any case necessary in order that terrestrial investment in outer space does not merely produce inflation in the home economy. But that inflow need not be of material goods, and is more likely to consist of energy (solar power delivered on microwaves or lasers) and information (software and product development). But surely ultimately the limits of the Solar System will be reached, and the interplanetary civilisation have to settle down as a zero-growth society? Yes, granted. But this differs from a zero-growth planet Earth due to the immense size of the Solar System, which is larger than Earth by between four and six orders of magnitude, depending how far out one wants to go – to the distance of Mars, say, or to the Oort comet cloud far beyond Pluto. An interplanetary industrial civilisation is secure for the long term in a way that a monoplanetary one is not, because it is too large to form a unity, either politically or environmentally, and because it is forced to adapt to a wide range of hostile environmental conditions. It will therefore be secure against any conceivable environmental or military disaster, because such a disaster can only affect a single planet, or at most a limited region of the system. Climate change or world war on Earth has no effect on Mars, and vice versa. And with the majority of the population in orbiting artificial space colonies, even a major change in solar luminosity could be tolerated (though such a change is not expected to have a noticeable effect for hundreds of millions of years yet). With interplanetary civilisation, the social system as a whole can tolerate decline and collapse in particular locations, because they can then be recolonised from outside. Once humanity achieves interstellar status, this security factor is clearly vastly enhanced. However, in order for interplanetary growth to occur in the first place, an economic mechanism must be in place to drive it. The most suitable economic mechanism that has been demonstrated so far is capitalism. Its need for continuous expansion makes it highly appropriate as an economic system for a society colonising its local planetary system.

( ) The Alt won’t end-up pushing a strong econ or space – the result is extinction.
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It is not clear whether an economic system based on ideology could perform this function of capitalism. If the ideology was growth-oriented, then it would have no reason to conflict with the existing capitalist order, but would rather work in concert with it. But in the more plausible case that it was oriented towards social stability and economic stagnation, particularly in view of the environmentalist, anti-growth or anti-consumerist agendas it might very likely serve, then it would not want to promote disruptive new technologies such as those of access to space. The idea of a socially just socialist society (if such a hypothetical entity is possible) expanding into space is therefore a questionable one. If Earth remained divided among competing centres of power, then they might make the leap to interplanetary capability even without the driving force of capitalist economics. However, the competitive Moon-race of the 1960s showed, firstly, that if one competitor drops out, the other may well lose interest to the point of abandoning capabilities developed for that competition, and secondly, that an ideologically based collectivist society is unlikely to make a good showing in the technologies required. Economic growth, however, has a vested interest in preserving and extending gains made. Given that the opportunities for growth in space are so large, it seems unlikely that the present burst of growth will reach a plateau until space has been colonised. There is in fact an inconsistency about the idea of an industrial civilisation which does not move beyond its home planet – like a lone tree in the middle of a fertile plain. Such a tree will either die off, or it will naturally reproduce until it has engendered a whole forest, in which a far greater variety of life is possible than on the unsheltered plain. Similarly, a persistent industrial civilisation on one planet will naturally tend to populate its local planetary system, because the unique feature of industrialism is its applicability to a wide range of environments, not only earthlike ones. We here refer to an interplanetary civilisation as a “universal society”, because is it capable of making a home for itself anywhere in the astronomical universe. Some comments on the sociology of such a society follow. The decision-point There exists a historically brief period of a few centuries in which a civilisation at our current level of development may take one of two very different paths: it may successfully complete the transformation from a low-tech (pre-industrial) to a high-tech (fully industrial) society, or it may fall back onto a low-tech level. Finding a stable state inbetween these two levels seems unlikely: the dynamics of growth tend towards completing the process, while the limits to growth on Earth tend towards rendering the intermediate phase of a unified globalised society insecure. The world’s energy limits are, however, not as imminent as was believed in the latter part of the 20th century. The feared peak and subsequent decline in fossil fuel production has been greatly postponed by new discoveries and new extraction technologies for shale oil and gas and for methane hydrates. Meanwhile the decade-long flatlining of global temperature estimates has led to the end of the climate mania and of the extremist anti-growth movement that grew up around it. While the limits to growth on Earth remain, they are of a long-term nature, and will allow global civilisation an adequate breathing-space to develop into a high-tech one. A high-tech society possesses by definition the technologies required for access to and use of the resources of its local planetary system, and therefore experiences an incentive to become an interplanetary society. Since technologies for safe, economic and sustainable interplanetary travel and habitation are quite hard for a monoglobal civilisation to master, a successful transition to multiglobal range is by no means a foregone conclusion. But since the reward in terms of access to new territorial, material and power resources is so great, the impact of this social decision-point on the subsequent history of the species is of unparalleled significance. Ultimately the jump to interplanetary status is necessary, not only for the long-term growth of civilisation, but also for its long-term survival.

\*\*A-to Space Militarization/Imperialism K’s\*\*

A-to Any Militarism or Imperialism K

( ) \*\*Your Alt solves nothing, your offense is exaggerated, and you make things worse.
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The concluding chapter sets “cosmic imperialism” against “social resistance”. Somehow the use of these heavily loaded terms escapes the authors’ critical analysis and sets up a vision of evil versus good. But while the intentions of the implicitly evil imperialists are clear, good is still bogged down with a problem defining its mission: “The science of outer space is now being deployed to humanize the cosmos in ways that not only reproduce the social order, but extend this order indefinitely into the cosmos. But an explanatory critique hopefully also shows that there is nothing inevitable about this process. Social and political alliances can be, and are being, forged against this particular form of humanization. New types of common sense can be constructed. Contemporary forms of subjectivity which are alienated from the cosmos and dreaming about being part of it are not inevitable. They are the product of recent times and can certainly undergo change in a more socially progressive direction.” (p.189) But what “new types of common sense”? What more socially progressive “forms of subjectivity”? The reader is not told. Perhaps because they do not exist? In general it is therefore clear what Dickens and Ormrod wish to do away with, but impossible to say, beyond vague hints and allusions, what they want to see appear in their place. A socialist society? A police state? A Marxist-Leninist dictatorship? Note their chilling comment on modern society “in which there is simply not enough repression” (p.74) – whether or not the authors intended it as such, to the reader this suggests a clear enough invitation for the secret police to move in and start arresting those guilty of thought crimes! Any validity *their criticisms* of present-day society may possess is completely lost as a result of this structural weakness. So, granted: “The United States government is by far the dominant military force in outer space. And its aim in militarizing outer space is to achieve what the US Joint Chiefs of Staff call ‘full-spectrum domination’, one in which the US government actively enforces a monopoly over outer space as well as air, land and sea.” (p.94) Fine. A clear enough statement of fact. So why the disapproving tone, why the constant insinuation that this is some terrible tyranny consolidating its power over the world? How else would you enforce world security? And supposing that it does represent an intolerable tyranny: *what are you proposing to do about it?* What alternative might be possible, what is the roadmap towards realising that alternative (space people love roadmaps) – and how might it be policed? Would it promote social peace and prosperity if the military domination of one country were replaced by the military domination of an international bureaucracy such as the United Nations, or by a balance between a number of competing superpowers, as in the 1960s? Would its achievement starting from our present position be remotely practical? Is a peaceful world with no military domination at all conceivable? These questions are not addressed. Instead, we get brief mentions of “resistance”, one form of which is “localised social movements now being made international in scope” such as the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space (p.72, 100). The Joint Chiefs of Staff must be quaking in their boots.

Militarism/Imperialism – their Link is Epistemologically Biased

( ) Space *can* be deployed neutrally – claims that it will be co-opted are epistemologically biased.
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Our authors seem incapable of neutrally describing the possibility of humanity spreading into space, but must spin it into a morality play in which the universe is reduced to “an inferior object to be colonized and subjugated” (p.143), an innocent victim in their fable of cosmic imperialism. If taken seriously, this piece of nonsense would also rule out any use of materials, not to mention animals and plants, for human ends on Earth. While how space can be settled by a “socialist or communist society” (p.190) without colonising or subjugating it is, needless to say, not explained. But the most egregious example of mendacious argument in Cosmic Society concerns the allegation of “cosmic narcissism”, which pro-space advocates, we are told, demonstrate in an extreme form: “These activists are pursuing fantasies about exploring and developing space which manifest themes from the infant’s experience of self during the stage of primary narcissism” (p.74). This is a “kind of personality disorder” first outlined by Freud (p.73). “The promise of power over the whole universe [sic] is therefore the latest stage in the escalation of the narcissistic personality. [...] Space travel and possible occupation of other planets further inflate people’s sense of omnipotence” (p.75). And an earlier author “examines how in Western societies people experience the world (or indeed the universe) through the ‘having’ mode, whereby individuals cannot simply appreciate the things around them, but must own and consume them” (p.75). But “narcissistic relationships with external nature are intrinsically unsatisfying. Objectifying nature and the cosmos does not actually empower the self, but rather enslaves it.” (p.76) What we have here, issued in measured academic cadences, is nothing short of outrageous. That university academics could sink so low is a scandal. Dickens and Ormrod (and their numerous sociological predecessors listed on p.73) are saying in effect: you disagree with us, therefore you must be suffering from a “personality disorder”! This charge inevitably links them with the abuses of the Soviet system (see for example Sidney Bloch and Peter Reddaway, Psychiatric Terror: How Soviet Psychiatry Is Used to Suppress Dissent, Basic Books, 1977). Consider, firstly, the lop-sidedness of the argument. Space advocates are suffering from infantile fantasies, a disorder characterised by Freud as “adult narcissism”? Well and good: then what about people who suffer infantile fantasies of developing “alternative forms of consciousness” (p.77)? What about people who talk earnestly about the “crises of capitalism”, with approving references to Marx, Engels and Lenin, and to authors who talk glibly of “overthrowing the social order” (p.182), more than a decade after the final collapse of the Soviet bloc? Who are so intolerant of dissent and so desperate to be right that their opponents have to be denigrated as psychiatric nutcases? How exactly did Freud characterise their psychological syndrome? “Adult Marxissism”?

Miltiary K’s – Non-Militaristic Space Reps = Good

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

\*\*\*A-to Any K that is claims to be a “pre-requisite” to exploration, or claims the K turns the quality of the Aff’s exploration\*\*\*

A-to “Pre-requisite – Must do K first, then space later”

( ) The K is not a pre-requisite – it goes in the opposite direction. Exploration remedies their terrestrial K.
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Clearly, that cannot be planned in advance. But one certainty is that production in space, using the natural raw materials and energy of space and of other worlds, will be significantly different from production on Earth, and therefore, according to Marx and Engels, will trigger changes in social relations. Not, however, according to Dickens and Ormrod, who write that extending terrestrial society into space seems likely “Tragically [...] to make outer space in the image of the Earth itself, with all its power relations and consequent social injustices” (p.176). But would they also argue that the power relations and social injustices of today’s internet world are the same as in the Victorian England of child labour and women’s subordination? Then why imagine that space development will not also change society? Dickens and Ormrod’s fundamental thesis might be stated in a nutshell as: first solve all social problems on Earth, only then, after justice and equality have been achieved for all, turn to the exploration and development of outer space. But they have no idea of when or even whether their social objectives can be achieved. While even if they are achieved, our authors have no guarantee that the resulting society, without the impetus to growth generated by capitalism, will still be capable of expansion into space. Their equation of change with “crisis” strongly suggests that it will not. In the light of historical materialism, which after all “provides a solid foundation for thinking about the cosmos and how and why it is being humanized” (p.50), that programme *must be inverted*: first go into space and set up space production. The consequences of such an industrial revolution may then play out into a fairer society for all – just as, on Earth, the revolutionary ideals and technologies of the Enlightenment lagged behind the start of colonisation of the Americas by a century or more.

\*\*\* A-to K’s saying Aff brings violence/’isms with us to space \*\*\*

Space does not extend terrestrial violence

( ) Space does not extend terrestrial violence and – unlike the alt – it provides pragmatic way of overcoming their K.
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Certainly, this was an event in which the world found itself reflecting, literally looking back at itself, in a way that had never been possible before—seeing itself through the eyes of Apollo, as it were. Views of Earth as a single entity on which no political border is visible produced a heightened sense of humanity’s shared condition; and simultaneously, a hope that, in a world capable of such an accomplishment, we as a single people might actually be able to address those problems on Earth which some had seen this project as evading. From Apollo 8’s image of an Earthrise appearing over the desolate lunar horizon—an image which “revolutionized public perception of our fragile planet”—to Apollo 17’s equally iconic image of a fully illumined blue marble hanging in the vasty deeps of space—a “photographic manifesto for global justice,” it has been called—Apollo altered our sense of what it is to be human (NASA, NSSDC; Poole, Earthrise plate 18). For all the pride that has been expressed in Apollo, the public response was, and to some extent continues to be, defined thus also by the humility it evoked in recognition of how tiny an accomplishment it really was—“a rebuke to the vanity of humankind,” as historian Robert Poole put it (Earthrise 13, 10). In taking us out away from the Earth, Apollo engendered a new way of gauging proportion—in respect not only to the universe but also to the challenges which faced humanity at home. Neil Armstrong noted that, from the surface of the Moon, he could blot out the entire Earth with his thumb; when asked if that made him feel like a giant, he replied, “No; it made me feel really, really small” (qtd. in Mackie). Though Apollo was not in any conventional sense a divine event, the images it produced of the planet’s collective humanity seem nonetheless to have produced in many what Freud called “the oceanic feeling”— the “feeling of an indissoluble bond [. . .] with the external world as a whole” (36, 37). Numerous religions refer explicitly to union with God, the all, or the infinite, but “one may,” Freud was prepared to believe, “rightly call oneself religious on the ground of this [oceanic] feeling alone, even if one rejects every belief and every illusion” (36).9 Freud here somewhat anticipates Derrida, who in the Gift of Death came to speak also of a kind of religiosity that is “without reference to religion as institutional dogma”—what he called “the possibility of religion without religion” (49). It is the hesitation implicit in such formulations that marks the postsecular as a moment of what McClure calls “partial faith”—a moment, that is, both of “dramatically ‘weakened’ religiosity” and of a “religiously inflected disruption of secular constructions of the real.” And it is here, in this condition of mutualized ontological interference—within a “strategy of perhaps”—that postsecular rhetoric can be seen renegotiating access to the oceanic (Partial Faiths ix, 3, 14). This renegotiation can be seen, for instance, in the “almost” in Poole’s symbolic legitimacy of) an image drawn from religion, while partially displacing it with a nonsymbolic, technologically derived (and hence, seemingly more real) secular counterpart (Interview). As is seen also in No One Walks, where the boy’s experience of the oceanic—“his body [. . .] drifted through the dazzling crescents’ glow”—coincides with the discovery of truth as “the many in one,” the spiritual can be seen to emerge not so much from the discourse of the religious as from the destabilization of the discursive and ontological boundaries that might otherwise have repeated its partitioning.

A-to “But, who Gets on the Spaceship ?... ‘isms won’t follow us into Space

( ) ‘isms won’t follow us into space – the opposite is true.

Larabee ‘94

Ann Larabee is Associate Professor of American Thought and Language at Michigan State University. Remembering the Shuttle, Forgetting the Loom: Intepreting the Challenger Disaster –Postmodern Culture, Volume 4, Number 3, May 1994 (Article) – via Project Muse

The political and social meanings of this consensual future are quite apparent in the imagined space settlements of Living and Working in Space. Philip Robert Harris refers to the expansion of the human species, the global human family, into the solar system, fulfilling a natural urge for frontier exploration. But his space settlements are built and inhabited by only a segment of that family, the postindustrial knowledge class, envisioned as a cross-disciplinary group of scientists, engineers, technicians, corporate managers, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, physicians, teachers, journalists, lawyers, politicians, architects, film makers, and designers. Harris writes: the colonists to the New World during the eighteenth century were largely poor, ill-used white artisans and indentured servants, as well as African slaves. The prospects are that the space colonists of the twenty-first century will be more affluent and self-directed, better educated and chosen. Expertise is required of specialists in cross-cultural relocation and living in exotic environments to design systems for deployment and support of spacefarers.54 # Thus, the Challenger disaster provided the text for the post-catastrophe survival of the knowledge class, constructed and maintained through systems theories. The Challenger disaster suggested that technological and organizational systems were ever on the verge of collapse; the massive public relations campaign for space settlements imagines a safe new biosphere, a closed ecology, for academics, civil servants, and corporate managers, freed from environmental disaster, atmospheric impurity, starvation, poverty, disease, and gravity. Harris suggests that this cross-disciplinary community will result in a transformation of human consciousness, a spirit of collaboration that will trickle down to the problematic Earth populations left behind.

\*\*\* Space de-constructs your K \*\*\*

Space solves Militarism, State, Capitlism

( ) Space is a mechanism to de-construct State, Capitalist, and Militaristic violence

Collins ‘8

Martin Collins is a curator at the Smithsonian Institution's National Air and Space Museum in Washington, D.C. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Maryland and is the author/editor of several books on space history and on science, technology, and society in the twentieth century, including Space Race: The US-USSR Competition to Reach the Moon (1999). A Chapter in the Book: Remembering the Space Age – Chapter 11 “A Second Nature rising: Spaceflight in an era of Representation” – http://www.nss.org/resources/library/spacepolicy/Remembering\_the\_Space\_Age.pdf

Let’s shake this mix of semiotics, capitalism, spaceflight, the global and the local, and consider a couple of examples. In public discourse on globalization, capitalism—restless, u.S. and european-centric, with asia on the rise—has drawn the most attention. But the u.S. military, as already inferred, has played an essential part, creating seemingly strange linkages between national security and a rampant transnational consumer culture. Consider the example of the global positioning System (GPS), a network of satellites designed and operated by the u.S. air Force (uSaF). Conceived in the early 1970s and only becoming fully operational in 1995, gpS’s history straddled the Cold War and its market-oriented aftermath. the system provided a soldier, ship, airplane, or missile with information on their exact position anyplace on the planet via signals encoded with highly accurate time data, its profound effects symbolized by its use in guiding “smart” bombs and missiles with deadly, precise accuracy in the post-September 11 conflicts in afghanistan and Iraq.26 In recent years, satellite photographic images of these “smart” actions have been a staple of television news and are widely available on the Internet.27 In the 1990s, though, GPS became not just a tool for the u.S. military, but for anyone, anywhere in the world—for a hiker in the rocky Mountains, for mom and dad driving the family car, as well as for past and present adversaries such as a Chinese soldier or a terrorist. In its posture toward users, the system became egalitarian in the extreme. Not surprisingly, in the go-go market-driven post-Cold War world, business and consumer use of gpS vastly outstripped that of the military. Imagine a use for location, tracking, or accurate time information and one found gpS there, often in the intimate contours of daily life— say, tracking a spouse suspected of having an affair. Indeed, one can “google” a phrase such as “cheater tracker” and find gpS products marketed for that purpose. Combined with a geographic information system (such as satellite-based google maps), one can track and visualize the itinerary of an errant mate.28 Such uses are not just confined to the u.S.: as the New York Times observed, “the world has incorporated our gpS into its daily life as rapidly as americans took up the atM banking network.”29 Nothing, perhaps, speaks more to the distinctive conjunction between production and semiotics in the global era, to the total, actual, not merely metaphorical, planetary scale of this conjunction, than GPS, its radio signals equally available to friends and foes, to weapons in flight, and to off-the-shelf products offering to meet every consumer need. the gpS story is not the same as that by-gosh, by-golly story of the origins of the Internet—of “isn’t it strange that a research project into maintaining command and control during a nuclear holocaust gave us this wildly diverse, unpredictable, electronic social universe.” It is different and more revealing of the transformation in the world order since the early 1970s. It still is, in essence, controlled by the u.S. military, and in a way unprecedented in u.S. history unites a classic function of empire—controlling and maintaining its perimeters—with the churning demands of capital and consumer appetites. and not just those based in united States, but everywhere. gpS has become a military-consumerist hybrid, in which each political-cultural domain has continually redefined the other. We—a transnational we—know the precision bomb blast from afghanistan or Iraq and the “cheater tracker” originate in and depend on the same system of production, yet in our everyday cultural frame of semiotics, we allow them to maintain their separateness. It is tensions such as these that continually redefine the global and the local, geographically and in time, and keep the united States—and its preeminence and exploitation of spaceflight— in the center of this dialectic. Consider another example, drawn from my current research that tracks Boorstin’s concern about semiotics and the structuring of our sense of the real. Like gpS, Iridium was and is a satellite constellation that completely embraces the planet—but with a different purpose, to provide telephony and data services, and with a different institutional actor in the lead, a multinational corporation. Conceived in 1987 at Motorola, a Fortune 500 company and a leading firm in cellular phone equipment and systems business and in semiconductors, the Iridium satellite project seemed to epitomize the historical moment: as the Cold War waned and collapsed, markets rather than government would lead into a techno-democratic future, and corporations rather than nations would articulate the pathways through which the local and the global took shape. the largest privately-financed technology project ever undertaken, and with an array of international investors, including the newly constituted russian Federation and the people’s republic of China, Iridium stood as symbol of this fusion of technology, corporations, markets, and international politics. In 1998, as the system neared completion, Wired magazine proclaimed, “It’s a bird, it’s a phone, it’s the world’s first pan-national corporation able to leap geo-political barriers in a single bound. part of my challenge in untangling this story has been to understand the varied ways in which semiotics functioned in a multinational corporation (MNC). You might expect that a MNC, deep-pocketed, well-connected politically, at home and internationally, with tens of factory and sales sites around the world would be an instrumental historical actor extraordinaire, a big “them” guy able to exert power in ways unavailable to all the little “us” guys. and, of course, that crude truth is there. But so is another one, one in which Motorola regarded the semiotic realm as real, a reality that required substantive corporate responses that intermingled culture, politics, and identity. as a literally planetary project, incorporating flesh-and-blood actors from around the world, Iridium dramatically highlighted the problem of semiotics—local, global, multiple, contesting, and not readily controlled—and the need for solutions. the Motorola’s response to this condition can be glimpsed in a 1998 book entitled Uncompromising Integrity: Motorola’s Global Challenge.31 the concept of culture stood as organizing precept. the narrative provided definitions of culture and related concepts that showed it as a structure, but varied in place and time, and as a process—national culture, subculture, host culture, enculturation, and transcultural. two key additional notions situated the discussion in the corporate context: “Motorola culture” and “home culture.” the first made clear that the organization had a semiotic sphere, derived from its own history and as a U.S. - centered capitalist institution. the second that that sphere was permeable and in flux because employees hailed from many localities around the world and because, as a multinational, the corporation always was operating in someone else’s backyard. Culture was something around which a company had to define itself (Motorola culture). Yet, in the global age, “home” was complex and mobile, reflective of the world’s many diasporas—of people, individually and en masse, following the flow lines of capital. home inhered in individuals even as they moved (with Motorola employees themselves an example) and in those places from which they came. Motorola and home cultures were oppositional and profoundly interpenetrating.32 Uncompromising Integrity’s preoccupation with culture—perceived as variegated and everywhere, in specific geographical places, in institutions (including Motorola), in individuals, and pulsing through the many channels of the media—had a corporate history. It encapsulated more than 15 years of high-level managerial attention to the global. It led executives in the late 1980s to create a hybrid academic-corporate institution—Motorola university—to engage and comprehend the fauna and flora of culture-world. this book was a product of that—a Motorola university press publication! Lest this example seem quirky and isolated, note that it exemplified a larger trend: over a decade, from the mid 1980s to mid 1990s, more than a thousand corporate universities were created in the united States—all of which were a response, in one fashion or another, to the perceived challenge of culture and semiotics to transnational business practice.33 the biography of the lead author—r. S. Moorthy—makes concrete some of the issues of identity and politics embedded in these developments. Born into an Indian family and raised in poverty in Malay, as a young man he found work in a Motorola facility in that country. his professional life at Motorola became one of reconciling his origins in a place with a specific history, one tied to colonialism and the new globalism, with the purposes and outlooks of a multinational firm. he found a way to marry his interests with Motorola’s culture preoccupation and he came to play a major role in establishing Motorola university, creating a subunit of that enterprise, the Center for Culture and technology. this vignette only is meant to suggest the complicated and non-obvious ways in which social boundaries got created and negotiated and how semiotics constrained and enabled this process at different levels of corporate activity. as one instance, consider this graphic (see figure) outlining the manufacturing flow for the Iridium project, one that required a transnational “virtual factory”— Motorola’s own phrase. In the lower right corner, we find included in the virtual factory Baikonaur, Kazakhstan and taiyuan, China. that Kazakhstan and China could be integral, functioning elements of a u.S.-based business project made sense only in the context of this belief in the everywhere-ness of culture and the reality of semiotic structures—whether in dealing with transnational elites or with questions of politics and identity in specific geographic locales. But as the project moved from planning and manufacturing execution to marketing, the instrumental view—think the way I, Iridium, want you to think, buy my phone—comes to the fore and you find a different way of presenting geographical specificity and cultural accommodation, bleached and abstracted back to the aims of the corporation and neo-liberal capitalism, and using enlightenment universals to facilitate those aims.34 Where do these examples leave us? What might we draw from this mix of state action and capitalism, of semiotics and on-the-ground practice, of geographical specificity, local meanings, and the meta-narratives of the West? and where does spaceflight fit into this contested field of action? I would point to two things. First, my recitation here advances a particularly modest claim: deep and important issues become visible when we recalibrate our interpretive lens and see spaceflight in history, rather than expecting it to be sui generis. Spaceflight—especially those near-earth applications cited here—has been a major element in creating the incarnation of the global we have experienced over the last 40 years. It has provided images and practices that have made the category of the global, natural and insistent, even when different actors give it different meanings. It has been a primary site in which prior categories of the modern—the nation state, the military, civil society, capitalism—have been refashioned and given new meanings. and in helping to elevate the importance of the global—to distribute its effects across regions and places, to recalibrate our sense of distance and time, of identity as a creation of community or the flows of transnational semiotics—it has helped to invigorate the meaning of the local. This has led to an intensified scrutiny of globalism’s origins in the West— emanating from its military, economic, political and cultural institutions—and in its ideological underpinnings, the legacy of the enlightenment, of universal values inhering in universal humans. Spaceflight thus has enabled the dominant vectors of the global and its critique.35

Extending the Perm and A-to Neg links – Space & “Master Narratives”

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

Launius ‘8

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

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

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

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

Collins ‘8

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

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

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

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

Gerovitch ‘8

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

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

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

\*\*A-to Specific K’s\*\*

Asteroid Reps Good

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

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

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

Cartography/Space Mapping K’s Wrong

( ) Mapping Space serves to destabilize conventional notions of Truth and order

McCallum 2K

(E. L. McCallum, Prof – English Dept at Michigan State University – Poetics Today, Volume 21, Number 2, Summer 2000 – Project Muse Database)

The recursive map in Snow Crash underscores the idea that data in cyberspace, like narrative itself, is a mapping or reconstruction of elements of the real. While this obvious notion is playfully employed to make the plot of Snow Crash work, it also functions performatively and theoretically, for the recursive information loop that emerges as Hiro locates himself through the cybermap replicates and literalizes a fundamental tenet of information theory: that redundancy provides better, more effective meaning. The recursive map doubles the information that Hiro has about his environment— not just what he senses through his body but also what he senses through his cyberconnection. The data loop, far from reifying reality as some determined truth that cyberspace seeks to approximate, becomes the leverage to destabilize any absolute coordinates of truth precisely because it is a feedback loop. Hiro’s navigation into the heart of the Raft with the aid of virtual maps and plans emphasizes how conditions change as agents make changes in the conditions: the map responds to changes in the situation that result from Hiro’s intervention, even though he is able to intervene because he has information. In short, neither reality nor cyberspace is stable in this text, and they mutually influence each other.

A-to Error-Replication/Tech Fixes Bad Args

( ) Error-replication arg wrong – assumes Space

Ashworth ‘10

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

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

A-to Heidegger/”Management”/Technological thought K’s

( ) Their “Object”, “Management”, and Tech Thought K is wrong and *has no impact* – assumes space.

Ashworth ‘10

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

Another example of the tendentious style of reasoning employed by Dickens and Ormrod is found in their repeated claim that outer space is “being made an object rather than a subject by some classes of people” (p.142). By the cosmos as “subject” they mean “a force dominating and controlling affairs on Earth”, through religious dogma or astrological superstition. But since the Enlightenment it has been increasingly envisaged as an “object, something to be constrained, managed and used towards human ends”. To the dominant modern social orders the heavens now “exist to be used, to be lived in, to be worked on and to be domesticated and dominated by society” (p.143); the universe is “something to be conquered, controlled and consumed as a reflection of the powers of the self” (p.76). Apparently this is supposed to be a bad thing. This psychological just-so story is presented as a damning argument against the modern world-view: the condemnatory tone of voice is unmistakable. But the argument, such as it is – based on the authors’ weak plea that the modern view is “intrinsically unsatisfying” (p.76) – is quite irrelevant; what matters for the study of society is how different cultural attitudes affect the survival and growth prospects of a civilisation in its interplanetary environment.

A-to Psycho-Analysis

( ) Psycho-analysis K is wrong and offensive in the context of space

Ashworth ‘10

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

What we have here, issued in measured academic cadences, is nothing short of outrageous. That university academics could sink so low is a scandal. Dickens and Ormrod (and their numerous sociological predecessors listed on p.73) are saying in effect: you disagree with us, therefore you must be suffering from a “personality disorder”! This charge inevitably links them with the abuses of the Soviet system (see for example Sidney Bloch and Peter Reddaway, Psychiatric Terror: How Soviet Psychiatry Is Used to Suppress Dissent, Basic Books, 1977). Consider, firstly, the lop-sidedness of the argument. Space advocates are suffering from infantile fantasies, a disorder characterised by Freud as “adult narcissism”? Well and good: then what about people who suffer infantile fantasies of developing “alternative forms of consciousness” (p.77)? What about people who talk earnestly about the “crises of capitalism”, with approving references to Marx, Engels and Lenin, and to authors who talk glibly of “overthrowing the social order” (p.182), more than a decade after the final collapse of the Soviet bloc? Who are so intolerant of dissent and so desperate to be right that their opponents have to be denigrated as psychiatric nutcases? How exactly did Freud characterise their psychological syndrome? “Adult Marxissism”? The implication is silently insinuated that by producing such armchair psychoanalysis our sociologists – themselves claiming to be oracles of pure adult reason untainted by infantile fantasies – have wisely trumped anything a space activist could possibly say on the matter. After all, the sociologists clearly know what will make other people happy – what will “empower” and what “enslaves” the self (p.76) – better than those people know themselves! But these totalitarian implications cannot be stated, for to do so would at once expose them as evident nonsense. In reality, any space activist wishing to be equally offensive could easily conjure up ways in which the revolutionary desire to overthrow the existing social order and institute a utopian state of social justice can be traced back to an angry sense of injustice nurtured from infancy. But such a Freudian fable would be just as equally irrelevant. For consider again the “reality principle” which is supposedly dear to our authors’ hearts (p.74, 139, 168). Their speculations about the psychiatric causes of the “narcissistic personality” who dreams of spaceflight are completely lacking in any discussion of the objective reality of the situation of human society in astronomical space.

A-to Psycho-Analysis/Cap K args

( ) Their psycho-analytic args are wrong in the space context, and Cap is able to change.

Ashworth ‘10

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

The answer seems to be that when Dickens and Ormrod (basing their discussion on Marx and Engels, p.50) use the word “crisis”, they actually mean no more than change, and when they speak of capitalism having “contradictions”, they mean no more than that our economic system is subject to the sorts of pressures which drive change. Thus: “The global market is proving increasingly unable to contain the many contradictions of capitalism” (p.179) actually means: the global market is developing in response to pressures for change. While the use of words such as “crisis” and “contradiction” may not help in elucidating economics, it does surround the economic system with a superficial aura of unsustainability and illegitimacy, which perfectly suits the authors’ polemical purpose. Thus an adaptable system which is responsive to changing circumstances is made to sound as if it were on the brink of collapse, without the inconvenience of actually having to produce arguments in support of such a dubious hypothesis. Similarly, slipping in the term “late capitalism” (meaning modern democratic capitalism, p.127) supplies the implication that the authors know how soon capitalism will be superseded by a different economic system, when in reality clearly they do not. The constant use of the word “capitalism” itself, unqualified by any adjective such as “democratic” or “liberal”, misleads readers by inciting them to fall into line with the authors’ assumption that the system is completely unregulated by governments answerable to a popular electorate. The authors can then offer “popular control” as a better alternative (p.123) without having to address difficult questions about the degree of popular control already in place, the practical limits of such control, or about where the optimum social balance between legislation and a free-market capitalist economy might lie. Obviously, in reality the capitalist system is highly regulated by governments. Constant references to “accumulation [of capital] by dispossession” and a total lack of references to accumulation by the creation of new wealth sneak in the misinformation that we live in a zero-sum society in which capitalism can only function by dispossessing vulnerable people of what is rightfully theirs. Certainly, there are new resources in space, but they can only ever be claimed by the already powerful (p.59-61). The broad mass of people benefit only to the extent that they are even further oppressed under the intensified sway of the ruling class, with ultimately their “every move being watched and targeted” from space (p.100). And the desired implication is unashamedly blatant when the plans of space advocates – often accompanied by detailed calculations and designs, and well supported by the historical precedent of globalisation – are dismissed as “daydreaming” and “fantasies” (p.141; 74, 190), while the authors’ own preferred future – which they are only able to allude to in the vaguest possible terms and which has highly discouraging historical precedents – is a “hope” and an “aim” (p.78; 190) towards which “alliances” are “forged” (p.189, 190). Thus the relative plausibility of these two future scenarios is reversed, not by reasoned argument, but by the choice of loaded words to describe them. Similarly, the charge that space advocates are indulging in “escapism” is rich indeed, coming from authors who insinuate on every page that all the desperately difficult problems of world development, wealth distribution and security will magically disappear after the installation of “alternative forms of consciousness” and “popular control”. In reality, dreams of escaping into a socially just society which does not suffer from these problems are far more fantastic than the plans of would-be space colonists, which deal with the world as it is, not as an unattainable utopia. The word “fix” is another favourite in Cosmic Society. A “fix” is a botch-up job: a mere “sticking-plaster”, a temporary, unstable solution to some social or economic problem (p.49-78, 113). The impression created is that such a solution is of no value because it merely creates new problems which then have to be solved in their turn – an example given is that the use of satellites has given rise to dangerous space junk (p.66-67, 153-154). Here again, the use of a misleading word is being offered as a substitute for argument, because the argument by itself would be too weak for the authors’ polemical purpose, and would attract tiresome counter-arguments. Obviously, one would not necessarily expect technological solutions to social or economic problems to be permanent, if they were introduced during a period of rapid technological change such as the one we are living in now. A long-established spacefaring civilisation would clearly routinely clear up its space junk or avoid creating any in the first place, but in order for us to progress to that stage we first have to see the problem and experience sufficient motivation to work out a solution appropriate to our current institutional and technological level. Later on we may find that our solution, that “temporary fix”, breaks down, and will feel the need to move on to the next higher level of solution. But because our authors have no interest in the likely end-point of this iteration, they therefore have no patience with the painstaking, step by step, evolutionary means which are the only ones through which it can be approached, and so those means must be denigrated as a “fix”. Beck’s notion of a “risk society”, which our authors draw upon (p.151-154), suffers from the same lack of a long-term overview. He, too, is trying to build the Palace of the Soviets without the use of any scaffolding. A major bone of contention for Dickens and Ormrod is consumerism: “Consuming goods can provide the illusory sense of omnipotence and self that the narcissist [of whom more in a moment] craves. They fantasize about their access to the world and its goods, failing to recognize the reality that they are still dependent individuals. If they make sufficient demands (particularly with the aid of money) they appear omnipotent and capable of acquiring and achieving almost anything. The reality principle has not struck home.” (p.74) But our authors are silent about the fact that the goods and technologies made widely available by capitalist development have vastly improved people’s lives in the developed world. We have been liberated from hunger, pestilence and the more arduous forms of manual labour, and have access to antibiotics, education, electrical appliances, domestic plumbing and travel opportunities which were unimaginable or the preserve of a tiny elite only a few generations ago. Perhaps Dickens and Ormrod are not as conversant with the “reality principle” as they claim to be? Note also the bogus psychological analysis: money gives people the “illusory sense of omnipotence”. This claim is so weird, so disconnected from the real experience of anyone of this reviewer’s acquaintance, as to defy comprehension. Could it perhaps apply to extremely rich people? But the discussion here is about mass consumers, for whom such a claim is simply absurd. The mass of people in Dickens and Ormrod’s world are doubly oppressed: by the social power structures of imperialist capitalism, and by the goods provided by consumerism – “a life of mindless consumption” (p.113). Apparently, so we are led to believe, they would be far better off being oppressed by the social power structures of socialism, and by a life of mindful poverty and hunger. Most readers will not call this “critical realism”, but something very different.

A-to Satellites K’s

( ) The Satellites-capitalism link is wrong and ignores the weakness of the alt
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Dickens and Ormrod have such a strong focus on selecting only those arguments which fit the Marxist-Leninist worldview that they have completely failed to notice the power struggle over the future of manned spaceflight which is so prominent at present. While big aerospace companies lobby for ambitious government exploration programmes which provide jobs at public expense but generate no profits, it is maverick entrepreneurs, some extremely rich but most not wealthy at all, who are pushing for the development of marketable services such as space tourism, and eventually space settlement. One would have expected this conflict to have attracted the attention of commentators who have “a concern throughout with social power” (p.1). But with the vested interests pushing for socialist-style programmes while the capitalists set up small companies to challenge the status quo, often unsuccessfully, the reality is too complex to illustrate the simplistic ideology of class struggle, and must therefore be ignored. Offering blatantly false assertions in order to reinforce the ideological message is not beyond these authors, when they approvingly report Amitai Etzioni’s criticism of the space race published in 1964. One of the claims made for the Apollo programme and for planetary exploration, according to Etzioni, “was that the structure of the universe itself would be better understood by space travel, but this too turned out to be a chimera, a money-making device” (p.188-189). In reality, while not making conspicuous amounts of money, lunar and planetary research via the Apollo landings and unmanned probes has led to a revolution in understanding of the Solar System, including a resolution of the long-standing mystery of the origin of the Moon. Etzioni, too, so far as can be judged from the report in Cosmic Society, is strong on the assertion that there are better alternatives to the conventional wisdom, but painfully shy about revealing what those alternatives might actually be. In chapter 4 the global information and surveillance industries mediated by satellites are linked to patterns of power in which order is imposed and maintained. The world’s populations are likened to prisoners under permanent observation, while big companies and governments consolidate and extend their power over them. Mention is made of resistance to that power, for example by anti-globalisation protesters and the Al Jazeera TV station (p.121). But the fact that democratic capitalism is more tolerant of dissent than any other social system yet devised is not discussed. Carl Sagan’s “error-correcting machinery in politics” is not referenced (The Demon-Haunted World, Headline, 1996, ch.25, “Real Patriots Ask Questions”). In fact, Sagan’s The Demon-Haunted World is not mentioned in the text or listed in the bibliography despite being one of the most prominent texts about society written by an active participant in and publiciser of space exploration and development.

A-to Space Tourism K’s

( ) Space Tourism K’s wrong – positive effects of the Aff outweighs their critical realism and capitalism args.
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Chapter 5 is concerned with space tourism, which it presents narrowly in terms of consumer psychology and relative social status: “Daydreaming about space, and indeed actually achieving those dreams in reality, can be seen as just another feature of consumerism infecting the whole of our lives” (p.141). Critical realists, apparently, do not need to consume. The desire to travel is roughly debunked with the pervasive implication that it is not worthwhile: “Capitalism, while generating alienation and disenchantment, is capable of providing apparent cures to these same problems” (p.133). What the real cure might be, or even whether any cure at all from these alleged problems is possible, is not stated. Did feudal or aboriginal (p.155) or socialist or communist (p.190) societies really generate more engagement and enchantment? Or have Dickens and Ormrod indulged in a little daydreaming themselves? Likewise, the economic implications of space tourism acting as a catalyst to transform society from a one-planet to an interplanetary civilisation – a function of major sociological interest, one would have thought – are ignored. In chapter 6, space and planetary colonisation is presented as irresponsible and dangerous. On terraforming: “The scale of possible consequences at the level of the solar system is quite frightening” (p.149), though what those consequences might be is left to the reader’s imagination. The ethical debate on colonisation and terraforming is touched upon, and here at least Dickens and Ormrod make a statement with which this reviewer is able to fully agree: “Ultimately [...] we cannot identify cosmic need in a disinterested, asocial way. The universe has no ‘value’ except that ascribed to it by society, for values are social constructs.” (p.158) Another interesting point in chapter 6 comes when space activists are criticised for using space to inspire young people and give meaning to people’s lives (p.168-169). But youth alienation and depression is not due to lack of a vision of space, we are told, but to socio-economic problems: specifically, their prospects of unemployment (p.169). No doubt this is perfectly correct. But the question is whether meaningful jobs are more likely to be created by investment in space tourism and development, or by the alternative forms of consciousness proposed on page 77, and on this question our authors have, needless to say, no analysis to offer.

Indicts on Cosmic Society Book (Dickens and Ormrod)

( ) Dickens-Ormrod are specifically wrong
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In conclusion, I have to say that Cosmic Society fails on its own terms. Thanks to its biased arguments, its heavy reliance on unspoken implications and utopian value judgements, its penchant for woolly psychologising and its deliberately misleading choices of words, it is neither a work of impartial research suitable for university studies, nor a convincing piece of political propaganda. Its uncritical use of clichéd terminology from Far Left politics, its simplistic reduction of modern society to a struggle of imperialism versus resistance and its selective blindness to both the merits of capitalism and the demerits of alternative economic systems mark it out as of interest to only a fringe audience. Despite being at heart a polemical work, it is unable to identify any positive goal capable of enlisting a reader’s support beyond vague platitudes about improving the lot of the dispossessed, which clash horribly against its use of authors and terminology associated with the nightmare socialist experiments of the 20th century. It implies a fantasy world of triumphant proletarian revolution whose connection with reality is far more questionable than the space colonisation plans which it criticises, and which furthermore contradicts the theory of historical materialism on which it is supposedly based. Its most striking charge against advocates of space exploration and colonisation is no more than infantile name-calling under a thin veil of psychoanalytic fable-telling. The sociology of a civilisation which engages realistically with the wider universe may one day be written, but Cosmic Society: Towards a Sociology of the Universe is not it. Meanwhile, in the spirit of following one’s own advice, this essay needs to move from a critical stance to a constructive one.