# Index

[SPACE FEM K 2](#_Toc297487704)

[1NC Shell 1/2 3](#_Toc297487705)

[2NC Overview 5](#_Toc297487706)

[2NC Link Overview 6](#_Toc297487707)

[Links 7](#_Toc297487708)

[2NC Impact Calc 8](#_Toc297487709)

[Impacts 9](#_Toc297487710)

[Perm Answers 1/2 10](#_Toc297487711)

[SPACE ANTHRO K 12](#_Toc297487712)

[Shell 1/2 13](#_Toc297487713)

[Space Colonization 15](#_Toc297487714)

[Aff Extinction Scenarios 16](#_Toc297487715)

[Technology 17](#_Toc297487716)

[Impacts 18](#_Toc297487717)

[Alt Solves 19](#_Toc297487718)

[A2: Technology Saves Life 20](#_Toc297487719)

[Ext: 21](#_Toc297487720)

[TECHNOLOGY K 22](#_Toc297487721)

[LINKS—Fem 1/2 23](#_Toc297487722)

[LINK- Security 25](#_Toc297487723)

[LINKS- Arendt 1/6 26](#_Toc297487724)

[Other People Agree With Arendt 1/3 32](#_Toc297487725)

[The Alt 35](#_Toc297487726)

# SPACE FEM K

## 1NC Shell 1/2

### The affirmatives Space Missions rely on the false representation of male technological superiority and infallibility

Bryld and Lykke 2k “Cosmodolphins: Feminist cultural studies of technology, animals and the sacred” pg. 25

The USA and Russia have both sustained their space narratives by celebrations of the powerful hardware and the super brave steel men who made the ‘conquest’ possible. This has been done through innumerable pictures, videos, books, exhibitions, official events (parades, etc.), that run counter to the conspicuous erasure of any trace of technology from the surface of the Whole Earth image, but at the same time maintain their own set of repressions. Whereas the Blue Planet picture keeps the question of technology, power and control out of sight, it is precisely these issues that the fiercely nationalistic American and Russian demonstrations of spaceships, rockets, launch-pads, astro- and cosmonaut equipment, mission control centres, etc., put on display. Conspicuously absent from these gadget-fetishistic representations is, in return, any shadow of the incalculable and any trace of the uncontrollable, even though these are an inescapable part of any story of interactions between human and nature. Both the USA and Russia like to demonstrate their technopower and indulge in narratives of technological infallibility and the highest potency of human power, control, cool detachment and rationality.

### We must take a socio-cultural approach to science in order to eliminate the bias associated with space science.

Kirkup, Janes, Woodward, Hovenden 2000 “The Gendered Cyborg” pg. 78

The dilemmas involved in the mobilization of gendered categories in the study of the r.ard sciences represent only one kind of problem facing the feminist subject who wants to do science studies in the present situation, in which the great divide still : it’s a hegemonic power over academia. I shall briefly discuss another, related problem which likewise forces feminists engaged in science studies out onto the [monstrous](file://-/onstrous) boundaries between the human and the non-human: namely, is science a socio-cultural construct, or can it lead to objective truth? In the transformatory work, which attempts to recast the image of science and open a space for feminist perspectives, a constructionist approach has proved very effectual. When science is reconsidered as a socio-cultural and textual construct, plenty : space is opened for feminist perspectives. At the same time, however, a new problem appears: constructionism threatens to bracket the question of scientific objectivity. It may lead to the unpleasant consequence that the feminist subject who thought that she had constructed a room of her own within science suddenly seems to have sold herself to non-science.Haraway's solution to the dilemma is her concept of "situated knowledges" (Haraway, 1991c: 183ff.), which defines a new kind of objectivity based upon an always partial, embodied and localized vision. It excludes the classical "god-trick" of modern science, pretending to build up a potentially universal, omniscient and omnipresi knowledge of the "laws of nature". My purpose here, however, is not to discuss this or other solutions, but in general, to emphasize that the dilemma of "objectivity or constructionism?" leads to ; questioning of the borders between human and non-human. As an illustration, I shall choose my own point of view, thereby situating myself and other feminists frorr. the humanities who find it important to take part in a trans disciplinary conversation, about feminism and science, and who perhaps are in a still more monstrous an: inappropriate/d position vis-a-vis science than feminist scientists. How does a: transgressive step taken by feminist scientists from a traditional conception c: objectivity to constructionism look from the margins that I inhabit?To me it seems to open up a path from my position of total outsider with no critical author-whatsoever to a position that is at least potentially rather powerful. Let us look first at the outsider's position. It goes without saying that the higher one climbs in the traditional hierarchy of sciences, as defined by Auguste Comte, an : the more one's object of study is distanced from the human pole of the great div the less a feminist voice from the humanities counts. A modern version of this kir.: of outlook can be found in the discussion of feminism and science undertaken bv the philosopher of science Isabelle Stengers (Stengers, 1994). She is critical of the hierarchical thinking implied in traditional approaches to science, but wants to kee-the distinctions between human and natural sciences clear. In her opinion, feminists have made a stronger case for playing a role in the transformation of science im­precisely those sciences which are not at the top of the traditional scientific hierarchy. It is possible, Stengers says, to criticize the externalpolitical context of the *1* sciences from feminist and other political points of view. Moreover, she find-desirable that all those who are being othered by science should articulate politico demands with respect to this context. But this critique of the externalcontext w. not, cannot, and shall not, so Stengers claims, open a way to the internalcore of the scientific problem.

1NC Shell 2/2

### The alternative is to reject the affirmative: We must first discuss feminist ideologies before all else to prevent bias in the scientific and political communities which will harm future studies and endorse false values.

Anderson 9 [Prof of women’s studies &philosophy at Michigan, “Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science,” AW] (PAGE 56)

The symbolic identification of the scientific with a masculine outlook generates further cognitive distortions. The ideology of masculinity, in representing emotion as feminine and as cognitively distorting, falsely assimilates emotion-laden thoughts—and even thoughts about emotions—to sentimentality. In identifying the scientific outlook with that of a man who has outgrown his tutelage, cut his dependence on his mother, and is prepared to meet the competitive demands of the public sphere with a clear eye, the ideology of masculinity tends to confuse seeing the natural world as indifferent in the sense of devoid of teleological laws with seeing the social world as hostile in the sense of full of agents who pursue their interests at others' expense (Keller 1992, 116-18). This confusion tempts biologists into thinking that the selfishness their models ascribe to genes and the ruthless strategic rationality their models ascribe to individual organisms (mere metaphors, however theoretically powerful) are more "real" than the actual care a dog expresses toward her pups. Such thoughts also reflect the rhetoric of unmasking base motivations behind policies that seem to be benevolent, a common if overused tactic in liberal politics and political theory. The power of this rhetoric depends on an appearance/reality distinction that has no place where the stakes are competing social models of biological phenomena, whose merits depend on their metaphorical rather than their referential powers. Thus, to the extent that the theoretical preference for competitive models in biology is underwritten by rhetoric borrowed from androcentric political ideologies, the preference reflects a confusion between models and reality as well as an unjustified intrusion of androcentric political loyalties into the scientific enterprise. These are not concerns that can be relieved by deploying the discovery/justification distinction. To the extent that motivations tied to acquiring a masculine-coded prestige as a theorist induce mathematical ecologists to overlook the epistemic defects of models of natural selection that fail to consider the actual impact of sexual selection, parenting, and cooperative interactions, they distort the context of justification itself. Some of the criteria of justification, such as simplicity, are also distorted in the light of the androcentric distinction between public and private values. For example, simplicity in mathematical biology has been characterized so as to prefer explanations of apparently favorable patterns of group survival in terms of chance to explanations in terms of interspecific feedback loops, if straightforward individualistic mechanisms are not available to explain them (Keller 1992,153). Finally, to the extent that gender ideologies inform the context of discovery by influencing the direction of inquiry and development of mathematical tools, they prevent the growth of alternative models and the tools that could make them tractable, and hence they bias our views of what is "simple" (Keller 1992, 160). The discovery/justification distinction, while useful when considering the epistemic relation of a theory to its confirming or disaffirm- ing evidence, breaks down once we consider the relative merits of alternative theories. In the latter context, any influence that biases the development of the field of alternatives will bias the evaluation of theories. A theoretical approach may appear best justified not because it offers an adequate model of the world but because androcentric ideologies have caused more thought and resources to be invested in it than in alternatives.

## 2NC Overview

1. Extend that the affirmative links hard to this kritik – extend Bryld and Lykke that the aff’s proposed mission relies on male superiority through the celebration of nationalism and technology. Space missions and the narratives of the US space program inherently rely on masculine assumptions and ideas. The aff is no exception.
2. Extend the impact – extend \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ that oppression and exclusion of feminist ideas is the root cause of other forms of violence. Western patriarchal thinking parallels with domination globally and thus other impacts. Though the aff may present huge and very low probability impacts, don’t vote on them – solving our kritik is a prerequisite to the aff because we can get a step closer to preventing their impacts from happening with a negative vote.
3. Extend the alt – extend Anderson that we must reject the affirmative. The perm is impossible because solving for biases in the scientific community and realizing the problems with overly-masculine ideas proliferating in western culture is a prerequisite to being able to solve anything. Vote negative to affirm that exclusion of feminist ideas is bad and that solving for our impacts should come first because we are key to solving for anything else in the future. Voting for the perm is impossible because the aff has already presented an inherently masculine plan – don’t let them sever out of their discourse.

## 2NC Link Overview

Extend the fact that this kritik links completely to the affirmative case. The affirmative case wants to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. This is in fact exploration of space. Extend the Bryld and Lykke link evidence that recounts stories of how the heroes that went into space and all of these heroes and people that originally went to space were male. In the past, this then established the idea of space exploration as a very masculine and it was entirely represented as a masculine associated position. Because history has established this as the position that space exploration will take, we then establish this mindset which the kritik claims we must break down.

## Links

### Space exploration is represented by the image of nationalistic masculine heroes

Bryld and Lykke 2K

Green’s description fits well as a characterization of the space fable. It sustains the suggestion that the adventure story and the fairy tale are both part of the underlying script that created the image of the astro- and cosmonaut supermen. Like Green’s adventure heroes, acting beyond the frontiers of civilization in the wilderness of hostile space, allegedly in ‘peace of all mankind,’ although always carrying with them their national flags to mark their presence in the new territories. Furthermore, the hero of the American and Russian space fable is strikingly masculine. The great ‘first steps’ of the human journey into the cosmos (the first human in space, the first humans on the Moon, and so on) are, over and over again, in history books, space museums, etc., celebrated as having been taken by men of the right stuff.

### Science is patriarchal and a way for men to exert violence and domination

Nhanenge 2007 (Jytte, Masters @ U South Africa, Accepted Thesis Paper for Development Studies, “ECOFEMINSM: TOWARDS INTEGRATING THE CONCERNS OF WOMEN, POOR PEOPLE AND NATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT, uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/10500/570/1/dissertation.pdf)

Science is consequently founded on androcentric premises and their associated values. The androcentric premises perceive a universal masculine model of man. The dualised feminist issues are objectified and only valued to the extent that they are useful to man. Man is seen as being autonomous from both nature and society. He is a rational individual striving for freedom and independence from social and natural constraints. This picture is generalized as being an implicit goal of humanity as a whole. In fact, what men do not experience is often regarded as somewhat unimportant, distant or unreal. The measurement of masculinity is power. Dependency and powerlessness are perceived as inferiority and calls for unequal treatment. (Birkeland 1995: 59). Thus the androcentric values leads powerful man to seek power over women, others and nature, which due to their lack of power deserve an unequal treatment. This makes science violent. When women, emotions and nature are constructed as the Other in scientific discourse, it reconfirms the masculine position as being rational, superior and the standard. Rationality and theoretical reason is in this way used as an instrument for male domination over women and all others. It is a tool to eliminate and ridicule differences. However, when one lacks the ability to see the positive in diversity, and instead systematically depreciate differences, trying to make all one, it leads to fundamentalism. Forcing through a single rational and masculine definition of reality becomes in this way violent. Thus, there is a close link between masculinity, rationality and violence in mechanical science. These oppressive features inhere therefore also in the various scientific disciplines and in its technology. (Braidotti et al 1994: 32, 34; Des Jardins 2001: 255).

## 2NC Impact Calc

This round should not be evaluated based on hypothetical impact scenarios presented by the affirmative. Before evaluating nearly impossible impact scenarios, you must first address the root cause of those impact scenarios. If we do not address the root cause of the impact scenario that the aff is presenting is a result of these patriarchal hierarchies that exist today. If you vote affirmative there will be millions of other impact scenarios that will be debated in the future. Voting to stop one of these impact scenarios will be beneficial for people, yes, but by voting negative you will address the root cause of every impact scenario that will happen in the future. This is because, to extend the Runyan evidence, the international system is based off of the system of putting women beneath men because the international system replicates the same thing. It is different countries that put other, weaker countries and making economic alliances that benefit the strong, perfectly replicating the male patriarchal hierarchies that exist and have existed centuries before there were international relations.

## Impacts

### War and militarism are inevitable in a world of gender hierarchies

Tickner professor in the School of International Relations at USC-LA 2001 J. Ann Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era page 6

Feminists have claimed that the likelihood of conflict will not diminish until unequal gender hierarchies are reduced or eliminated; the privileging of characteristics associated with a stereotypical masculinity in states' foreign policies contributes to the legitimization not only of war but of militarization more generally. Wary of what they see as gendered dichotomies that have pitted realists against idealists and led to overly simplistic assumptions about warlike men and peaceful women, 17 certain feminists are cautioning against the association of women with peace, a position that, they believe, disempowers both women and peace. The growing numbers of women in the military also challenges and complicates these essentialist stereotypes. To this end, and as part of their effort to rethink concepts central to the field, feminists define peace and security, not in idealized ways often associated with women, but in broad, multidimensional terms that include the elimination of social hierarchies such as gender that lead to political and economic injustice**.**

### Masculinity is the root cause of international violence 🡺 extinction

Jones professor of international studies at the Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE) in Mexico City 1996 Adam Review of International Studies Cambridge Journals Online d/a 7/12/10

The most common motif in feminist analyses of peace and war depicts mas- culinity as a transcendentally aggressive force in society and history. Women are bystanders or victims of men's wars. Most feminist commentary, through to the 1980s, followed this framework. In particular, the extraordinary outburst of concern over the nuclear threat in the 1970s and early '80s resulted in a spate of feminist writings explicitly or implicitly founded on a critique of masculinist militarism. The zenith of this genre came with the 1984 publication of Dr Helen Caldicott's Missile Envy, which denounced the arms race in pop-Freudian terms.43 The underlying philosophy is well exemplified by Barbara Zanotti's 1982 'Patriarchy: A State of War'. Zanotti asked: Why weren't we prepared for this?—the imminence of nuclear holocaust; the final silencing of life; the brutal extinction of the planet. . . We have lived with violence so long. We have lived under the rule of the fathers so long. Violence and patriarchy: mirror images. An ethic of destruction as normative**.** Diminished love of life, a numbing to real events as the final consequence. We are not even prepared . . . Wars are nothing short of rituals of organized killing presided over by men deemed "the best." The fact is—they are. They have absorbed in the most complete way the violent character of their own ethos**.**

### Patriarchal hierarchies are the root cause of international violence

Runyan Professor and former Head, Department of Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, University of Cincinnati 1994 Anne Sisson Women, Gender, and World Politics: Perspectives, Policies, and Prospects Page 202 - 203

These hierarchies of men over womenand officers over recruits, Radical feminists insist, lay the basis for hierarchies in the international system. For example, Strange argues that "international politics closely resembles gang fights in the playground. The leader is the one acknowledged to have superior force: his power is then augmented by his position--in effect, the power of his underlings is added to his own. They give this power to him and get certain benefits--protection, enhanced prestige from the relationship to the leader." 3 Thus, from the Radical feminist view, the international system of unequal and competitive states can be seen as one big male-protection racket wherein the strong extort the weak to enter into various military and economic alliances or relationships that mostly benefit the strong**.** Radical feminists argue that this male-protection racket has its origins in patriarchal thinking that assumes that "man" should have dominion over natural resources. In particular, Western patriarchal thinking, which Radical feminists claim is reflective of the worldview of largely white men in power in the West, considers not only the natural world but alsowhite women and Third World peoples as raw materials that can be exploited for political and economic gain. This constant extraction of resources--which increasingly impoverishes women, Third World peoples and states dependent on "aid" from elite men and First World states--is what makes the male-protection racket possible. This racket undermines any attempts to develop self-reliance that might release dominated peoples and states from the contemporary international hierarchy. Thus, for Radical feminists, the struggles of "weak" states against "strong" are related to the struggles of women against patriarchal domination. "The aim of self-reliance is paralleled by the struggle of many women who refuse to be victims any longer, yet also refuse to become oppressors. What is being struggled against is at root the same thing--a hierarchy grounded in and perpetuated by sexual dominance." 4

## Perm Answers 1/2

### Incorporation only replicates the oppression of rationality – must embrace the alternative alone

Haslanger Professor of Philosophy in the Department of Linguistics and Philosophy at MIT 2001 Sally A Mind of One’s Own: Feminist Essays on Reason and Objectivity page 209-210

On the other strand, reason itself is more deeply implicated in our oppression; the problem is not one that can be solved by a shift in emphasis – in short, by a new appreciation of the feminine. Offering a positive characterization of this second strand is tricky, for there are markedly different views about how reason is implicated and what we should do about it. But the core idea is that a rational stance is itself a stance of oppression or domination, and accepted ideals of reason both reflect and reinforce power relations that advantage white privileged men. On this view, the point is not to balance the value of reason with feminine values, but to challenge our commitment to rational ideals.

### The permutations attempt at incorporation links to the criticism – the alternative should be allowed to flourish in its own understanding of the political – not as a supplement to classical theory

Jones professor of international studies at the Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE) in Mexico City 1996 Adam Review of International Studies Cambridge Journals Online d/a 7/12/10

Christine Sylvester's 1994 work Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era angrily rejects the notion that feminist theory ought to be playing essentially a supplementary role. Criticizing Robert Keohane for proposing something along these lines, Sylvester writes:

Explicit in this analysis is yet another support assignment for "women." We who are feminists in the academy are urged to come out of our vague and homeless positions in IR in order to provide something that the mainsteam [sic] needs and cannot think through and provide using its own powers of reflection . . . There is, in this admonition, little sense that feminists can set an agenda for ourselves and for IR and really no sense that we may want to interface differently and rewrite-repaint-recook the field rather than join it.39

### Incorporation is insufficient – it cannot address the constructed nature of gender

Sjoberg Ass’t Prof of Poli Sci at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University 2009 Lura Security Studies 18.2 informaworld d/a 7/13/10

Scholars who take an explicitly feminist approach to studying ir contend that Carpenter has misidentified the problem: it is not (only) the methods of “mainstream” scholarship that feminist ir scholarship problematizes; it is the incompleteness of its substantive analysis. It is not the incorporation of gender as a variable in “mainstream” ir that feminist work critiques; it is that many “mainstream” scholars who use gender as a variable do so with what feminists argue is an insufficient understanding of the meanings and implications of gender in global politics. Too many scholars who use gender as a variable use it as a proxy for women (or men), failing to take account of the complexity of the levels and ways that gender operates in global politics. Marysia Zalewski explains that “the driving force of feminism is its attention to gender and not simply to women. To be sure, for many feminists the concern about the injustices done to women because of their sex is paramount, but the concept, nature and practice of gender are key.”40 Helen Kinsella is concerned that scholars approaching gender from a nonfeminist standpoint “necessarily presuppose that gender is not already constructed.”41 Scholars looking through gender lenses “ask what assumptions about gender (and race, class, nationality, and sexuality) are necessary to make particular statements, policies, and actions meaningful.”42 In other words, gender is not a variable that can be measured as a “yes” or “no” (or “male” or “female” question), but as a more complicated symbolic and cultural construction.43

Perm Answers 2/2

### Reconciliation 🡺 gender subordination

Sjoberg Ass’t Prof of Poli Sci at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University 2009 Laura Security Studies 18.2 informaworld d/a 7/13/10

To be sure, feminist ir differs from “mainstream” ir in important ways, ontologically, epistemologically, and methodologically. The question of how to define the relationship between the two, given the tendency of the “mainstream” not to engage with feminist concerns, has caused substantial controversy among ir feminists. Some feminists have argued that the project of reconciling with “mainstream” ir is insidious and poses danger to the integrity of feminist theory and feminist theorists.124 As Sarah Brown explains:

The danger in attempts to reconcile international relations and feminism is twofold. Most immediately, the danger lies in the uncritical acceptance by feminists of objects, methods, and concepts which presuppose the subordination of women. More abstrusely, it lies in the uncritical acceptance of the very possibility of 'gender equality.'125

### Seeing patriarchy is not enough –we must interrogate the inherent cynicism of hierarchal structures in every instance

Enloe, Professor of Women’s Studies at Clark University, 2004 Cynthia, The Curious Feminist, page 18

When the latest news is so dismayingly patriarchal, it is natural for anyone with a hint of feminist consciousness to think, "Here we go again." Yet there is a very fine line, sometimes, between a sharp vision that can see clearly the perpetuating dynamics of patriarchal structures and a cynicism that dulls curiosity - curiosity about exactly why two Colorado boys used guns and explosives to express their masculinized adolescent alienation or about precisely what gender rearrangements occurred in an Albanian tent city. Seeing patriarchy, even misogyny, is not enough. In each instance, we need to know exactly how it works and whether, even if continuing, it has been contested. At a gross level of analysis the patriarchal outcomes may seem to be more of the same, but discovering what is producing them may come as a surprise.

Thus, as we go forward in the twenty-first century, feminists inside and outside academia need to be on our guard against a cynical form of knowing. We need to send the roots of our curiosity down ever deeper. We need to stand ready to be surprised - to admit surprise and build on it. It is bound to enliven our teaching, broaden our conversations, and make our strategies more savvy.

### We cannot use the masters tools for successful feminist criticism – the permutation replicates the normalization of masculine identities

Tickner professor in the School of International Relations at USC-LA 2001 J. Ann Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era page 122

As suggested by Pateman's analysis, certain feminist political theorists see a deep gender bias in democratic theory. For them, seeking equality in a man's world is problematic because it assumes a standard of normality that is male; in the West, this standard is that of white, privileged males. 84 The model of the abstract individual, behind which this gendered representation is hidden, is a powerful impediment to the recognition of gender as a salient political factor. The association of citizenship with masculine characteristics such as rationality and autonomy is problematic for women's citizenship; women cannot be included in categories associated with public sphere activities that are themselves defined by the exclusion of female traits and identities. 85 For women to be equal political actors, this must be recognized.

# SPACE ANTHRO K

Thesis: The affirmative proposal is locked into the old “human centered” paradigm that is unjustified, ineffective and a threat to our, and all, future survival in space.

## Shell 1/2

### Anthropocentrism is the idea that only human beings have rights, and the rest of nature is seen as immoral. This epistemology is flawed because nature is the arena in which our minds are molded.

Arendt, ’07 (Hannah, as a German-born American political philosopher known for her writings on totalitarianism, evil, and political action. Her works include Origins of Totalitarianism (1951), The Human Condition (1958), On Revolution (1963), and Eichmann in Jerusalem (1963) “The Conquest of Space and the Stature of Man”

The system of ethics under which we now live—the “default” system, we might call it—is anthropocentrism (sometimes called homocentrism) which has ancient roots in both secular and religious philosophies. Only human beings have rights within anthropocentrism, which holds that the basis of intrinsic value is the individual capacity to think rationally and act morally. Moral agents are hence moral patients. If developed along Kantian lines, anthropocentrism would uphold a Principle of Respect for Persons: that people should be treated as ends-inthemselves and not as a means to an end. People have a right to exist, are entitled to their dignity and freedom from injustice. The rest of nature though is seen as amoral and hence is assigned no moral standing. Nature is valuable in that it contributes to human welfare, but animals, plants, microbes, the ecosystems of which they are a part, and the inorganic stuff of planet Earth have no rights other than those that humans choose to give them on instrumental grounds. With nature regarded in this way purely as a resource, one might regard anthropocentrism as not being an environmental ethic at all, but merely as a self-serving excuse for exploitation. This perhaps reflects history. However historical experience has been teaching us, in increasing measure, the value of nature for the present and future well-being of mankind—both materially and spiritually. The Earth and its ecosystems are both the human lifesupport system and the arena in which our minds take shape. The environment is an anthropocentric issue. Anthropocentric morality would therefore hold that although our obligation toward nature is indirect, it is nonetheless real. Humans should therefore balance exploitation with preservation to provide for the material needs of future generations, and should refrain from gratuitous cruelty and destruction that only serves to corrode the human spirit. We must cultivate an enlightened self-interest and take on the role of “wise stewards” of planet Earth.

### The journey to space is just an extension of the human separation from the rest of nature

Mander 1995 (Jerry, senior fellow at Public Media Center. “Leaving the Earth: Space Colonies, Disney, and Epcot,” in Deep Ecology for the 21 st Century, ed. George Sessions, p. 311-312)

Over the years, I have wondered about the apparently strong appeal of space travel and development to the public mind. I can understand why corporations, militaries, and governments want to promote departing from the planet, and I have mentioned its appeal to the New Age collective ego. But it hasn’t been easy for me to grasp why the idea is so attractive to others. I finally realized that space travel is not new; it is only the final stage of a departure process that actually began long ago. Our society really “left home” when we placed boundaries between ourselves and the earth, when we moved en masse inside totally artificial, reconstructed, “mediated” worlds—huge concrete cities and suburbs— and we aggressively ripped up and redesigned the natural world. By now, nature has literally receded from our view and diminished in size. We have lost contact with our roots. As a culture, we don’t know where we came from; we’re not aware we are part of something larger than ourselves. Nor can we easily find places that reveal natural processes still at work. … As a corporate culture, we have begun to feel that one place is as good as the next; that it’s okay to sacrifice this place for that one, even when the new place is not even on Earth. In the end, this leaves us all in a position similar to the millions of homeless people on our streets. In truth, we are all homeless, though we long to return. My friend Gary Coates, an architecture professor at Kansas State University … has argued provocatively that our quest for space is actually a distorted expression of a desire to return home to Eden, the place we abandoned. He sees our whole culture as caught in a replay of the Adam-and-Eve story. In a recent conversation, Coates put it to me this way: “Like all creation myths, the story of the Garden of Eden is not something that never happened or only happened long ago; it is something that is happening in every moment . . . It was the murder of Abel, who represented a state of oneness with the earth, that set Cain off wandering in a never-satisfied quest for the return to, or re-creation of, paradise. Within the confines of our totally artificial environments on Earth, as they will soon also be in heaven, we also seek to re-enter Eden. In particular, the creation of Leisure worlds, Disney Worlds, megamalls, Air Stream mobile home cities, lifestyle segregated condominium communities, and especially genetic engineering, space colonization, and terraforming of planets, are all updated forms of Cain’s desire to return home by remaking the original creation. The tragedy is that in attempting to recover paradise we accelerate the murder of nature. It’s yet another repeat of the story of Cain and Abel, another acting out of the founding myth of Western history.

Shell 2/2

### We must move beyond anthropocentrism to embrace an ethic that values all forms of life

Capra 1995 (Fritjof, physicist. “Deep Ecology: A New Paradigm,” in Deep Ecology for the 21st century, ed. George Sessions, p. 20-21)

The reason why most of old-paradigm ethics cannot deal with these problems is that, like shallow ecology, it is anthropocentric. Thus the most important task for a new school of ethics will be to develop a non-anthropocentric theory of value, a theory that would confer inherent value on non-human forms of life. Ultimately the recognition of value inherent in all living nature stems from the deep ecological awareness that nature and the self are one, . This, however, is also the very core of spiritual awareness. Indeed, when the concept of the human spirit is understood to the cosmos as a whole, it becomes clear that ecological awareness is spiritual in its deepest essence and that the new ecological ethics is grounded in spirituality

### Alt: Rejecting the assumptions of the Affirmative and allowing alternative visions to emerge is key to allowing change

Devall, ’88. (Bill, Dept. Of Sociology at Humboldt University) “The Deep, Long Range Ecology Movement” Ethics & the Environment Journal.

“Many contemporary philosophers have explored other approaches to nature and the implication of these images for our current crisis. These images include Eastern Traditions of Taoism and Buddhism and Native American religion and cosmologies. Exploration of these and other images of nature are extremely important to the development of the deep ecology movement. As McLaughlin says, “Alternative images of nature are a sort of internal wilderness, whose cultivation may be helpful in retaining and eventually expanding external wilderness. Considering alternatives may help loosen the spell of instrumental view, showing it as only one of the many possibilities, giving a deeper vision of the world, as two eyes enable the vision of depth.” Practicing deep ecology mean, in part, experiencing both intellectually and emotionally some of these alternative approaches to nature.”

## Space Colonization

### Mining the Moon or Mars will be an extension of human exploitation into space

Crisp 2009 (John, staff writer. “Right to Go Back to Moon,” Korea Times, November 30, 2009. Accessed via Lexis-Nexis, 4/23/11)

Maybe it's because once you throw resources like water into the picture - and water undoubtedly will become an increasingly valuable commodity - a trip to the moon and on to Mars begins to look like an ill-considered extension of our long history with the natural world. Oversimplifying only slightly, the story of civilization can be reduced to a chronicle of the consumption of local resources - lumber, land, water, petroleum - and then moving on to fresh abundance elsewhere. The examples are practically countless, but consider our own petroleum production, which reached a peak in 1970 and has gone downhill ever since. We've had to move on to fresh abundance, depending more and more on places like Saudi Arabia and Nigeria. To a great extent modern American foreign policy has been driven by the impending dearth of local petroleum. Why else would we be so interested in Iraq? Common sense tells us that no non-renewable resource can be infinite, but this is a lesson we've yet to learn in practical terms. We imagine that more resources will always lie over the horizon, and the moon and Mars may represent for us, at some conscious or subconscious level, a fanciful safety valve for our overburdened earth. Who knows what resources are on Mars? We never thought there was water on the moon. Maybe more resources are out there, and our natural instinct is to go and get them. But there's something vaguely unseemly about failing to live within our means here, and then hoping at some level to bail ourselves out by moving on to other worlds. I'm wondering if we have done a good enough job of husbanding the abundance of this planet to have earned the right to begin exploiting resources elsewhere

## Aff Extinction Scenarios

### The complete extinction of life on this planet is not inherent – Rather than looking for technological solutions to environmental problems, humans must change the way they think about the planet in order to avoid the destruction of life

Berry 1995 (Thomas, director of Riverdale Center for Religious Research. “The Viable Human,” in Deep Ecology for the 21 st Century, ed. George Sessions, p. 11)

The total extinction of life is not imminent, though the elaborate forms of life expression in the earth’s ecosystems may be shattered in an irreversible manner. What is absolutely threatened is the degradation of the planet’s more brilliant and satisfying forms of life expression. This degradation involves extensive distortion and a pervasive weakening of the life system, its comprehensive integrity as well as its particular manifestations. While there are pathologies that wipe out whole populations of life forms and must be considered pernicious to the life process on an extensive scale, the human species has, for some thousands of years, shown itself to be a pernicious presence in the world of the living on a unique and universal scale. Nowhere has this been more evident that in the Western phase of development of the human species. There is scarcely any geological or biological reality or function that has not experienced the deleterious effects of the human. The survival of hundreds of thousands of species is presently threatened. But since the human survives only within this larger complex of ecosystems, any damage done to other species, or to the other ecosystems, or to the planet itself, eventually affects the human not only in terms of physical well-being but also in every other phase of human intellectual understanding, aesthetic expression, and spiritual development. Because such deterioration results from a rejection of the inherent limitation of earthly existence and from an effort to alter the natural functioning of the planet in favor of a humanly constructed wonderworld for its human occupants, the human resistance to this destructive process has turned its efforts toward an emphasis on living creatively within the functioning of the natural world. The earth as a bio-spiritual planet must become, for the human, the basic reference in identifying what is real and what is worthwhile

## Technology

### We need to shift our focus away from technological solutions

**Naess 1995 (Arne, professor of philosophy at Univ. Oslo. “The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects,” in Deep Ecology for the 21 st Century, ed. George Sessions, p. 75)**

When arguing from deep ecological premises, most of the complicated proposed technological fixes need not be discussed at all. The relative merits of alternative technological proposals are pointless if our vital needs have already been met. A focus on vital issues activates mental energy and strengthens motivation. On the other hand, the shallow environmental approach, by focusing almost exclusively on the technical aspects of environmental problems, tends to make the public more passive and disinterested in the more crucial non-technical, lifestyle-related, environmental issues.

### Technology is not synonymous with progress

Naess 1995 (Arne, professor of philosophy at Univ. Oslo. “Simple in Means, Rich in Ends: An Interview with Arne Naess,” in Deep Ecology for the 21 st Century, ed. George Sessions, p. 32)

On the contrary, technology is more helpless than ever before because the technology being produced doesn’t fulfill basic human needs, such as meaningful work in a meaningful environment. Technical progress is sham progress because the term technical progress is a cultural, not a technical term. Our culture is the only one in the history of mankind in which the culture has adjusted itself to the technology, rather than vice versa. In traditional Chinese culture, the bureaucracy opposed the use of inventions that were not in harmony with the general cultural aims of the nation. A vast number of technical inventions were not used by the populace because it was simply not permitted. Whereas here we have the motto, “You can’t stop progress,” you can’t interfere with technology, and so we allow technology to dictate cultural forms.

Environment

### Environmental policies assume a human centered system of values

**Wapner, 1996 (Dr. Paul, Professor and Director of the Global Environmental Politics Program in SIS, focuses on Environmental Thought, Transnational Environmental Activism, Environmental Ethics, and Global Environmental Politics.) “Toward a Meaningful Ecological Politics”, Tikkun, May**

“Yet reasonableness and genuine environmental protection are different things. Liberal environmentalism is so compatible with contemporary material and cultural currents that it implicitly supports the very things that it should be criticizing. Its technocratic, scientistic, and even economicistic character give credence to a society that measures the quality of life fundamentally in terms of economic growth, control over nature, and the maximization of sheer efficiency in everything we do. By working to show that environmental protection need not compromise these maxims, liberal environmentalism fails to raise deeper issues that more fundamentally engage the dynamics of environmental degradation. Liberal environmentalism is unconcerned with reflecting upon who we are, our place in the global ecosystem, and our relationship with other species who also inhabit the earth – issues that strike at the core of a genuinely ecological politics.”

## Impacts

### Treating nature as a resource makes environmental decline inevitable

**Plumwood 2000 (Val, Australian Research Council Fellow at Univ. Sydney. “Deep Ecology, Deep Pockets, and Deep Problems: A Feminist Ecosocialist Analysis,” in Beneath the Surface: Critical Essays in the Philosophy of Deep Ecology, edited by Eric Katz, Andrew Light and David Rothenberg, p. 79)**

The outcome of working the land must be seen as the product of at least two (kinds of) agencies and interests, and not of a single one (the human one) who is entitled to appropriate the land in accordance with the capitalist interpretation of Locke’s formula. For if, as Locke’s formula concedes for the human case, the outcome of “mixing labor” in the land is the product of more than just one of these agents, the human one, any more than a single agent is able to appropriate other joint products in which his or her labor is mixed with those of other human agents. Once the agency of nature has been recognized, this placement can only appear either as unjustified seizure or as a form of coverture, the assumption of unity or fusion of interest that we have identified above and that is subject to the same kinds of objections. If our dominant concept of property formation is one that at bottom treats nature as a nullity, it is small wonder that the outcome of its enormous growth and progress as a force for remaking the Earth is a progressive nullification and decline of nature.

### The same human problems that allow us to feel the need to colonize space will reoccur once there.

**McLean, ’06. “To Boldly Go: Ethical Considerations for Space Exploration” (Margaret. Margaret R. McLean is assistant director of the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University.) http://www.scu.edu/ethics/publications/ethicalperspectives/space-exploration.html**

But before we think about exploring-and potentially exploiting-"the final frontier," we would do well to remember that we do not have a very good track record in protecting our planet home. We have expanded human presence into pristine forests resulting in the disruption of migratory routes, soil erosion, and species extinction. What can be learned from our presence on Earth about the potential impact of our forays into the outer reaches of the solar system? We are the only earthly creatures with the capacity to extend our influence beyond the 4 corners of the globe. This puts on us the responsibility to acknowledge that, despite the depths of space, it is not so limitless as to be able to weather mistreatment or suffer every demand we may place on it. One way to think about expanding our presence in the solar system is through the lens of stewardship. Stewardship envisions humans not as owners of the solar system but as responsible managers of its wonder and beauty. Stewardship holds us accountable for a prudent use of space resources. Such responsibility may support exploration of the final frontier, but at the same time it warns against exploitation of its resources. We must account for our urges and actions in terms of their impact on others, the universe, and the future. As we boldly plan to extend ourselves to places where no one has gone before, we would do well to consider the following principles: 1. Space preservation requires that the solar system be values for its own sake, not on the basis of what it can do for us. 2. Space conservation insists that extraterrestrial resources ought not to be exploited to benefit the few at the expense of the many or of the solar system itself. 3. Space sustainability asks that our explorations "do no harm" and that we leave the moon, Mars, and space itself no worse-and perhaps better-than we found them. As we expand human presence into the solar system, we ought not to park ethical considerations next to the launching pad. We must take our best ethical thinking with us as we cross the frontier of space exploration.

### Anthropogenic attitude causes global extinction crisis resulting from environment crisis

**Devall 00 Bill Devall, professor at Humboldt State University, "The Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement", http://muse.jhu.edulj oumals/ ethics and\_the environmentlv006/6.1 devall.html, 3 July 2008**

[Many researchers have documented the recurring, anthropogenic-caused collapse of natural systems at the regional or landscape level since modem humans began spreading across the planet approximately 35,000 years ago. However, the contemporary environmental crisis is the fIrst planetary-wide anthropogenically caused extinction crisis (Wilson 1992; Bright 1998) and environmental crisis. ]

## Alt Solves

### Viewing the world through another life form’s eyes, we come to a deeper understanding of the world

**Taylor ’98 (Paul W. Professor of Philosophy at Brooklyn College, Environmental Philosophy) pg 77-78**

As our knowledge of living things increases, as we come to a deeper under­ standing of their life cycles, their interactions with other organisms, and the manifold ways in which they adjust to the environment, we become more fully aware of how each of them is carrying out its biological functions according to the laws of its species-specific nature. But besides this, our increasing knowledge and understanding also develop in us a sharpened awareness of the uniqueness of each individual organism. Scientists who have made careful studies of particular plants and animals, whether in the field or in laboratories, have often acquired a knowledge of their subjects as identifiable individuals. Close observation over extended periods of time has led them to an appreciation of the unique "personalities" of their subjects. Sometimes a scientist may come to take a special interest in a particular animal or plant, all the while remaining strictly objective in the gathering and recording of data. Nonscientists may likewise experience this development of interest when, as amateur naturalists, they make accurate observations over sustained periods of close acquaintance with an individual organism. As one becomes more and more familiar with the organism and its behavior, one becomes fully sensitive to the particular way it is living out its life cycle. One may become fascinated by it and even experience some involvement with its good and bad fortunes (that is, with the occurrence of environmental conditions favorable or unfavorable to the realization of its good) . The organism comes to mean something to one as a unique, irreplaceable individual. The final culmination of this process is the achievement of a genuine understanding of its point of view and, with that understanding, an ability to "take" that point of view. Conceiving of it as a center of life, one is able to look at the world from its perspective.

## A2: Technology Saves Life

### 1)When they say that the technology they are protecting can be used to save non-human life, they are really just linking even harder to the kritik. Life has gone on for billions of years, life will go on without man’s help

**Grey, ’93 (William, prof. @ University of Queensland, taught at Australian National University, Temple University, Philadelphia, and the University of New England.**

**“Anthropocentrism and Deep Ecology”, Australiasian Journal of Philosophy, Vol 71, No 4 (1993), pp. 463-475.)**

If the concerns for humanity and nonhuman species raised by advocates of deep ecology are expressed as concerns about the fate of the planet, then these concerns are misplaced. From a planetary perspective, we may be enterirg a phase of mass extinction of the magnitude of the Cretaceous. For planet earth that is *fist* another incident in a four and a half billion year saga. Life will go on—in some guise or other. The arthropods, algae arai the ubiquitous bacteria, at least, will almost certainly be around for a few billion years more.

### 2) The technology that they are claiming was still designed for human ends- and the production of such certainly resulted in environmental degradation.

## Ext:

### (\_) Every time that they say that they can save a life, human or nonhuman, they bite the kritik one more time- their logic is so far rooted in anthropocentrism that they have been blinded to the realization that extinctions do occur- the aff should stop trying to play God.

**Grey, '93 (William, prof @ University of Queensland, taught at Australian National University, Temple University, Philadelphia, and the University of New England " Anthropocentris m and Deep Ecology". Australiasian Journal o fPhiloso phy. Vol 71, No 4 (1993), pp. 463-475.)**

Robert Goodin has proposed a "moderately deep" theory of value, accordirg to which what imparts value to an outcome is the naturalness of the historical process through which it has come about (Goodin 1991, p. 74). Putting aside the problem, mentioned above, that the distinction between what is natural and what is cultural (or technological, or artefactual) is problematic, the deliverances of natural historical processes are not necessarily benign, nor ones which should command our approval. The traumatic disruptions to the planet brought about by natural forces far exceed anything which we have been able to effect. Consider, first, what Lovelock (1979) has called the worst atmospheric pollution incident even the accumulation of that toxic and corrosive gas oxygen some two billion years ago, with devastating consequences for the then predominant anaerobic life forms. Or the Cretaceous extinction 65 million years ago, which wiped out tie large reptiles, the then dominant life forms. Or the Permian extinction some 225 million years ago, which eliminated an estimated 96 per cent of marine species. Like the eruption of Mt St Helens, these were natural events, but it is implausible to suppose that they are to be valued for that reason, alone. There is of course an excellent reason for us to retrospectively evaluate these great planetary disruptions positively from our current position in plane tar." history, and that is that we can recognise their occurrence as a necessary condition for our own existence. But what could be more anthropocentric than that?

# TECHNOLOGY K

## LINKS—Fem 1/2

### Expansion into space creates the “ideal male” self who is ever expanding, completely excluding and even eradicating the female form.

http://soc.sagepub.com/content/41/4/609.full.pdf

The key point here, however, is that while these discoveries and assertions were being made, a new kind of ideal, infinite, ‘self’ was also being actively pro- posed and elucidated. Thus paralleling the discovery of a new open cosmos was a discovery that the self was also open and infinite in its capacities. No longer was the individual seen as locked into a rigidly defined chain of being as proposed by the Ancient Greeks and the Mediaeval cosmologists. Rather, the Renaissance humanist philosophers were outlining a new kind of self-propelled self, a proac- tive, rational individual, fully capable of exercising free will and with infinite capacities for self-improvement. Charting the seas and the heavens and travelling round the Earth were a rational means of escaping what DeOliva, a major 16th- century Spanish philosopher, called ‘the dregs of the Earth’. God and the heav- ens, ‘the dwelling place of happy people’, were to be accessed in this way (1977[1543]: 38). This self-improving rational person is a close cousin of Weber’s hard-working Calvinist. Pico was a central figure in making this transformation (Poppi, 1987; Tarnas, 2006). Tarnas says of this era: It was of course no accident that the birth of the modern self and the birth of the modern cosmos took place at the same historical moment. The Sun, trailing clouds of glory, rose for both, in one great encompassing dawn. (2006: 4) In short, the confident, self-expanding, potentially infinite, individual (one pre-figuring the ‘have it all’ narcissistic individual that characterizes contempo- rary capitalist subjectivity) was a product of the discovery of a cosmos and a society which was itself seen as open and infinite. By the same token, this notion of a potentially self-creating self further enhanced and supported observation and yet further exploration of an infinite world and heavens. The universal man would be able to engage in political and civic debate, dreaming up new concepts but also planning for their realization. His mission was to understand the whole of the Earth andto regulate it, making all organic and inorganic nature in God’s image. It is of course important not to get carried away by the ideal and practice of ‘universal man’. Not only are females largely excluded from this picture but, as has been well documented by Wallerstein (1974) and oth- ers, many people in Europe and the newly opened-up peripheral societies were made still more alienated and ‘unfree’ at this time. ‘Universal man’ may have been the characteristic of social elites in Northern Italy but most of humanity then, as now, were in practice subject to all kinds of control. The peripheries of world economy in particular were subjected to many kinds of limitation and oppression, including slavery, cash-crop and share-crop labour. Control of these labourers depended on legal and other coercion and, if all else failed, continuing threats by their social betters of a descent to Hell. They would not have known what ‘uni- versal man’ was all about and they stood little chance of making themselves into one of these self-developing, all-encompassing, individuals. We now stress the differences as well as the similarities in the kinds of indi- vidualism that have developed in our own era. Burckhardt (1878) argued that the ideal of a rounded, fully developed, versatile personality was destined not to prevail as capitalism continued to develop and make people increasingly spe- cialized, one sided and only partly developed. Subsequent developments have shown him to be even more correct than he probably imagined.

### Spaceflight is built on a hegemonic masculine model. For example, rockets are phallic.

Casper & Moore 1995 (Monica, Director of Humanities at Arizona State University, & Lisa Jean, professor of sociology at Purchase College. “Inscribing Bodies, Inscribing the Future: Gender, Sex, and Reproduction in Outer Space,” Sociological Perspectives, Vol. 38, No. 2, Summer 1995, pp. 311-333)

Female bodies are constructed against a backdrop in which male bodies are accepted as the norm, an inscription process shaped by the masculine context of space travel. More explicitly, space travel can be interpreted as a historically masculine project in that rocket design has in some ways modeled male anatomy. Space flight, in our reading, becomes the realization of penetration and colonization fantasies about the future. This spirit of masculinity permeates almost all aspects of the space program including long-term political goals, engineering designs, assumptions about crew behavior, and life-sciences research protocols. The masculine "nature" of space flight creates an institutional and ideological framework within which women not only are excluded but also are configured as highly problematic by virtue of their gender, bodies, sexualities, and reproductive capacities. Female bodies thus become the target of a range of practices within NASA aimed at reconfiguring women to fit into the space program. Below, we point to some specific ways in which women's bodies are inscribed through discourses of sexual difference.

LINKS—Fem 2/2

### And hegemonic male dominance is only sustained through the subordination and subjugation of not just women but other men as well.

Robins & Lusher, Gary and Dean, PhDs at the Melbourne Department of Psychology, “Hegemonic and Other Masculinities in Local Social Contexts”, 2006, http://www.sna.unimelb.edu.au/publications/Lusher+Robins\_M+M\_2006.pdf

Connell’s social theory emphasises that gender is fundamentally relational and argues that hegemonic masculinity cannot be defined a priori as a set of psychological traits or predetermined characteristics (Connell, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Hegemonic masculinity exists only in relation to subordinate, complicit and marginalized masculinities but it is often asserted in a non- relational (or not explicitly relational) way as a quality that resides within the individual. Within such a perspective, Connell’s theory is sometimes utilised as a set of individual level variables or psychological traits, leading to the criticism that hegemonic masculinity has the tendency to be used attributionally (Collier, 1998; Connell, 2002b; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Jefferson, 2002). For instance, Kupers (2005) focuses on the destructive or “toxic” qualities of hegemonic masculinity that are dangerous to men’s health, indicating that hegemonic masculinity acts as a barrier to mental health treatment in prisons. The notion that gender is a set of power relations between men and women, and between groups of men, is absent. Many researchers do attempt to go beyond the individual and discuss the power relations and cultural ideals related to hegemonic masculinity (for instance, see Kenway & Fitzclarence, 1997). But it may not always be easy for researchers and readers alike, who are used to envisaging gender as a set of personal qualities, to engage gender instead as a set of power relations and dismiss the ‘psychological attribute’ angle of gender. Further, “pop psychology” predilections for “the invention of new character types” such as “the alpha male, the sensitive new-age guy, the hairy man, the new lad, the “rat boy”, etc…” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005, p. 840) push the perspective that gender is internalised, not relational to others. Social structures and relations become lost. For example, concepts such as power and independence are promoted as attributes of hegemonic masculinity that reside within the individual, when both terms are better understood as relating to social relations between individuals. It is therefore no surprise that Connell is keen to refute such purely psychological perspectives because they disregard the strength of the theory - that gender is a set of power relations that are dynamic and historically contextualised. Psychological perspectives do not notice this concern because in the main their proponents appear content to see structure in terms of individual differences.

## LINK- Security

### US international cooperation in space is nothing more than securitization under a different name

Zhang, Political Science, Rutgers College, 2008 (Cynthia B., “Do as I Say, Not as I Do - Is Star Wars Inevitable - Exploring the Future of International Space Regime in the Context of the 2006 U.S. National Space Policy,” Rutgers Computer & Technology Law Journal, 34.

The 2006 National Space Policy signals a crossroad. Will this be another instance of the lowest common denominator, in which loftier goals fall because a "majority" of one refuses to play along? Or will this be another opportunity lost, much like the chance to create a military free outer space half a century ago? Cynics may argue that a total ban of military activities in space, even if it can attract international support, would be futile without the biggest player. That would be putting the fate of many states in the hands of one. Unfortunately, the new U.S. Space Policy applies a double standard that places U.S. national interests supreme, at the cost of international peace and stability. The purpose of a sanctuary is premised on the notion that the interest of mankind must prevail over the interest of any one state. Ironically, the original champion of that greater good now positions itself to do the precise opposite. The ASAT test of January 2007 is but one indication of the rekindling of a space arms race. In this case it would be, for example, the U.S. being fully armed and dominant, while Russia and China give up all military space capabilities. Although officials may deny its existence, the trend of hyper-militarization of outer space is clear. The United States, while seeking to guarantee its national security, has, through its policy changes, made the world less secure. The ultimate irony may be that the country which had originally advocated for an arms control regime in outer space may also be the first to transform that same arena into a battleground. After fifty years of space hegemony, the United States now finds it difficult to "project a peaceful image regarding space activities.218 It is naive to think that the world would abide by the U.S. definition of "cooperative" measure or "peaceful use" or "interference". It is equally naive to think that United States can wield its supreme space power to dictate one set of lax rules for itself and another strict interpretation of the international legal framework for the rest of the world. In a game of make-belief demons, one fool is enough, there is no need for 160 more.

### NASA plans to use space as a forum for expressing US global dominance and hegemony, as well as furthering national security objectives.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration, “The Vision For Space Exploration”, February 2004, http://www.nasa.gov/pdf/55583main\_vision\_space\_exploration2.pdf

Just as Meriwether Lewis and William Clark could not have predicted the settlement of the American West within a hundred years of the start of their famous 19th century expedition, the total benefits of a single exploratory undertaking or discovery cannot be predicted in advance. Because the very purpose of exploratory voyages and research is to understand the unknown, exact benefits defy calculation. Nonetheless, we can define important categories of benefits to the Nation and society. Preparing for exploration and research accelerates the development of technologies that are important to the economy and national security. The space missions in this plan require advanced systems and capabilities that will accelerate the development of many critical technologies, including power, com- puting, nanotechnology, biotechnology, communica- tions, networking, robotics, and materials. These technologies underpin and advance the U.S. econo- my and help ensure national security. NASA plans to work with other government agencies and the pri- vate sector to develop space systems that can address national and commercial needs. Space exploration holds a special place in the human imagination. Youth are especially drawn to Mars rovers, astronauts, and telescopes. If engaged effec- tively and creatively, space inspires children to seek careers in math, science, and engineering, careers that are critical to our future national economic com- petitiveness. The accomplishments of U.S. space explorers are also a particularly potent symbol of American democracy, a reminder of what the human spirit can achieve in a free society. However, space explo- ration also encourages international cooperation, where spacecraft and explorers come to represent our world as well as our Nation.

## LINKS- Arendt 1/6

### Modern science concerns itself with the technical, excluding common sense as irrelevant and ignorant—space exploration fuels this superiority complex of modern science.

Arendt, Hannah, German-American Political Philosopher, “The Conquest Of Space And The Nature Of Man”, republished by The New Atlantis: Journal of Technology and Society in 2007, original published in 1963, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/the-conquest-of-space-and-the-stature-of-man

The goal of modern science, which eventually and quite literally has led us to the moon, is no longer “to augment and order” human experiences (as Niels Bohr,[5] still tied to a vocabulary that his own work has helped to make obsolete, described it); it is much rather to discover what lies behind natural phenomena as they reveal themselves to the senses and the mind of man. Had the scientist reflected upon the nature of the human sensory and mental apparatus, had he raised questions such as What is the nature of man and what should be his stature? What is the goal of science and why does man pursue knowledge? or even What is life and what distinguishes human from animal life?, he would never have arrived where modern science stands today. The answers to these questions would have acted as definitions and hence as limitations of his efforts. In the words of Niels Bohr, “Only by renouncing an explanation of life in the ordinary sense do we gain a possibility of taking into account its characteristics.”[6] That the question proposed here makes no sense to the scientist qua scientist is no argument against it. The question challenges the layman and the humanist to judge what the scientist is doing because it concerns all men, and this debate must of course be joined by the scientists themselves insofar as they are fellow citizens. But all answers given in this debate, whether they come from laymen or philosophers or scientists, are non-scientific (although not anti-scientific); they can never be demonstrably true or false. Their truth resembles rather the validity of agreements than the compelling validity of scientific statements. Even when the answers are given by philosophers whose way of life is solitude, they are arrived at by an exchange of opinions among many men, most of whom may no longer be among the living. Such truth can never command general agreement, but it frequently outlasts the compellingly and demonstrably true statements of the sciences which, especially in recent times, have the uncomfortable inclination never to stay put, although at any given moment they are, and must be, valid for all. In other words, notions such as life, or man, or science, or knowledge are pre-scientific by definition, and the question is whether or not the actual development of science which has led to the conquest of terrestrial space and to the invasion of the space of the universe has changed these notions to such an extent that they no longer make sense. For the point of the matter is, of course, that modern science—no matter what its origins and original goals—has changed and reconstructed the world we live in so radically that it could be argued that the layman and the humanist, still trusting their common sense and communicating in everyday language, are out of touch with reality; that they understand only what appears but not what is behind appearances (as though trying to understand a tree without taking the roots into account); and that their questions and anxieties are simply caused by ignorance and therefore are irrelevant. How can anyone doubt that a science enabling man to conquer space and go to the moon has increased his stature?

### However, this distinction between “real” or scientific knowledge and “false” or layperson’s knowledge is not just facetious, it actively harms both the scientist and the layperson, eroding their power of understanding.

Arendt, Hannah, German-American Political Philosopher, “The Conquest Of Space And The Nature Of Man”, republished by The New Atlantis: Journal of Technology and Society in 2007, original published in 1963, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/the-conquest-of-space-and-the-stature-of-man

This division between the scientist and the layman, however, is very far from the truth. The fact is not merely that the scientist spends more than half of his life in the same world of sense perception, of common sense, and of everyday language as his fellow citizens, but that he has come in his own privileged field of activity to a point where the naïve questions and anxieties of the layman have made themselves felt very forcefully, albeit in a different manner. The scientist has not only left behind the layman with his limited understanding; he has left behind a part of himself and his own power of understanding, which is still human understanding, when he goes to work in the laboratory and begins to communicate in mathematical language. Max Planck was right, and the miracle of modern science is indeed that this science could be purged “of all anthropomorphic elements” because the purging was done by men.[7] The theoretical perplexities that have confronted the new non-anthropocentric and non-geocentric (or heliocentric) science because its data refuse to be ordered by any of the natural mental categories of the human brain are well enough known. In the words of Erwin Schrödinger, the new universe that we try to “conquer” is not only “practically inaccessible, but not even thinkable,” for “however we think it, it is wrong; not perhaps quite as meaningless as a ‘triangular circle,’ but much more so than a ‘winged lion.’”[8]

LINKS- Arendt 2/6

### Power of understanding (or hermeneutic power) is key to the survival of culture into the future.

Balkin, J. M., knight professor of constitutional law and the first amendment at Yale Law School, “Cultural Software: A theory of ideology”, copyright 1998, http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/jbalkin/cs/cultural\_software\_chapter12.htm

The hermeneutic power involved in ideological effects is simply a special case of the power that cultural software has over individuals generally. In es sence, the entire previous discussion of ideological effects has been concerned with the mechanisms of ideological power. In previous chapters we have seen how many of the basic tools of cultural understanding that we inevitably and necessarily employ in our understanding of the social world-heuristics, nar ratives, metaphors, categories, and networks of conceptual associations-shape our thoughts and hence our actions in important ways. Whenever we offer an account of an ideological mechanism, we also explain how it produces power over our imaginations. Thus, within the theory of cultural software, the con nections between understanding and power-between ideology and cratology are fundamental. Ideological power is an inevitable consequence of the operations of subjec tivity, because hermeneutic power is an inevitable consequence of being a per son existing in a culture at a particular moment in history. Because individuals must understand the social world through use of their cultural software, they are inevitably subjected to various forms of hermeneutic power merely by ex isting as persons equipped with and constituted by cultural software. Each act of cultural understanding is a potential source of ideological power over the individual because each act of understanding is a source of hermeneutic power over the individual. Hermeneutic power, and hence ideological power, is not something wholly imposed on a subject from without; it results from the in teraction of the social world with a subject already programmed to receive information in a certain way. As Stanley Fish notes, the force of ideology is not an external force, and ideological power does not operate like a gun at your head. There is no gun at your head: "The gun at your head is your head."[21] Because individuals are constituted by their cultural software, they are con tinually immersed in forms of hermeneutic power without noticing it. Thus Foucault's claim about the ubiquity of disciplinary power is also true of the hermeneutic power of cultural software. Take, for example, cultural codes con cerning dress. Cultural understandings of appropriate and attractive dress ex pect women to wear high heels in certain situations. For some, these cultural expectations are oppressive, but they are oppressive in part precisely because they are internalized-the individual feels that she is being forced by com munity expectations to dress in ways she would rather not. But if a particular individual does not mind wearing high heels and even thinks that they make her look more attractive, she does not feel oppressed or disempowered by the cultural codes that require them. We may make a partial analogy to the forces of nature. When a swimmer swims with the ocean tide, she does not necessarily feel the tide as a force. Nor do we feel the force of the air that presses against us, unless there is a sudden drop or increase in pressure that produces wind. Nor do we feel the inertial force of the earth's accelerated motion around the sun (produced by a gravi tational force), or the solar system's motion within the galaxy. By analogy we might think of hermeneutic power (and ideological power) as a sort of back ground power that we live within, a power that is constitutive of our everyday existence. Like normal air pressure or the acceleration of the earth around the sun, it is a necessary albeit unnoticed element of our lives, a background force that accompanies and produces our life on Earth. We do not feel the force of the various background forms of ideological power until we oppose them in certain ways. Then we are like a swimmer who tries to swim against the tide and suddenly feels its strength. The example of air pressure is important for another reason: not only do we not notice normal air pressure but our bodies are designed to operate cor rectly only within tolerable deviances from this normality. If air pressure be comes too little or too great, we cannot survive. To continue the analogy, there may be an important sense in which hermeneutic power is not felt in ordinary circumstances partly because our ability to participate in a culture or a shared set of conventions or expectations requires this power to be present. Without this force, our culture, and our cultural identities, could not long survive. The power of cultural software binds members of a culture together and makes following, participating, and developing cultural conventions possible. The fact that this power can be used for good or for ill does not change the fact of its ubiquity; its capacity for good or bad use is implicit in the ambivalent concep tion of cultural software.
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### And culture is necessary for human existence for three reasons: it provides skills for adaptation, is the basis for human social life and affects how we view reality.

http://www.wadsworthmedia.com/marketing/sample\_chapters/1111301522\_ch02.pdf

Culture is necessary for human existence in at least three specific ways: 1. Culture provides the knowledge by which we adapt to our natural environment by harnessing resources and solving other problems of living in a particular place. As they grow up, children socially learn skills for tracking game, gathering wild plants, making gardens, herding livestock, or finding a job, depending on how people make their living in a particular society. Because most human populations have lived in the same environment for many generations, if not cen- turies, the current generation is usually wise to take advantage of the adaptive wisdom learned and passed down by its cultural ancestors. 2. Culture is the basis for human social life. It provides ready-made norms, values, expectations, attitudes, symbols, and other knowledge that individuals use to communicate, cooperate, live in families and other groups, relate to people of their own and opposite sex, and establish political and legal systems. As they grow up, people learn what actions are and are not acceptable, how to win friends, who relatives are, how and whom to court and marry, when to show glee or grief, and so forth. 3. Culture affects our views of reality. It provides the mental concepts by which people perceive, inter- pret, analyze, and explain events in the world around them. Our culture provides a filter or screen that affects how we perceive the world through our senses. This view certainly applies to some behaviors, but cul- tural knowledge consists of far more than just rules or instructions. It consists of values that provide only rough and sometimes conflicting guidelines for behavior. It includes shared constructions of reality and worldviews, which influence our behavior, but only indirectly (by affecting how we perceive and interpret the world) rather than directly (as instructions). Finally, cultural knowledge includes attitudes, understandings of symbols, and other kinds of ideas and beliefs that affect how people act, but not in the same way that rules do. The effects of these and other mental components of culture are too subtle and complex to think of them as rules or instructions.

### And hermeneutics provide the necessary preunderstanding for explicit conscious acts, thus leading to a less violent use of power and agency.

Kogler, Hans-Herbert, Associate Professor Of Philosophy at the University Of North Florida, “A critical hermeneutics of subjectivity: Cultural studies at a critical social theory”, 2002, http://www.unf.edu/~hkoegler/Postmodernism/KoeglerDocs/OtherDocs/Koegler.pdf

It is thus misleading to oppose harshly the real or conscious process of synthesis with “blind subsumption.” Rather, the reflexivity of (situated) agents is in general to be understood as mediated by a cultural preunderstanding, with regard to which it is in a more or less conscious attitude. The hermeneutic model of a preunderstanding necessary for explicit conscious acts can provide the context for a less violent mediation of power-saturated schemes and reflexive agency.42 As shown by numerous cultural studies, conscious acts are embedded in power-shaped frames of meaning, without, however, disempowering the agents fully or disarming them of any possible reflexive attitude. In other words, the turn to a theory of symbolic mediation allows us to detect and analyze the pervasive features of power by preserving a level on which to locate the potential for critical reflexivity and political transformation.43
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### By encouraging us to move beyond a terrestrial framework for discovery, the affirmative’s discoveries become nothing but meaningless abstraction, infinitely beyond human comprehension.

Arendt, Hannah, German-American Political Philosopher, “The Conquest Of Space And The Nature Of Man”, republished by The New Atlantis: Journal of Technology and Society in 2007, original published in 1963, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/the-conquest-of-space-and-the-stature-of-man

Niels Bohr, however, went one step further. For him, causality, determinism, and necessity of laws belonged to the categories of “our necessarily prejudiced conceptual frame,” and he was no longer frightened when he met “in atomic phenomena regularities of quite a new kind, defying deterministic pictorial description.”[14] The trouble is that what defies description in terms of the “prejudices” of the human mind defies description in every conceivable way of human language; it can no longer be described at all, and it is being expressed, but not described, in mathematical processes. Bohr still hoped that, since “no experience is definable without a logical frame,” these new experiences would in due time fall into place through “an appropriate widening of the conceptual framework” which would also remove all present paradoxes and “apparent disharmonies.”[15] But this hope, I am afraid, will be disappointed. The categories and ideas of human reason have their ultimate source in human sense experience, and all terms describing our mental abilities as well as a good deal of our conceptual language derive from the world of the senses and are used metaphorically. Moreover, the human brain which supposedly does our thinking is as terrestrial, earthbound, as any other part of the human body. It was precisely by abstracting from these terrestrial conditions, by appealing to a power of imagination and abstraction that would, as it were, lift the human mind out of the gravitational field of the earth and look down upon it from some point in the universe, that modern science reached its most glorious and, at the same time, most baffling achievements. In 1929, shortly before the arrival of the Atomic Revolution, marked by the splitting of the atom and the hope for the conquest of universal space, Planck demanded that the results obtained by mathematical processes “must be translated back into the language of the world of our senses if they are to be of any use to us.” In the three decades that have passed since these words were written, such translation has become even less possible while the loss of contact between the physical world view and the sense world has become even more conspicuous. But—and in our context this is even more alarming—this has by no means meant that results of this new science are of no practical use, or that the new world view, as Planck had predicted in case the translation back into ordinary language should fail, “would be no better than a bubble ready to burst at the first puff of wind.”[16] On the contrary, one is tempted to say that it is much more likely that the planet we inhabit will go up in smoke as a consequence of theories that are entirely unrelated to the world of the senses, and defy all description in human language, than that even a hurricane will cause the theories to burst like a bubble.
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### The space enterprise encourages the dehumanization of those on earth and leaves us in the mire of existential loneliness and destroying all value to human life.

Arendt, Hannah, German-American Political Philosopher, “The Conquest Of Space And The Nature Of Man”, republished by The New Atlantis: Journal of Technology and Society in 2007, original published in 1963, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/the-conquest-of-space-and-the-stature-of-man

The magnitude of the space enterprise seems to me beyond dispute, and all objections raised against it on the purely utilitarian level—that it is too expensive, that the money were better spent on education and the improvement of the citizens, on the fight against poverty and disease, or whatever other worthy purposes may come to mind—sound to me slightly absurd, out of tune with the things that are at stake and whose consequences today appear still quite unpredictable. There is, moreover, another reason why I think these arguments are beside the point. They are singularly inapplicable because the enterprise itself could come about only through an amazing development of man’s scientific capabilities. The very integrity of science demands that not only utilitarian considerations but the reflection upon the stature of man as well be left in abeyance. Has not each of the advances of science, since the time of Copernicus, almost automatically resulted in a decrease in his stature? And is the often repeated argument that it was man who achieved his own debasement in his search for truth, thus proving anew his superiority and even increasing his stature, more than a sophism? Perhaps it will turn out that way. At any event, man, insofar as he is a scientist, does not care about his own stature in the universe or about his position on the evolutionary ladder of animal life; this “carelessness” is his pride and his glory. The simple fact that physicists split the atom without any hesitations the very moment they knew how to do it, although they realized full well the enormous destructive potentialities of their operation, demonstrates that the scientist qua scientist does not even care about the survival of the human race on earth or, for that matter, about the survival of the planet itself. All associations for “Atoms for Peace,” all warnings not to use the new power unwisely, and even the pangs of conscience many scientists felt when the first bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki cannot obscure this simple, elementary fact. For in all these efforts the scientists acted not as scientists but as citizens, and if their voices have more authority than the voices of laymen, they do so only because the scientists are in possession of more precise information. Valid and plausible arguments against the “conquest of space” could be raised only if they were to show that the whole enterprise might be self-defeating in its own terms. There are a few indications that such might indeed be the case. If we leave out of account the human life span, which under no circumstances (even if biology should succeed in extending it significantly and man were able to travel with the speed of light) will permit man to explore more than his immediate surroundings in the immensity of the universe, the most significant indication that it might be self-defeating consists in Heisenberg’s discovery of the uncertainty principle. Heisenberg showed conclusively that there is a definite and final limit to the accuracy of all measurements obtainable by man-devised instruments for those “mysterious messengers from the real world.” The uncertainty principle “asserts that there are certain pairs of quantities, like the position and velocity of a particle, that are related in such a way that determining one of them with increased precision necessarily entails determining the other one with reduced precision.”[23] Heisenberg concludes from this fact that “we decide, by our selection of the type of observation employed, which aspects of nature are to be determined and which are to be blurred.”[24] He holds that “the most important new result of nuclear physics was the recognition of the possibility of applying quite different types of natural laws, without contradiction, to one and the same physical event. This is due to the fact that within a system of laws which are based on certain fundamental ideas only certain quite definite ways of asking questions make sense, and thus, that such a system is separated from others which allow different questions to be put.”[25] From this he concluded that the modern search for “true reality” behind mere appearances, which has brought about the world we live in and resulted in the Atomic Revolution, has led into a situation in the sciences themselves in which man has lost the very objectivity of the natural world, so that man in his hunt for “objective reality” suddenly discovered that he always “confronts himself alone.”[26]

LINKS- Arendt 6/6

### Technological separation from the terrestrial combines the technological and the biological until we can see no distinction and the machine is inextricably woven into the human being who created it.

Arendt, Hannah, German-American Political Philosopher, “The Conquest Of Space And The Nature Of Man”, republished by The New Atlantis: Journal of Technology and Society in 2007, original published in 1963, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/the-conquest-of-space-and-the-stature-of-man

At this moment, the prospects for such an entirely beneficial development and solution of the present predicaments of modern science and technology do not look particularly good. We have come to our present capacity to “conquer space” through our new ability to handle nature from a point in the universe outside the earth. For this is what we actually do when we release energy processes that ordinarily go on only in the sun, or attempt to initiate in a test tube the processes of cosmic evolution, or build machines for the production and control of energies unknown in the household of earthly nature. Without as yet actually occupying the point where Archimedes had wished to stand, we have found a way to act on the earth as though we disposed of terrestrial nature from outside, from the point of Einstein’s “observer freely poised in space.” If we look down from this point upon what is going on on earth and upon the various activities of men, that is, if we apply the Archimedean point to ourselves, then these activities will indeed appear to ourselves as no more than “overt behavior,” which we can study with the same methods we use to study the behavior of rats. Seen from a sufficient distance, the cars in which we travel and which we know we built ourselves will look as though they were, as Heisenberg once put it, “as inescapable a part of ourselves as the snail’s shell is to its occupant.” All our pride in what we can do will disappear into some kind of mutation of the human race; the whole of technology, seen from this point, in fact no longer appears “as the result of a conscious human effort to extend man’s material powers, but rather as a large-scale biological process.”[27] Under these circumstances, speech and everyday language would indeed be no longer a meaningful utterance that transcends behavior even if it only expresses it, and it would much better be replaced by the extreme and in itself meaningless formalism of mathematical signs. The conquest of space and the science that made it possible have come perilously close to this point. If they ever should reach it in earnest, the stature of man would not simply be lowered by all standards we know of, but have been destroyed.

## Other People Agree With Arendt 1/3

### Arendt’s call for change in modern science has not become irrelevant with age but has, rather, become more applicable. Even more so today, science is threatening to undermine the very ideas of equality and humanity.

Deneen, Patrick J., associate professor of government at Georgetown University, where he holds the Markos and Eleni Tsakopoulos-Kounalakis Chair in Hellenic Studies. He is also the director of the Tocqueville Forum on the Roots of American Democracy, “Nature, Man and Common Sense”, The New Atlantis: A journal of technology and society, Fall 2007, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/nature-man-and-common-sense

More fundamentally, the motivation underlying “the conquest of space” imperils the very idea of “common”: the scientific enterprise was apt to give priority of the measurable inequalities of humans over our non-measurable equality. Human equality is not most obviously derived from empirical data, but rather from a religious and political tradition that understood it as more fundamental than any sensory or empirical evidence of inequality. Arendt argued in her essay “Truth and Politics” that the articulation of human equality in the Declaration of Independence was based not so much on its self-evidence than by dint of the fact that it was a truth that “we hold.” By dismissing the “common”—the very basis of such a shared “holding” of equality’s validity—science threatens to undermine the very idea of equality, and hence, the very idea of a single humanity. The deepest danger of the destruction of “common sense” was the temptation of science to dismiss unprovable belief in human equality in favor of scientifically “provable” distinctions that would divide super- from sub-human. Arendt suggested that such a “truth”—even if it could be established scientifically, as was attempted by National Socialists in their studies of Jews—had no place in the realm of politics, or the domain of the common. Arendt saw clearly the trajectory of modern science in undermining the belief in a common humanity and the religious and political basis of the belief in equality. Her prescience in anticipating modern science’s tendencies toward displacing God and installing humankind in the place of divinity can only strike today’s reader as prophetic. However, Arendt’s own doubts about the standard of nature and the divine marks her work as finally insufficient to the task of defending against the tendency of science to alter nature and make its standards irrelevant. To the extent that Arendt held that humanity was a creature defined through politics and in history—that our equality was the result of the fact that “we hold” it to be true, and not that it is self-evident by nature—Arendt shared a certain set of modern philosophic presuppositions with modern science. Her philosophic sympathies lay with Kant (Kant of the Critique of Judgment, which she interpreted to understand that truth was the construct of human communities) and perhaps most deeply Heidegger. Her critique of modern science’s destruction of “common sense” is powerful enough to point us back to the status and standard of nature as it was understood by the pre-modern thinkers, and especially Aristotle and Aquinas. While her work does not articulate a sufficient defense of a kind of Aristotelian or Thomistic standard in nature and the divine, her writings—this essay among them—are nevertheless a powerful and necessary corrective to our ongoing faith in the power of science and its ambition for the conquest of nature—even that human nature that informs us at once of limits to our effort to control nature and of the source of our human dignity.

### Technology creates a turn towards introspection, which, in turn, causes the world itself to become an obstacle between our selves and understanding.

Koganzon, Rita, a Harvard graduate and writer living in DC, The New Atlantis: A journal for the study of technology and society, “Science and Totalitarianism”, Fall 2007, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/science-and-totalitarianism

The Conquest of Space and the Stature of Man” is best read in conversation with Arendt’s 1958 book The Human Condition, wherein she develops some of the same themes and lays out with care her views on freedom, political agency, and modernity. (Unless otherwise noted, all the ensuing quotations from Arendt appear in The Human Condition.) She argues that the divide between politics and science is in essence a divergence of language, with its source in the insufficiency of sense perception for modern science. Galileo’s invention of the telescope, Arendt observes, marked the first time that “the secrets of the universe were delivered to human cognition ‘with the certainty of sense-perception’” by a man-made instrument. It demonstrated that man could, through his technical ingenuity, transcend the limitations of his body and his earth-bound condition and come to an understanding of nature previously accessible only through abstract speculation. At the same time, the telescope demonstrated that man’s senses were woefully insufficient—even misleading—in his quest to understand nature. Paradoxically, the abandonment of sense perception for fabricated instruments, rather than illuminating the physical world, “has left us a universe whose qualities we know no more than the way they affect our measuring instruments.” The more we rely on instruments to deliver the remote reality of atomic particles or distant galaxies to us, the more true it is that, as Heisenberg wrote, “the object of research is no longer nature itself, but man’s investigation of nature. Here, again, man confronts himself alone.” This for Arendt was symptomatic of a kind of “world alienation”—the isolation of the individual from the shared human world—that endangers the possibility of political life. When Descartes observed that sensual knowledge and reason failed to render truths about the universe as well as instruments could, he concluded, as Alfred North Whitehead put it, “that the mind can only know that which it has itself produced and that remains in some sense within itself.” The result of this logic was the rise of introspection, and with it, a concomitant decline in common sense. “For common sense,” Arendt writes, “which had once been the one by which all other senses, with their intimately private sensations, were fitted into the common world ... now became an inner faculty without a world relationship.... What men now have in common is not the world, but the structure of their minds.” This turn toward introspection is a turn away from the world. The world still exists, of course, and we remain mortal, earth-bound creatures, but since we can only trust the things we create, it becomes an obstacle to self-understanding rather than a vehicle for it.

Other People Agree With Arendt 2/3

### Exploration of space will always, inevitably retrench us in anthropocentric discourse. The more we explore space, the less likely we are to find anything but ourselves.

Rubin, Charles T., An Associate Professor of political science at Duquesqunee University, “Thumos in Space”, The New Atlantis, Fall 2007, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/thumos-in-space

Some two score years on, Arendt’s concerns have by no means been shown to be groundless. She was not wrong to point out the ironic outcome of scientific anti-anthropocentrism, which she believed practically ensured that man “will be the less likely ever to meet anything but himself and man-made things the more ardently he wishes to eliminate all anthropocentric considerations from his encounter with the non-human world around him.” Without concerning ourselves with distant future possibilities like space-settlement or terraforming, we can already see a subtle sign of this anti-anthropocentrism in the iconic status of the “blue marble” photographs of Earth from space, which are said to reveal the great truth about our situation in the cosmos. Proudly shorn of all signs of the human world (take that, all you merely conventional map boundaries!) the picture reveals an abstract—in effect, alien—Earth. Carl Sagan could look at Earth photographed from four billion miles away—hardly showing any disk at all—and see “a lonely speck in the great enveloping cosmic dark.... To me, it underscores our responsibility to deal more kindly with one another and to preserve and cherish the pale blue dot, the only home we’ve ever known.” What we see in the muted colors and swirling cloud patterns is little more than a projection of our own hopes and fears, a complement to the broader, postmodern intellectual project that imprisons us within our particularity. Arendt was also right to worry about a scientific worldview disconnected from day-to-day human experience. Some might have argued that any resources extended to space exploration already provide a practical illustration of this disconnect, but Arendt takes a different tack. The scientist wants data against which to test his theories. While the scientist as such does not need or want to go to the Moon to gather the data he needs, Arendt seems to believe that there is almost a compulsion for human beings to go where previously only their imaginations have been able to reach, precisely to try to reestablish the connection between theory and “the world of the senses and appearances.”

### And anthropocentrism leads to environmental degradation and lack of compassion—only rejecting the anthropocentric attitudes of space exploration can create world peace.

Das, Kantilal, doctor of Philosophy and author, “Searching non-anthropocentrism as a message toward world peace”, November 8, 2007, papers.isud.org/files/Das\_Kantilal.doc

The most dangerous propensity of the present human generation is the propensity of enjoying anthropocentrism in every aspect of life that directly or indirectly invites environmental degradation which in turn poses a serious threat to the mankind in general. From religion to ethics and from ethics to science there underlies a cemented view of anthropocentrism where man is determined as the measure of all things; where everything is determined in terms of instrumental (use) value rather than non-instrumental (intrinsic) value; where human greed overlaps human’s basic needs; where nature is considered as a storehouse of materials. In short anthropocentric attitude of humans degrades environment, devalues nature and above all injudiciously attempts to conquer nature. Non-anthropocentric approach, on the contrary, pleas for a radical change of human attitude towards nature so that nature can be treated not as a mere storehouse of materials, but as the beholder of all biotic and abiotic community. This could be justified in restoring the intrinsic value of natural entities. Non-anthropocentrism thereby brings a message of world peace where every natural entity maintains a harmonious life with others. It tries to establish that all non-human living organisms are morally valuable in themselves as each of them possesses intrinsic value irrespective of valuers. It annihilates moral hierarchism within biotic communities, restores equal moral status, and restores environmental justice, mutual care, love and sympathy. It equally cultivates individual rationality by means of which one can realize that his own self is no longer different from other and every individual self is essentially merged with the Self. Thus, self realization is the most important key to understanding nature. Here one would be a virtuous being who can realize others, feel for others, controls himself from doing mischievous action and confines himself within his basic needs. He then realizes that he is a tiny being like many others and he is no longer in a position to dictate nature. He would come to know that his own fortune and own flourishing actually hinges on the contribution of other fellow beings and he cannot survive any more without the survival of others. This realization actually prompts him to care for others, love others, and share with others. Lack of feeling for others is a serious threat of present generation and anthropocentrism in general is responsible for this. So world peace as such can only be restored by searching non-anthropocentrism which in turn minimizes the so-called environmental degradation in general. Everything would be futile as long as one cannot realize himself, cultivate himself within the parameter of non-anthropocentrism. Thus, it can be said that without protecting environmental degradation, no world peace can be restored in true sense and this is where the relevance of non-anthropocentrism as a message towards world peace actually hinges on.
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### The alt is to reject the affs notion of an anthropocentric drive to explore and colonize outer space while embracing the negative’s biocentric initiative to understand nature as the key to world peace.

Das, Kantilal, doctor of Philosophy and author, “Searching non-anthropocentrism as a message toward world peace”, November 8, 2007, papers.isud.org/files/Das\_Kantilal.doc

Thus world peace as such is hard to come by within the framework of materialism, individualism, subjectivism where individual needs and tastes are determined not on the basis of basic needs, but on the basis of greed. Here we call upon the voice of Mahatma Gandhi who once remarked that there is plenty in nature to cope up with the individuals’ needs, but not individuals’ greed. Domination of individuals’ greed over basic needs is the main hurdle of achieving human harmony and peace. This is where the relevance of modern environmental ethics, a new form of philosophy that appears with the message of non-anthropocentrism where value is measured not in terms of use, but in terms of inherent worth lies. Non-anthropocentrism as contrary to anthropocentrism tries to abolish individual subjectivism, dualism, materialism and instead of this, it tries to restore universal holism where every entity, animate as well as inanimate, is considered to be equal not in terms of the quality it possesses, but in terms of inherent worth an object possesses. It conceives values not in terms of means, but in terms of end. In other word, a thing is valuable not as a means to an end, but as an end in itself. Valuing something as an end in itself is the message of non-anthropocentrism which is urgently needed for maintaining world peace. Environmental ethics brings the message of non-anthropocentrism which tries to overcome environmental degradation through a second order prescription where interlocking of moral dignity and equality of all biotic as well as abiotic community is being preserved and maintained. It has been realized, though belatedly, by the western society that scientific implications within materialistic environment can only degrade environment and where there is environmental degradation, there cannot sustain peace and harmony. Scientific implication without moral foundation has no social value. It pollutes the environment and thereby disturbs peace and harmony. So to say world peace to a large extent depends on the harmonious relationship among all natural communities and this harmonious relationship can be sustained and preserved only within the domain of proper environment. A natural environment, therefore, is supposed to be the key of sustaining world peace. Unfortunately, the present society under the brand of anthropocentrism conceives nature as the storehouse of materials; it tries to conquer nature, tries to reordering nature according to the will of the society. But the very fact is that nature can never be conquered by the tiny individuals, because nature is too mighty to conquer. So instead of segmenting or robbing intrinsic value of natural communities, non-anthropocentrism proclaims that all natural communities do have intrinsic value not as a means to an end, but as an end in itself. It denies the subjectivists account of intrinsic value where intrinsic value is comprehended as derivative. Rather it has pleaded for an objectivists account of intrinsic value of all natural communities which are valuable not as a means to an end, but as an end in itself. A thing is valuable as an end in itself if it would be valuable irrespective of the valuers. All natural communities being the integral and inevitable part of nature do possess intrinsic value. Accordingly, humans are no longer superior to other living organisms as all living organisms are teleological centers of life in the sense that each is a unique individual and flourishing its own good in its own natural manner. It has good of its own. Since a proper habitat within the biotic society depends on the coherent existence of all living things, one species cannot survive by forfeiting the existence of others. This theory is known as biocentrism where the moral integrity and stability of all biotic communities can be equally preserved

## The Alt

### The alt is not to forget technology but rather to critically examine our language and expression of that technology, allowing advances to develop as a secondary measure.

Koganzon, Rita, a Harvard graduate and writer living in DC, The New Atlantis: A journal for the study of technology and society, “Science and Totalitarianism”, Fall 2007, http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/science-and-totalitarianism

Of course, the fear of man’s unpredictability hardly puts us on an inexorable path to totalitarianism. Neither, for that matter, does modern science, or even space travel itself, which confronts us starkly with the image of ourselves as mere animals. The fabrication of technology is one of man’s primary capacities; through it, he creates a relatively permanent human world, which one generation bequeaths to the next and through which successive generations mitigate their individual mortality. Arendt’s critique of science is not intended to diminish this essential aspect of man as a fabricator and builder of the world. Nor does she deny that man is an animal who must attend to his nutritive and reproductive functions to survive. The Archimedean point is even, her argument admits, a boon to human understanding, so long as we don’t apply that line of reasoning to ourselves. The image from space of humans as ants is not wrong, but it is incomplete, especially in light of man’s vast technological know-how. Arendt offers a view of a future in which space travel, rather than drawing

man farther away from the earth, would instead remind him of the limitations of his condition—what she calls, in her essay, the “factual mortality” that is among the “elementary conditions” of his existence on earth that allow for science. These conditions include the earth itself, the prerequisite of life and man’s connection to nature. They include the fabricated world, man’s effort to introduce something onto the earth that will outlast his individual life. And they include the fact of plurality—the fact, as she famously put it, “that men, not Man, live on the earth and inhabit the world,” and each birth is the beginning of something wholly new in the world. Arendt’s call in her essay to “think what we are doing” is not merely an injunction to passively ponder our situation, but to consider the meaning of science in light of man’s capacities, and to take responsibility to ensure that the world we transmit to future generations is a world “fit for action and speech.”