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# Space Frontier K

## Space Frontier Kritik 1NC

### We should analyze our future in space exploration as part of the American frontier narrative – the 1AC’s justifications for exploration are fundamentally shaped by our rhetoric

Williamson 87 (Ray A, Research Professor of International Affairs and Space Policy in the Space Policy Institute of The George Washington University, “Outer Space as Frontier: Lessons for Today,” *Western Folklore*, Volume 46, No. 4, October 1987)

Folklorists have a distinctive contribution to make in understanding and interpreting the effects of science and technology on humans-what it means to be human in the modern world-and in analyzing our future role in space. This essay examines the implications of using the western frontier as a metaphor for human occupation of outer space, and explores how this metaphor, and its associated mythology, along with the lore deriving from it, helps to shape our view of our future in outer space. Most tellers of these tales earn their livelihood as engineers, scientists, technicians, and managers in one or another part of the U.S. space program. Others have no direct involvement in the space program at all but are attracted to the idea of a space culture. Although they constitute an elite group with respect to their education and their interest in space, these narrators are otherwise ordinary people whose views reflect American culture. My involvement with this group of men and women has come about as a consequence of my own interest in space activities, and in analyzing U.S. space policy. My understanding of their stories and what they mean to these individuals is informed by my professional interactions with them, as well as by my analysis of their written expression. It is in their writing that one finds the clearest expression of this group's hopes and aspirations about their view of the future, but their oral culture often carries the same narratives and tropes. In later research I expect to focus more intensely upon the narratives gleaned from my interviews with these people. In the first three decades of this country's civilian space effort, those who provided our space technology have developed distinctive ways of thinking and acting and of justifying their actions. They believe staunchly in the power to improve our lives, and they remain firmly optimistic about the future. Their stories reflect a way of thinking about the world, almost a distinct cosmology, in which technology holds the key to improvements in well-being. Few other than folklorists think of these written narratives material texts that set the stage, or frame the argument, or the space program-as "stories." Indeed, the tellers of these tales generally think of them as arguments, or predictions, or speculations about real events-at least events that could be real if only we say the right words and then follow the right actions. Yet, the storytellers use many of the artful and persuasive devices of traditional storytelling. Indeed, these stories, many of them couched in the terms of the lore of the western frontier, are of particular importance today because they amount to a political rhetoric justifying an expanded U.S. presence in space. They succeed rhetorically precisely because they appeal to basic human hopes and aspirations, such as the "blind hopes" that Prometheus gave humans when he bestowed the gifts of techne.3 In these stories, outer space is a vast, uncharted realm, ripe for exploration and exploitation and ready to return new information, new industries, and great material benefit to Earth. Above all, these stories present outer space as our nation's new or final frontier, a challenge to all who possess the fortitude and sense of adventure to carry through the vision. America has developed and prospered economically in the context of a well-developed lore and mythology of the western frontier that is unique to the United States and embedded deep within its popular culture.4 According to this lore, the western frontier consisted of newly discovered, open land that required only hard work and resourcefulness to conquer. It was an exciting place to be, a land of unparalleled economic opportunity and freedom for the few who had the strength and stamina. Women had a distinct role in the myth of the frontier, as they accompanied their men out of love and duty. These stories cast the native inhabitants as temporary barriers to Anglo-European economic opportunity.

### The judge should examine rhetorical criticism as a way of evaluating representations – the 1AC space advocacy is a manifestation of exceptionalism and frontier ideology

Billings 7 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Societal Impact of Spaceflight,” edited by Steven Dick and Roger Launius, 2007)

The ideas of frontier pioneering, continual progress, manifest destiny, free enterprise, and rugged individualism have been prominent in the American national narrative, which has constructed and maintained an ideology of “Americanism”—what it means to be American, and what America is meant to be and do. In exploring the history of U.S. spaceflight, it is useful to consider how U.S. space advocacy movements and initiatives have interpreted and deployed the values and beliefs sustained by this national narrative. The aim here is to illuminate the role and function of ideology and advocacy in the history of spaceflight by examining the rhetoric of spaceflight advocacy. Starting from the premise that spaceflight has played a role in the American national narrative and that this national narrative has played a role in the history of spaceflight, this paper examines the relationship between spaceflight and this narrative. Examining the history of spaceflight advocacy reveals an ideology of spaceflight that draws deeply on a durable American cultural narrative—a national mythology—of frontier pioneering, continual progress, manifest destiny, free enterprise, rugged individualism, and a right to life without limits. This ideology rests on a number of assumptions, or beliefs, about the role of the United States in the global community, the American national character, and the “right” form of political economy. According to this ideology, the United States is and must remain “number one” in the world community, playing the role of political, economic, scientific, technological, and moral leader. That is, the United States is and must be exceptional. This ideology constructs Americans as independent, pioneering, resourceful, inventive, and exceptional, and it establishes that liberal democracy and free-market capitalism (or capitalist democracy) constitute the only viable form of political economy.2 The rhetoric of space advocacy exalts those enduring American values of pioneering, progress, enterprise, freedom, and rugged individualism, and it advances the cause of capitalist democracy. Delving into the language or rhetoric of spaceflight is a productive way of exploring the meanings and motives that are embedded in and conveyed by the ideology and advocacy of spaceflight—the cultural narrative of pioneering the space frontier. According to rhetorical critic Thomas Lessl, rhetorical analysis can shed some light on . . . [t]he processes of communication that underpin decision making in free societies . . . . Judgments on matters of public policy take their cues from rhetoric, and so an understanding of any society’s rhetoric will tell us a lot about its ideas, beliefs, laws, customs and assumptions—especially how and why such social features came into being.3 To begin this analysis, some definition of key concepts is warranted, starting with culture and communication. anthropologist Clifford Geertz’s definition of culture is operative in this analysis: [culture is an] historically transmitted pattern of meanings embedded in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life. [it is a context within which social action can be] intelligibly—that is, thickly—described.4 Building on Geertz’s conception, communication theorist James Carey has characterized culture as a predominantly rhetorical construction, “a set of practices, a mode of human activity, a process whereby reality is created, maintained and transformed,” primarily by means of communication.5 Social norms can be constructed, perpetuated, and resisted—and ideologies can be propagated—“through ritualized communication practices.”6When advocates speak of advancing scientific and technological progress by exploring and exploiting the space frontier, they are performing ritual incantations of a national myth, repeating a cultural narrative that affirms what America and Americans are like and are meant to do. For the purposes of this analysis, communication is a ritual, culture is communication, and communication is culture. Standard definitions of ideology and advocacy are operational here.an ideology is a belief system (personal, political, social, cultural).advocacy is the act of arguing in favor of a cause, idea, or policy.

### Frontier rhetoric advocates unrestrained exploitation and totalitarianism, necessitating infinite destruction and turning case – only a rethinking of our space narrative makes peaceful spaceflight possible

Billings 7 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Societal Impact of Spaceflight,” edited by Steven Dick and Roger Launius, 2007.)

Of course, the idea of the human colonization of space is not publicly compelling in the current cultural environment. Poet Wendell Berry has addressed this dilemma: the [space colonization] project is an ideal solution to the moral dilemma of all those in this society who cannot face the necessities of meaningful change. It is superbly attuned to the wishes of the corporation executives, bureaucrats, militarists, political operators, and scientific experts who are the chief beneficiaries of the forces that have produced our crisis . . . . if it should be implemented, it will be the rebirth of the idea of progress with all its old lust for unrestrained expansion, its totalitarian concentrations of energy and wealth, its obliviousness to the concerns of character and community, its exclusive reliance on technical and economic criteria, its disinterest in consequence, its contempt for human value, its compulsive salesmanship. the sales pitch for space colonization goes this way, according to Berry: if we will just have the good sense to spend one hundred billion dollars on a space colony, we will thereby produce more money and more jobs, raise the standard of living, help the underdeveloped, increase freedom and opportunity, fulfill the deeper needs of the human spirit etc. etc. . . . anyone who has listened to the arguments of the army corps of engineers, the strip miners, the defense department or any club of boosters will find all this dishearteningly familiar.64 Visions of the human colonization of space present a “moral law of the frontier” that is disturbing, Berry concludes: this law is that “humans are destructive in proportion to their supposition of abundance; if they are faced with an infinite abundance, then they will become infinitely destructive.”65 Berry wrote his essay about the downside of space colonization in the 970s. But his views are not necessarily out of date. Environmentalists might argue today that the case Berry made against space colonization is even more relevant today than it was in the 970s. In order to survive as a cultural institution, spaceflight needs an ideology. It needs to have some connection to widely held beliefs. It needs a role in a cultural narrative. But as Pyne has noted, “locating exploration in the human gene or in the human spirit” and not in specific cultures is not viable. Continued reliance on this narrative “only absolves us from making those vital, deliberate choices” we inevitably have to make—about how we should proceed into space, and what values space exploration should embody. “These choices,” Pyne has said, “are not intuitive.”66 as a cultural institution, space exploration “has to speak to deeper longings and fears and folk identities.” it “is not merely an expression of curiosity but involves the encounter with a world beyond our ken that challenges our sense of who we are. It is a moral act . . . more than adventuring, more than entertainment, more than inquisitiveness.” it has to explain “who a people are and how they should behave.”67 and in the current cultural environment, as Pyne has observed, space exploration “will have to base its claim to legitimacy on transnational or ecumenical values.” unlike the Western-American frontier, as Janice Hocker rushing has pointed out, space is too big to be conquered. The recent focus of space exploration on the search for evidence of extraterrestrial life is a product, she has said, of a widespread understanding that humankind exists in a universe, not only on planet earth. The narrative of space exploration today might better reflect this understanding by telling a story of “a spiritual humbling of self” rather than “an imperialistic grabbing of territory.”69 although she has noted that “the WASP space cowboy version of spaceflight” has persisted from the Apollo era into the present, Constance Penley also has observed that NASA “is still the most popular point of reference for utopian ideas of collective progress.” in the popular imagination, “NASA continues to represent . . .perseverance, cooperation, creativity and vision,” and these meanings embedded in the narrative of spaceflight “can still be mobilized to rejuvenate the near-moribund idea of a future toward which dedicated people . . . could work together for the common good.”70 this historical review of the rhetoric of space advocacy reveals competing American cultural narratives, then. The dominant narrative—advancing the values of the dominant culture—upon which the narrative of U.S. spaceflight piggybacks, is a story of American exceptionalism that justifies unilateral action and the globalization of American capitalist democracy and material progress. The story of spaceflight is embedded in this broader narrative. that story is also woven into a competing narrative, a vision of “utopian ideas of collective progress” and “a spiritual humbling of self.” this competing narrative may be a site within which the ideology of spaceflight might rejuvenate itself—where the vision of a human future in space becomes a vision of humanity’s collective peaceful existence on Spaceship earth and the need to work together to preserve life here and look for life out there.

### Rejecting Space Frontier imagery and embracing space as wilderness opens up the possibility for human growth and understanding of the sociopolitical underpinnings of space exploration

Billings 97 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Frontier Days in Space: Are They Over?” *Space Policy*, 1997.)

Instead of profit, what the space community should be attending to in developing long-term exploration plans are the social, political, ethical, and even spiritual ramifications of extending human presence into space. NASA needs a few good social theorists and moral philosophers to guide the design of a meaningful 21st century space exploration program. Fundamentally, what space exploration is all about is not profit but evolution, revelation, and inspiration. “Explorers...are driven by a desire to discover which transcends the urge to conquer, the pursuit of trade,” writes Robin Hansbury-Tenison. (The Oxford Book of Exploration, Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, 1993) Apollo 11 astronaut Michael Collins has observed that “exploration produces a mood in people, a widening of interest, a stimulation of the thought process....” (Carrying the Fire: An Astronaut’s Journey, Farrar Straus Giroux, New York, 1974) Such efforts as NASA’s Discovery program -- a series of low-cost missions to study planets, moons, asteroids, and comets -- embody the true spirit of exploration. The search for extraterrestrial intelligence (abandoned by NASA in 1993) and the search for extrasolar planets epitomize the spirit of exploration as well. Patricia Nelson Limerick has recommended that the space community abandon the frontier metaphor. But at the same time she acknowledges that it is “an enormously persistent and determining pattern of thought....” Ultimately, it may not be feasible to expunge the frontier metaphor from the public discourse about space exploration. But it certainly is possible, and practical, to reexamine it as a motivating force for space exploration. What is this space frontier? It might be useful to think of the space frontier as a vast and distant sort of Brazilian rainforest, Atacama desert, Antarctic continent -- a great unknown that challenges humans to think creatively and expansively, to push their capabilities to the limits, a wild and beautiful place to be studied and enjoyed but left unsullied. Curiosity is what brought humans out of caves, took them across oceans and continents, compelled them to invent airplanes, and now draws them toward the stars. The broad, deep public value of exploring the universe is the value of discovery, learning, and understanding; thus, the space frontier could be a school for social research, a place where new societies could grow and thrive. This is the space frontier: the vast, perhaps endless, frontier of intellectual and spiritual potential.

## 2NC Framework

### **Examination of rhetoric is the best framework for evaluating the round – space advocacy is rooted in understanding our community and modes of communication**

Neal 7 (Valerie, Space History Curator at the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum, *Societal Impact of Spaceflight*, edited by Stephen Dick and Roger Launius, p. 68-70.)

Over the past five decades NASA, the media, and interested sectors (aerospace industry, scientific community, political figures, grass-roots groups, and others) plus thoughtful individuals have engaged in an ongoing process of asserting and contesting the value of human spaceflight by advancing a variety of visions or metaphors meant to answer such questions and sway public opinion. The continual effort to define the purpose of human spaceflight and reach a societal consensus on its value can be viewed as an extended exercise in the social construction of meaning. In the Shuttle era, at least five reference frames have been crafted, promoted, critiqued, refined, accepted, rejected, or transformed in the process of shaping and communicating the meaning of human spaceflight. These frames reveal much about what Americans hope for—and doubt—in our national ventures into space. Frame Analysis as an Interpretive Tool to pursue these questions about the meaning of Shuttle-era human spaceflight, it is helpful to apply some concepts, terms, and techniques from the literature of “frame analysis” that has become prominent in social science disciplines, especially in media studies and the study of social movements.1 in this context human spaceflight can be considered a social movement that has an action agenda, an imperative to muster resources, and a need to mobilize public support in order to carry out its agenda. NASA is the hub of this social movement, with aerospace companies, space societies, other government entities, and auxiliaries in the advocacy community, including some in the media. To analyze how social movements motivate public support, some scholars focus on framing processes, and they use the term “framing” for the “construction of meaning.” Framing is the packaging of messages that resonate with core values and appeal to supporters. a “collective action frame” is a construct of ideas and meanings based on shared beliefs and values that will motivate support.2 it is the conceptual analogy to a structural framework or a picture frame. The space race and the space frontier are such conceptual frames. Frames are “the basic frameworks of understanding available in our society for making sense out of events”; they help to render events meaningful, organize experience, guide action, and simplify and condense aspects of the world.3 they are intended to motivate support and disarm opposition, to inspire adherents, and to legitimize the activities and campaigns of a social movement. Frames provide context for a proposed action or policy. Opponents may contest or challenge them with counter-frames.4 the mobilizing potency of a frame lies in its credibility and resonance. It must be consistent with the facts and goals of the movement, and it must resonate with the beliefs, values, and interests of the targeted support community or constituents. Even more broadly, it should have “narrative fidelity” or coherence with cultural assumptions and myths in the public domain. Activists use cultural resources— beliefs, values, myths—as a “tool kit” to make their cause appealing and believable, and audiences also use them to gauge resonance.5 Because framing is an intentional process, frames need not be static. They can evolve as circumstances change, either to account for unexpected events or to better appeal to the target community. To mobilize support, a frame may need to be fairly elastic.6 Social movement activists are not the only ones developing frames of meaning. Media discourse also participates in the process of constructing meaning. Analysis of media discourse relative to a variety of social movements (e.g., the women’s movement, nuclear power, civil rights) reveals sophisticated frames or “interpretive packages” that are promulgated to make sense of issues and events. Like frames, interpretive packages have a central organizing idea, often presented in shorthand through symbols, metaphors, visual images, and icons. The media provide both an accessible forum for public consideration of issues and for suggested interpretations that help to shape the social construction of meaning. This paper applies frame analysis concepts to human spaceflight during the three-plus decades of the Shuttle era. primary sources for this analysis are selected elements of societal discourse that helped shape or curb public expectations of contemporary spaceflight—in this study, NASA’s publicity materials, The New York Times (news, editorials, and opinion pieces), and editorial cartoons from a variety of papers. The New York Times was selected for its breadth of coverage of Shuttle missions and spaceflight, its often critical editorial stance, and the long tenure of reporter-analyst John noble Wilford, who often wrestled with the meaning of human spaceflight. Other newspapers, magazines, and electronic media that could be fruitfully explored are not included in this brief study; likewise, speeches, transcripts of congressional hearings, and other official documents might be examined for a broader study. Among the techniques of frame analysis is close textual study with attention to keywords and themes, a rhetorical approach that is suitable for the sources examined.

### Exploration and exploitation of outer space are rooted in frontier justifications—we should critique the underlying ideology of American history before we consider the aff

Lin, 06. (Patrick, Assistant Professor at California Polytechnic State Univeristy. “Viewpoint: Look Before Taking Another Leap For Mankind- Ethical and Social Considerationa in Rebuilding Society in Space” Astropolitics. < <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14777620601039701>.> 2006 [TL])

Going back a few centuries to colonial America, our history lessons seemed to have glossed over the fierce ethical debate that had surrounded English colonialism, which focused on the moral permissibility of settling on lands already occupied by the indigenous people of America or Amerindians. It was not at all obvious that colonialism was an unproblematic practice, and in fact, it seemed to be such an intractable and important ethical dilemma that it inspired some of the most notable thinking in political philosophy. For instance, John Locke's influential *Second Treatise of Government*, which explained the origins of private property and civil government, is now believed to be a defense of English colonialism, establishing a legitimate mechanism to claim property in lands that are already occupied, though not “owned” by Amerindians as they were believed to be nomadic and only wandered across the land rather than have ownership in it. 1 The difference between colonialism and space exploration, of course, is that we do not run immediately into the problem of displacing or interfering with pre-existing inhabitants of whatever space bodies we explore next, since no such “alien” life-form has yet to be established. And given Fermi's Paradox, this may be a problem we need not tackle in the near future. Rather, the point here is if we are taking another giant leap into the space frontier, our position is not too different from that of colonialists, as we have the unique opportunity to start a new world, but in doing so, there may be important ethical and social issues we should consider first.

## Framework---Gender

### The discourse of space exploration is heavily gendered---their claims of neutrality mask underlying power relationships

Bormann and Sheehan 09 (Natalie, Michael , Professor of Political Science at NorthEastern University & Foreign Affairs “The Lost Dimension? A spatial reading of US weaponization in Space” p.77)

I have argued in this chapter that sex and gender are discursively constituted to gender the apparently ungendered discourse(s) of outer space exploration and colonization coherent. Involving a multitude of actors, organizations, state and non-state-based articulations, the US politics of outer space is dominated by a discourse of military, commercial and scientific con­quest that draws heavily from essentialist and foundational understandings of and beliefs about nature, civilization, science, progress and consumption. Herein, important performances of gendered identity construct specific, tacitly gendered, rationalizations of exploration and colonization in particular ways, and gender is made intelligible in US outer space discourse in order to preserve essentially heteronormative regulations of identity that allow for the increased militarization of space, while serving neo-liberal, Anglo-American ideals of marketization, privatization, deregulation and flexibilization. the 'seeing' is made possible through the effects of technology in its production of space (or, one reality of it) and its subsequent authorisation of spatially contingent action (the defence of 'our space').2 I argue that such connection between technology and space is tantamount for explaining the modalities and limits of, and possibilities for, space weapons in that any spatial production of outer space always-already comprises an exploration of the logic of military technology.

## AT: Perm

### Frontier mythology actively suppresses dissent and excludes all other voices – the perm would just structurally exclude the discourse of the alt

ROGIN 1988 (Michael, Ronald Reagan: The Movie, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Political\_Repression/Political\_Repression\_US.html)

Most treatments of the countersubversive mentality, as we shall see in chapter 9, disconnect demonology both from major American social divisions and from institutionalized political repression. Most versions of American history, by a complementary set of choices, chart a progress toward freedom and inclusion. To link countersubversive thinking to political repression is to write another history. Such an account hardly stands in for American history as a whole. But if certain familiar patterns recede into the shadows, neglected, dark areas emerge into light. At the same time, the subject of political repression must not be confined to the suppression of already legitimate political opposition. A history of American political suppression must attend to the repression of active, political dissent. But it must also direct attention to prepolitical institutional settings that have excluded some Americans from politics and influenced the terms on which others entered the political arena. An account of American political suppression must acknowledge the suppression of politics itself. It must notice the relations between politics and private life. Countersubversive ideologies psychological mechanisms, and an intrusive state apparatus all respond to the fear of subversion in America. We begin with the controls exercised over peoples of color. "History begins for us with murder and enslavement, not with discovery," wrote the American poet William Carlos Williams. He was calling attention to the historical origins of the United States in violence against peoples of color. He was pointing to America's origins in the origins of a capitalist world system. Indian land and black labor generated a European-American-African trade in the seventeenth century and contributed to the development of commodity agriculture, industrial production, and state power in Europe and the Americas. Karl Marx wrote, "The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement, and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and the looting of the East Indies, and the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalized the rosy dawn of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief moments of primitive accumulation." By primitive accumulation Marx meant the forcible acquisition by a mixture of state and private violence of land and labor to serve the accumulation of capital. Primitive accumulation made land, labor, and commodities available for the marketplace before the free market could act on its own. The suppression, intimidation, and control of peoples of color supplies the prehistory of the American history of freedom. People of color were important, moreover, not only at the origins of America but also in its ongoing history-through westward expansion against Indians and Mexicans, chattel slavery and the exclusion of emancipated blacks from political and economic freedom, and the repressive responses to Hispanic and Asian workers. The American economy exploited peoples of color, but American racial history is not reducible to its economic roots. A distinctive American political tradition that was fearful of primitivism and disorder developed in response to peoples of color. That tradition defines itself against alien threats to the American way of life and sanctions violent and exclusionary responses to them.

## AT: Perm – Native Americans

### Including the 1AC representations fundamentally unravels Native American understanding of inner reality and merely conceals the imperialist foundations of frontier mentality

Young 87 (Jane M., professor at the University of New Mexico, “Parables of the Space Age: The Ideological Basis of Space Exploration,” *Western Folklore* Vol. 46, No 4, October 1987.)

The resulting years of struggle and misunderstanding between Euro-Americans and Native Americans arose, in part, because of their differing world views-their conflicting perspectives concerning the relationship between humans and the natural world. Whereas Europeans saw the elements of the cosmos as forces to explore and conquer, the Native Americans regarded them as living beings with whom they attempted to coexist in harmony. For instance, tribes such as the Navajo and Pawnee regarded the sky and earth as beings to whom they were intimately connected; the journey towards understanding these beings was accomplished in the context of ritual activity. Thus, for the Native American, the "real" adventure was internal, an exploration of one's own being in relationship to the cosmos. In contrast, for Euro-Americans the challenge was external. They set out to conquer the wilderness and push the frontier ever westward. Their folk heroes, generally masculine, were those who accomplished this task. Certain characteristics of such folk heroes necessarily changed as the frontier itself changed, but a constant was the image of this hero as a loner, a rugged and aggressive individual who traveled unknown territories, guided always by the spirit of adventure, the thrill of the unknown.' These qualities were embodied in turn by personages such as the woodsman, the pioneer, the cowboy, the oilman, the businessman, and, finally, the spaceman, all characterized as much by their exploitation of the natural environment as by their drive towards exploration. In recent times, as various areas of the earth have been labelled nostalgically as the "last frontier," the need for adventure and for new sources of energy has given rise to the concept of outer space as the "new frontier." Strengthened by representations in the media, the lore of the western frontier has been used to argue for the expanded exploitation and settlement of outer space. The internal/external, Native American/Euro-American contrast mentioned above relates to the way differing peoples regard their bodies as well as to their attitudes toward the relationship between themselves and the cosmos. For example, according to Keith Basso, the Western Apache say that Euro-Americans (or Anglos, whites) are overly concerned with the "surfaces of themselves ... their hair, faces, body, and dress."2 In contrast, the Western Apache are anxious to avoid this form of self-consciousness that pertains only to appearance, rather than to inner reality. Mary Douglas argues similarly that the use of the human body is a significant symbol of social and political order.3 Thus, the Anglos, concerned with the outside of their bodies, and hoping to be noticed, are also concerned with extending their domain, first into the frontier of the American West and now into the frontier of outer space. In contrast, Native American groups such as the Navajo, Zuni, Hopi, and Western Apache pay little attention to the external body. Examples of this are the healing ceremonies that focus on the mind as much as the body. Nor do individuals from these tribes wish to be seen as different or standing out. Significantly, these Native American groups focus on inner-directed experience. The adventure for them has been to live in balance and harmony with the natural world. Since Native Americans travel to the sky in their minds, they have no need to build space shuttles. Stoeltje emphasizes that the metaphor of the frontier as applied to outer space is a false metaphor, a construct that maintains a sense of excitement while obscuring the reality that the endeavor is essentially a materialistic enterprise. Stoeltje adds that the term metaphor implies a similarity between outer space and the western frontier that is lacking; instead, it is the concept of the frontier as entitling myth, as unambiguous justification for an authorative plan of action, which shapes the U.S. space program.

## Link---Space Exploration

### Perpetuation of our space frontier myth constructs a biological and moral imperative to dominate space

Billings 7 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Societal Impact of Spaceflight,” edited by Steven Dick and Roger Launius, 2007.)

According to rhetorical critic Janice Hocker Rushing, “rhetorical narratives are discourses which explicitly or implicitly advocate moral choices.” Rushing has said that the meanings of “definitional [American] cultural myths,” such as the myths of the Western frontier and the space frontier, are a source of identity and “moral vision.” Rushing noted that the United States “has drawn upon the frontier for its mythic identity,”20 or moral imperative, as McDougall called it. In this mythic universe, the cultural role of the explorer—the frontier conqueror, as it were—is, as Stephen Pyne has said, to serve as “a moral missionary, telling others and his sustaining civilization who they are and how they ought to behave.”2 From the start, advocates constructed a narrative of spaceflight that made it a necessary, even biologically driven, enterprise. But, as Pyne has pointed out, spaceflight and other modes of exploration are not in our genes but in our culture. “Exploration cannot be extracted from the historical and cultural context within which it occurs.” It is “a specific invention of specific civilizations conducted at specific historical times.” Advocates of U.S. spaceflight have created their own frontier mythology, as limerick has noted, expanding the story of Western American settlement to encompass space exploration. And problems have ensued because, as Pyne has said, “discovery among the planets is qualitatively different from the discovery of continents and seas.”22

## Link – US Key

### Their “US key” arguments entrench our rhetoric of US exceptionalism and investment in frontier mythology

Billings 7 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Societal Impact of Spaceflight,” edited by Steven Dick and Roger Launius, 2007.)

The frontier metaphor, the ideology of progress and the belief in American exceptionalism have been prevalent in government space policy rhetoric as well as the rhetoric of advocacy groups. the national commission on Space, appointed by president Reagan to develop long-term goals for U.S. civilian space exploration, entitled its final report “pioneering the Space frontier” and described in it “a pioneering mission for 21st-century America: to lead the exploration and development of the space frontier.” humankind is “destined to expand to other worlds,” the commission said in its report, and “our purpose” is to establish “free societies on new worlds.” toward achieving those goals,” we must stimulate individual initiative and free enterprise in space.”45 the rhetoric of American exceptionalism remained apparent in space policy documents of the George h. W. Bush administration: “America’s space program is what civilization needs . . . America, with its tremendous resources, is uniquely qualified for leadership in space . . . our success will be guaranteed by the American spirit—that same spirit that tamed the north American continent and built enduring democracy.” The “prime objective” of the U.S. space program is “to open the space frontier.”46 NASA declared in its 90-day study of this Space exploration initiative, “the imperative to explore” is embedded in our history . . . traditions, and national character,” and space is “the frontier” to be explored.47 “Space is the new frontier,” said another space study group of that time, where the united States will find “a future of peace, strength, and prosperity.” in keeping with rhetorical tradition, the Clinton administration declared, “Space exploration has become an integral part of our national character, capturing the spirit of optimism and adventure that has defined this country from its beginnings . . . . its lineage is part of an ancient heritage of the human race . . . deep in the human psyche and perhaps in our genes.”49 in the George W. Bush administration, White house office of Science and technology policy director John Marburger has said the point of the president’s so-called vision for space exploration “is to begin preparing now for a future in which the material trapped in the Sun’s vicinity is available for incorporation into our way of life.”50 NASA administrator Michael Griffin has said that the aim of space exploration is “to make the expansion and development of the space frontier an integral part of what it is that human societies do.”5 griffin has said that when human civilization reaches the point where more people are living off earth than on it, “we want their culture to be Western.” he has asserted that Western civilization is “the best we’ve seen so far in human history,” and that the values space-faring people should take with them into space should be Western values.52 “We want to be the world’s preeminent space-faring nation for all future time,” he said on another occasion, “second to none.”53 griffin has said that space exploration has something to do with “core beliefs” about what societies and civilizations should be doing “on the frontiers of their time . . . north Americans are the way we are because of the challenges of the frontier . . . i believe that Western thought, civilization, and ideals represent a superior set of values,” better than those of civilizations that came before. These values are “irretrievably linked to” expansion, he has said, and now this expansion will continue into the human frontier of space.54 Most recently, griffin has said: it is in the nature of humans to find, to define, to explore and to push back the frontier. And in our time, the frontier is space and will be for a very long time . . . .the nations that are preeminent in their time are those nations that dominate the frontiers of their time. The failed societies are the ones that pull back from the frontier. I want our society, America, [W]estern society, to be preeminent in the world of the future and i want us not to be a failed society. And the way to do that, universally so, is to push the frontier.

## Link---Exceptionalism/State Identity

### Frontier mythology consumes individual identity in American exceptionalism and solidifies state control

Gouge 2 (Catherine, West Virginia University, “The Great Storefront of American Nationalism: Narratives of Mars and the Outerspatial Frontier,” Americana, Fall 2002, Vol. 2.)

"American" coherence and power, according to this structure, are "things" to be acquired. Furthermore, they are both the motivation for exploring and conquering frontiers and, ultimately, that in which, on an individual level, U.S. citizens are expected to invest in order to support frontier exploration. That is, as a nation, we desire to explore the frontier because we believe that we must do so to secure the sociopolitical power and control of the American nation-state; however, individually, most Americans must demonstrate their civic loyalty and desire for powerful subjectivity by admitting both that they fail to occupy the powerful and coherent subject position they seek to secure and that they will never be able to acquire the coherence and power of whole citizenship. This is characteristic of most American national myths which, as Donald Pease writes, "presuppose a realm of pure possibility where a whole self-internalized the norms of American history in a language and series of actions that corroborated American exceptionalism" (24). The myth of the American frontier similarly presupposes just such a realm of pure possibility to support a fiction of American exceptionalism and, in so doing, sutures over our individual identities with a fiction of a collective, national identity.

## Link – Heg/Econ

### Using hegemonic or economic power to justify space exploration feeds into the frontier myth’s need for outward growth

Williamson 87 (Ray A, Research Professor of International Affairs and Space Policy in the Space Policy Institute of The George Washington University, “Outer Space as Frontier: Lessons for Today,” *Western Folklore*, Volume 46, No. 4, October 1987)

Within a few months of the Princeton meeting, I confronted for the first time the extent to which the myth of the frontier had been subsumed into the immediate drive to expand this nation's capacity for working in space. At a briefing in my office, representatives of a large aerospace firm argued that exploitation of outer space was a means for maintaining U.S. national power and prestige, and stressed the use of outer space as "America's Frontier for Growth, Leadership and Freedom."'7 In other words, fully exploiting space will pull the United States out of its national and international doldrums and give it a new economic and political edge over other nations. Without this outward growth, they argued, we as a nation are likely to become stifled. It is part of our heritage as Americans that "exploration and growth have been synonymous."'8 Our ancestors explored, conquered, and settled the "new" land just beyond the boundaries of civilization, and in doing so, each time they moved the boundaries out just a bit further. So, in a sense, by living on the edge of the unknown,19 as a nation we became accustomed to being unsettled, became inured to the continually new, were ever ready to move on and out. But the American spirit is not characterized solely by continual physical movement and expansion. We have also made scientific research and engineering development our hallmark. And we have manifested that emphasis to ourselves and the world by highly visible, well-publicized exploits in outer space. First we traveled to the moon and then developed a reusable orbiting space shuttle. By becoming masters of the space spectacular, covered extensively on television and radio, we have maintained our place on the edge of our collective seats.20

## Link – Econ/Spinoffs

### Using NASA gains and spinoffs for infinite economic gain promotes American frontier mythology

Gouge 2 (Catherine, West Virginia University, “The Great Storefront of American Nationalism: Narratives of Mars and the Outerspatial Frontier,” Americana, Fall 2002, Vol. 2.)

From the perspective of those moving in to explore and colonize, prospective frontiers are, on the other hand, a space of unfulfilled hopes and dreams, a fantasy space of unlimited socioeconomic potential. And it is this potential which marketers of frontier technologies and proponents of frontier exploration often exploit to secure public support. Accordingly, the twentieth-century American public was encouraged to associate a desire to explore outer space, in which media representations and science fiction invested so deeply, with two things: citizenship and products they could buy. In the 1920s, American market specialists learned that by altering the packaging and appearance of a product, they could increase public desire for it (McCurdy 209). Consequently, especially in the years following the Great Depression, product designers manipulated product sizes, shapes, and colors to mimic the sleek, aerodynamic lines and polished finishes of various "frontier technologies": trains, airplanes, and, eventually, rockets. The average American citizen, or so the logic went, could participate in the frontier, the great storefront of American nationalism, by buying things. Owning Teflon frying pans and consuming products like Tang were markers of good citizenship. And planned obsolescence, primarily in technology markets, became a strategy for smart business, a strategy further fueled by the pattern of the early space program, which frequently substituted rockets and spacecraft with newer models. The official website for NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory continues the project of conveying an intimacy between the development of outer-spatial frontier technologies and the United States economy. In fact, one section of the site devoted to NASA's official "U.S. Commercial Technology Policy," formulated in 1995, includes portions of Bill Clinton's 1993 U.S. Technology Policy that ask NASA to foster its involvement in the "progress of the nation" by developing "new ways of doing business." 13. "Since 1958," the policy reads, "NASA has been an important source of much of the nation's new technology." The site proceeds to explain that in "today's increasingly competitive global economic climate, the U.S. must ensure that its technological resources are fully utilized throughout the economy." And this means, according to the site, that NASA must accept a "new, broader role" in the future of this nation: "While meeting its unique mission goals, NASA Research and Development must also enhance overall U.S. economic security." The site imagines this dynamic as one in which NASA essentially feeds its "technological assets and know-how" into U.S. economic growth. This should be done, the site maintains, by "quickly and effectively translat[ing]" NASA's assets and know-how "into improved production processes and marketable, innovative products." In order to accomplish this, the agency must find "new ways of doing business and new ways of measuring progress." Indeed, as this NASA policy makes clear, there is no such thing as a purely scientific project. NASA's current official technology policy is, thus, on one level, a utopian projection or science fiction that imagines the productive power of NASA technologies to "enhance overall U.S. economic security."

## Link – Colonization “Extinction Inevitable”

### The plan’s rhetoric of Earth as a dying planet justifies space frontier mentality and builds upon a flawed understanding of our manifest destiny

Billings 7 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Societal Impact of Spaceflight,” edited by Steven Dick and Roger Launius, 2007.)

Author Ishmael Reed has made the link between progress and spaceflight in an essay called “progress: a Faustian Bargain”: in order to justify its programs, NASA, in its brochures, describes the earth as a dying planet, a fact which for them justifies colonizing the universe . . . . you can understand why, in many science fiction movies, the goal of the invaders is to destroy this planet, lest this progress be extended to their neighborhoods. 5 historically and presently, the rhetoric of space advocacy advances a conception of outer space as a place of wide-open spaces and limitless resources—a space frontier. The metaphor of the frontier, with its associated images of pioneering, homesteading, claim-staking, and taming, has been persistent in American history. In the rhetoric of spaceflight advocacy, the idea of the frontier is a dominant metaphor. it is worth noting that the root of the word “frontier” is the old French word for “front.” in the English language, that word “front” conveys a complex of meanings, ranging from the most common definition—the part of anything that faces forward—to the definition that probably comes closest to the meaning of “front” in “frontier”: an area of activity, conflict, or competition. A common military definition of “front” is also tied up in the meaning of “frontier,” that is, the area of contact between opposing combat forces. Other meanings of “front” that should be considered in assessing the meaning of the frontier metaphor are: a façade; a position of leadership or authority; and a person or thing that serves as a cover for secret, disreputable, or illegal activity. What meanings are advocates intending to convey, and what meanings are they in fact conveying, when they talk about the space frontier? 6 historian Frederick Jackson turner’s century-old essay, “the Significance of the frontier in American history,” is perhaps the best-known articulation of the frontier metaphor. 7 it is a powerful and evocative piece of writing. In making the case for spaceflight, advocates continue to cite, directly or indirectly, Turner’s frontier thesis and the related, potentially dangerous, idea of manifest destiny, seemingly oblivious to a changed cultural context and critiques of Turner’s thinking. As Wright and Sale did with progress, Richard Slotkin, in his trilogy of books about the history of the American West, has deemed the idea of the frontier a myth—a myth in which the United States is “a wide-open land of unlimited opportunity for the strong, ambitious self-reliant individual to thrust his way to the top.” 8 Patricia nelson limerick has pointed out that space advocates cling to the frontier metaphor, conceiving “American history [as] a straight line, a vector of inevitability and manifest destiny linking the westward expansion of Anglo-Americans directly to the exploration and colonization of space.” limerick has warned that in abusing this metaphor, “[S]pace advocates have built their plans for the future on the foundation of a deeply flawed understanding of the past, [and] the blinders worn to screen the past have proven to be just as effective at distorting the view of the future.” 9

## Link---Development

### Frontier mythology stifles societal evolution and deepens the lopsided social order and the flawed values that prop it up

Billings 7 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Societal Impact of Spaceflight,” edited by Steven Dick and Roger Launius, 2007.)

xThis brief historical review has shown how the rhetoric of space advocacy has sustained an ideology of American exceptionalism and reinforced longstanding beliefs in progress, growth, and capitalist democracy. This rhetoric conveys an ideology of spaceflight that could be described, at its worst, as a sort of space fundamentalism: an exclusive belief system that rejects as unenlightened those who do not advocate the colonization, exploitation, and development of space.56 the rhetorical strategy of space advocates has tended to rest on the assumption that the values of “believers” are (or should be) shared by others as well. Although the social, political, economic, and cultural context for space exploration has changed radically since the 960s, the rhetoric of space advocacy has not. In the twenty-first century, advocates continue to promote spaceflight as a biological imperative and a means of extending U.S. free enterprise, with its private property claims, resource exploitation, and commercial development, into the solar system and beyond. Pyne, among others, has addressed the problematic nature of these arguments: “the theses advanced to promote [solar system] settlement,” he noted, “are historical, culturally bound, and selectively anecdotal: that we need to pioneer to be what we are, that new colonies are a means of renewing civilization.”57 Spaceflight advocacy can be examined as a cultural ritual, performed by means of communication (rhetoric), for the purpose of maintaining the current social order, with its lopsided distribution of power and resources, and perpetuating the values of those in control of that order (materialism, consumerism, technological progress, private property rights, capitalist democracy). Communication research has shown how public discourses—those cultural narratives or national myths—“often function covertly to legitimate the power of elite social classes.”58 And this review has shown how the rhetoric of space advocacy reflects an assumption that these values are worth extending into the solar system. “Everything now suggests,” Nisbet wrote 25 years ago, “that Western faith in the dogma of progress is waning rapidly.”59 this faith appears to have remained alive and well, however, in the ideology of spaceflight. Christopher Lasch wrote 5 years ago, “almost everyone now agrees that [the idea of] progress—in its utopian form at least,” no longer has the power “to explain events or inspire [people] to constructive action.”60 But in the current cultural environment, perhaps it does—at least among space advocates. Progress is, indeed, modern American dogma and a key element of pro-space dogma. But it does not resonate well—as Pyne and others have noted—in the current postmodern (or even post-postmodern) cultural environment, where public discourse is rife with critiques of science, technology, the aims of the military industrial complex, and the corporate drive for profit. Pyne observed almost 20 years ago that space exploration was “not yet fully in sync” with its cultural environment.6 Modern (seventeenth- to twentieth-century) Western (European-American) exploration functioned as “a means of knowing, of creating commercial empires, of outmaneuvering political economic, religious, and military competitors—it was war, diplomacy, proselytizing, scholarship, and trade by other means.”62 But the postmodern exploration of space is different. Outer space is not simply an extension of earth and the era of space exploration is not simply an extension of the modern era of transoceanic and transcontinental exploration. Its cultural context is different. The modern phenomenon of spaceflight has outlived the modern era and its purpose is not clear in a postmodern or even post-postmodern world, characterized by uncertainty, subjectivity, deconstruction, and a rejection of so-called master narratives such as the story of frontier conquest. The moral imperative of the myth of pioneering the space frontier could be interpreted as a narrative that is in tune with its postmodern cultural environment in the sense that it conveys the values of the dominant social order—that is, what communication scholar herb Schiller has called “the transnational corporate business order” and its ideology of private property ownership, resource exploitation and profit building.63

Lin, 06. (Patrick, Assistant Professor at California Polytechnic State Univeristy. “Viewpoint: Look Before Taking Another Leap For Mankind- Ethical and Social Considerationa in Rebuilding Society in Space” Astropolitics. < <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14777620601039701>.> 2006 [TL])

At the risk of cynicism, if we were to truly apply Earth rules to space, then the ultimate, albeit morally problematic, litmus test for claiming property may be about one's ability to physically defend the property. Without a police force in space, it may first start with individuals or corporations defending their parcel against competitors in turf battles, despite any prevailing laws on Earth. But while “right through might” may perfectly describe frontier justice, one would hope that we have evolved beyond that. Even among enlightened people, there will inevitably be property-rights disputes in space, just as there is on *terra firma* between reasonable parties, so we will need a regulatory or administrative body that has jurisdiction over those lands, in addition to an enforcement agency. It will not be enough that we govern from Earth—we will need a local organization to maintain law and order in real-time, as well as to more efficiently administer public policy, urban planning, and other matters. Again, these concerns point to our new era in space exploration as a true opportunity to start over from scratch, bringing with it new responsibility to architect a blueprint for society in space.

## Link---Resources

### The view of space as a place that posses abundant resources – just replicates the same issues we have here and lead to the complete destruction of outer space

Williamson, 03 [Mark Williamson, independent Space Technology Consultant “Space ethics and protection of the space environment”, published in Space Policy magazine, ,[http://www.medicine.mcgill.ca/mnmsmi/Williamson%202003.pdf]](http://www.medicine.mcgill.ca/mnmsmi/Williamson%202003.pdf%5D)

The exploration of the space environment—by robotic and manned missions—is a natural extension of mankind’s desire to explore our own planet. Likewise, the development of the space environment—for industry, commerce and tourism—is a natural extension of our current business and domestic agenda. Unfortunately, this brings with it the ability to pollute, degrade and even destroy aspects of the space environment. Space exploration and development have been underway for some 45 years, since the launch of Sputnik1 in October 1957, and few would doubt their importance and impact on society. In a pragmatic sense, space development provides employment and opportunities for wealth creation, while in a philosophical sense it provides an outlet for mankind’s inherent desire to explore and conquer new environments [1]. For the most part, the history of space exploration and development is regarded as a triumph of mankind over the space environment, ﬁrst in providing access to it and second in surviving its extremes of temperature, radiation and other characteristics. Relatively little consideration has been accorded to the space environment itself in terms of the detrimental effects of space exploration and development, and relatively few practitioners consider the subject worthy of consideration Gradually, however, protection of the space environment is beginning to appear on the space community’s agenda, as increasing numbers of space professionals begin to consider mankind’s collective attitude towards the space environment

## Link – Moon

### The belief that man can colonize moon reinforces a nationalistic mindset that man conquer all –

Sage, 08 [Dr. Daniel Sage, “Framing Space: A Popular Geopolitics of American Manifest Destiny in Outer Space”, Institute of Geography and Science at the University of Wales, PhD in Space, Place, and Politics <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14650040701783482>]

Beyond these aesthetic techniques, the text in Colliers reinforces the popular, geopolitical connotations implicit in Bonestell’s images, as Americans were told that, “Man will conquer space soon”, first creating a space station, then a moon colony and, in time, undertaking a Mars expedition. 61 The contours of this popular roadmap, as illustrated by Bonestell, with its focus upon human colonisation, predominated over and above alternative ‘non-human’ activities in outer space, such as the use of scientific probes and military satellites. **The innate similarities to nationalistic mythologies of American manifest destiny in the West, where frontier exploration went hand in hand with physical settlement, were strikingly visible in these popular visions of space travel. Not surprisingly, countless replicas of Bonestell’s frontier vision of space exploration appeared across the world during the pre-Apollo years**, including innumerable books for children. As Miller and Durrand explain: “The Collier’s spacecraft, and even the artwork itself, were copied and plagiarized endlessly. If anyone had to illustrate a rocketship it had to look like a Collier’s rocket or it just wasn’t right. They were the standard.

## Link---Space Tourism

### **We must evaluate the implications of going to space before we do the aff**

Lin, 06. (Patrick, Assistant Professor at California Polytechnic State Univeristy. “Viewpoint: Look Before Taking Another Leap For Mankind- Ethical and Social Considerationa in Rebuilding Society in Space” Astropolitics. < <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14777620601039701>.> 2006 [TL])

Commercial space travel is looking more like a real possibility than science fiction, but tied to that ambition we may be held back by the gravity of emerging ethical dilemmas. This viewpoint article surveys a range of social, economic, and political questions, and critically evaluates reasons why we should explore space. The usual ethical issues related to environmental and safety concerns are just the beginning, as there are other interesting questions, such as: what would be a fair process for commercializing or claiming property in space; how likely would a separatist movement be among space settlements who want to be free and independent states; and are reasons to explore space, like for adventure, wanderlust, or “backing up the biosphere,” good enough to justify our exploration of space? The point here that we should explore space; and if we are to move forward with our journey, which may be unstoppable anyway, then we should seriously consider these issues. At the least, this would give the public more confidence—amid questions of misplaced priorities and wasteful spending, along with an increased focus on ethics in science—that we are looking ahead before we take another leap for mankind.

## Link – Space Based Weapons

### The aff’s construction of space based weapons is used as a form to remove ourselves from the battlefield as killing, violence and destruction take place in another space –

Bormann and Sheehan 09 (Natalie, Michael , Professor of Political Science at NorthEastern University & Foreign Affairs “The Lost Dimension? A spatial reading of US weaponization in Space” p.77)

Second, the interrelation of technology and space composes some pressing questions regarding the new modes of destruction and warfighting that it gives possibility to.4 The projection of outer space as a battlefield ('earth-bound' albeit in cosmos) is constitutive of certain 'qualities'. Space-based weapons that are designed to target threats in space as much as on Earth lead first and foremost to a loss of certain known geo-strategic reference points: the possibility of a space-based laser that shoots down targets 'anywhere' is such that every place on Earth and in space can be considered a virtual front­line. There is a duality of proximity at work that is puzzling: on the one hand, the placement of weapon systems close to their target is no longer needed. On the other hand, and while the possibility of fighting against threats and engaging in conflicts is therefore brought 'close to us', the battlefield on which the fighting takes place remains nonetheless 'distant from us'; virtual and non-visible in, from and through outer space. Furthermore, and closely related, it is not only the necessity of geographical proximity of combat that is dwindling, so is the proximity of violence and destruction. While the targeting and killing becomes possible at all times and anywhere, the virtual shooting down of enemy missiles and the use of **space-based lasers against hostile attack from space removes us — ourselves — from the battlefield, the bodily violence and the experience, pain, and memory thereof. Space technology promises to offer an automated, clean and sanitized mode of destruction and killing**.5,6 It is a process that Virilio (1999) sums up in his notion of an 'aesthetics of disappear­ance" by which the author means to suggest the following: in the same way in which technology leads to a destruction of physicality and matter (and all the way to its disappearance), weapon technology leads to a disappearance of our modes of relating and referring to that space.

### The technologies constructed by the affirmative as a means of space weaponization ensure space as place of endless conflict – Understanding space as a place of combat only precludes its peaceful use

Bormann and Sheehan 09 (Natalie, Michael , Professor of Political Science at NorthEastern University & Foreign Affairs “The Lost Dimension? A spatial reading of US weaponization in Space” p.77)

In Virilio's view, the invention of mili­tary technology occurs simultaneously with the invention of a space to be defended and secured, invaded and colonised, weaponised and commer­cialised. In other words, in order to grasp the modes of representation that underpin outer space weaponisation we must turn to the technologies that provide the condition for visualising the need to weaponise, colonise, secure, and so forth. The work of Virilio can thus open some valuable insights, 1 believe, for understanding the weaponisation of outer space by drawing upon the, mostly overlooked, relationship and interaction of technology, spatiality and outer space as military space. By SO doing, a Viriliari reading offers nor only a stringent critique of the ways in which current space pol­icies are rendered meaningful but it also provides us with a tool for unpacking the very spatial (re)constructions of outer space that are presented to us as seamless and common-sensical. Why should this matter!' In this chapter I want to point towards two significant arguments in support for a renewed interest in questioning and criticising modes of spatiality — and that which informs them. The first argu­ment is concerned with the logic of spatiality and the practices it claims to render meaningful. The second one has to do with the new military technolo­gies in their role of conducting space warfare and the modes of automated fighting and killing that they appear to evoke. To begin with the first point, it seems clear to me that only by unbundling the processes which lead to the cre­ation of seeing and inventing outer space as a sphere of permanent crisis and its 'in-built' logic of the need to weaponise that sphere can we bring back the, hitherto, marginalised possibility of an alternative process of organising outer space (e.g. peacefully). In other words, it must be understood that it is the invention of space as a place of crisis and combat which precludes the peaceful use of space.'

## 2NC Turns Case

### Turns case – our conception of space as frontier and an outgrowth of manifest destiny break down space efforts

Billings 97 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Frontier Days in Space: Are They Over?” *Space Policy*, 1997.)

Though perhaps not so clearly articulated as the frontier metaphor, the idea of a manifest destiny in space is still alive. Manifest destiny in nineteenth-century American thought “expressed a spirit of confidence and a sense of power,” writes historian Norman Graebner (Manifest Destiny, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis and New York, 1968). This idea “implied that the United States was destined by the will of Heaven to become a country of political and territorial eminence. It attributed the probability and even the necessity of this growth to a homogeneous process created by certain unique qualities in American civilization -- the energy and vigor of its people, their idealism and faith in their democratic institutions, and their sense of mission....” Advocates actually declared that expansion was a natural process. John O’Sullivan, a journalist credited with coining the term “manifest destiny,” wrote in 1839 that the United States was “destined to be the great nation of futurity.... We are the nation of human progress, and who will, what can, set limits to our onward march?” (“The Great Nation of Futurity,” Democratic Review) This rhetoric is old and tired, even threatening today, and certainly not suited to the current global political environment. Yet it persists among space advocates, supported by a prevailing belief among Americans that the United States remains “Number One” among all the nations of the world. Even President Bill Clinton has described his country as “the world’s only superpower.” The rhetoric of the U.S. space program, a rhetoric conceived by America’s military industrial complex, persistently retains the idea of manifest destiny as a mobilizing concept. As the theory of historical materialism explains, history is not a matter of “destiny” but human-made. Nonetheless, the rhetoric of manifest destiny still permeates public discourses on national identity and national security. And space exploration is still described as pioneering the frontier, conquering the unknown, exploiting space resources. The Cold War rhetoric and today’s rhetoric are virtually the same. This sort of thinking reinforces the idea that conquest and exploitation are reasonable ends for space exploration. American space exploration initiatives today are ostensibly intended to promote global leadership, economic competitiveness, scientific excellence, and technological progress. But the idea of conquest and exploitation for the sake of profit is an insidious threat to achieving any of these ends. With the Cold War over and the entire world accessible, the military industrial complex is extending the doctrine of manifest destiny into outer space. In the late 20th century, the common wisdom is that humankind has conquered nature here on earth. Now the conquerors who run the military industrial complex are looking toward the chaos and emptiness of space as new territory to claim and tame. As the doctrine of manifest destiny was used to justify purging U.S. territory of indigenous residents, it is being used to justify clearing the way into space.

### The plan is a painted landscape of idealism in outer space – the methodology of the frontier only interferes with decision making and stunts political progress

Sage, 08 [Dr. Daniel Sage, “Framing Space: A Popular Geopolitics of American Manifest Destiny in Outer Space”, Institute of Geography and Science at the University of Wales, PhD in Space, Place, and Politics <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14650040701783482>]

Bonestell’s images of outer space implicitly coordinated outer space as the ‘high’ or ‘new’ frontier in a purportedly unified American imagination so as to help familiarise an otherwise ominous environment around a nationalistic mythology. Jonathan Smith explains how such frontier landscapes are integral to the articulation of American identity, since “it is of course, impossible to pretend that the American people sprang from common ancestors, from a mythic tribe in the midst of antiquity, as so many other nations do, and so it is necessary to define the group by its relation to a common territory [the frontier].” 63 By familiarising outer space in these terms, Bonestell naturalised the American ‘frontier’ paradigm of human space exploration as not just the most likely course of the space age but as part of the performance of American national identity in the Cold War. Such a mobilisation of the popular cosmographical imagination dovetails with Sharp’s acknowledgement of how **popular geographical imaginations are deployed by interest groups to augment national mythologies of belonging that familiarise new and threatening situations and naturalise certain political assumptions through “accepted models, metaphors and images” 64 ; thereby instilling a sense of pre-destiny to foreign policy decisions and outcomes.**

## 2NC Must Read Impact

Frontier mentality causes extinction---destroys the foundation of survival in space and on earth

Lin, 06. (Patrick, Assistant Professor at California Polytechnic State Univeristy. “Viewpoint: Look Before Taking Another Leap For Mankind- Ethical and Social Considerationa in Rebuilding Society in Space” Astropolitics. < <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14777620601039701>.> 2006 [TL])

The prospect of increased space travel brings with it a host of ethical questions, including: environmental conservation, competing priorities, safety risks, and non-proliferation of military technology. These are somewhat familiar questions, and though they will not be the focus of this article, we will discuss them briefly here for the sake of completeness. One of the first and natural reactions of many is to ask: should we be encouraging private space exploration, given what we have done to our own planet? What is to prevent problems on Earth from following us into outer space, if we have not evolved the attitudes, and ethics, which have contributed to those problems? As examples, an over-developed sense of nationalism may again lead to war with other humans in space, and ignoring the cumulative effects of small acts may again lead to such things as the over-commercialization of space and space pollution. Have we learned enough about ourselves and our history to avoid the same mistakes as we have made on Earth? Preserving the pristine, unspoiled expanses of space is a recurring theme, much as it is important to preserve wetlands, rainforests, and other natural wonders here on Earth. We have already littered the orbital environment in space with floating debris that we need to track so that spacecraft and satellites navigate around, not to mention abandoned equipment on the Moon and Mars. So what safeguards are in place to ensure we do not exacerbate this problem, especially if we propose to increase space traffic? Furthermore, are we prepared to risk accidents in space from the technologies we might use, such as nuclear power? Another common concern is for the safety of our pioneering astronauts. Should we send people to other planets when robots might do the job just as well but more safely and less expensively? Peter Diamandis, Chairman of the X-Prize Foundation, argued in his United States (U.S.) congressional testimony, that “our country was founded by adventurous people who lost their lives in crossing the Atlantic, the Mississippi River, the Rocky Mountains, and beyond. Immigrants who have come to America risked everything to make the journey, even to this day. So it is practically *un-American* to shy away from these risks. But with today's regulations, the Wright Brothers might never have had been allowed to take off on their flimsy, bicycle-powered flying contraption.” 2 Even if safety is not a key ethical concern for astronauts, space adventurers, or tourists who have consented to the risks, what about any children that are born in or taken to space who cannot give legal consent? Political critics of human spaceflight and exploration have also asked whether we should be redirecting our significant investments in these areas—much of it funded by taxpayers—to solve more pressing problems on Earth, such as helping economic development in depressed areas, alleviating poverty and hunger, providing access to clean and affordable water and energy, and addressing other issues including human rights violations. There are also political and legal worries about the further militarization of space, given a history of weaponizing new technologies and carrying old conflicts over into new lands here on Earth.

## Impact---Reject Manifest destiny

### Manifest destiny justifies slavery, conquest and genocide should be rejected in all instances

Jimson ’92 (Thomas, “Reflections on Race and Manifest Destiny,” <http://www.cwis.org/fwdp/Americas/manifest.txt>)

This sums up much of the rhetoric of the mid 19th Century philosophy of Manifest Destiny. In re-reading the various quotes and passages in Reginald Horsman’s work, I gained a clearer understanding of this very important, yet often “ignored” aspect of the creation of the American psyche. **Manifest Destiny is really a multi-faceted excuse for slavery, conquest, and genocide. It is the point at which racism, religion, and politics can meet and form a unified front and a unified philosophy for the ignoble aim of world empire.** Manifest Destiny (a term coined in the 1840s by John O’Sullivan) can only be understood in the context of race and the philosophy of Anglo-Saxonism that was rampant from the mid 19th Century onward in Europe and North America. The notions of inherent human equality (biological and cosmological but not cultural) and the Biblical unity of humanity that had reigned over the Age of Enlightenment had gradually given way to theories of polygenesis and inherent human inequality. The process of scientific classification of nature by Euroamericans, had by the 19th Century culminated in the classification of humanity itself into separate races with innate qualities of inferiority and superiority. This process is typified by the “science” of phrenology which so revolutionized the 19th Century’s view of human relations. Phrenology was not simply the “scientific” examination of the relationship between skull size and intelligence — it was also the study of brain/skull size in relation to MORALITY, both of which supposedly resided in the frontal and coronal parts of the brain; Euroamericans having the largest coincidentally enough. So Euroamericans were not only more intelligent than non-whites, they were also correspondingly more moral than other types of humanity, with more moral institutions and laws than any other type of human beings; it, in fact, could be derived from phrenology that morality is a unique feature of the Euroamerican stock of humanity, lacking in the darker races. Any similarities between Euroamerican institutions and those produced by non-Euroamericans were explained away as being the product of white blood having been introduced at some point in their history. Science would be the explanation for the slavery of the Africans and the extermination of the Indians. “It is not our fault, we are not murderers and thieves, we are merely fulfilling scientific principles of superiority. In fact we are not killing Indians, they simply cannot survive civilization. It is an inherent fault within them, it has nothing to do with us.” This is what made Manifest Destiny such a powerful force in empire building. It placed the responsibility of the destruction of nations and peoples on the victims themselves, not on the perpetrators of it. The power of Manifest Destiny lied in the fact that it created a cosmological rationale for genocide, taking the responsibility out of the hands of the individual. When you set about to dispossess a people of their land and source of livelihood, unless you have no conscience at all, one must find an excuse to safely hide from the truth of the pain and suffering you are inflicting on innocent peoples. In the era of Manifest Destiny and Anglo-Saxonism the excuses were varied but most boiled down to the simple fact that if, indeed, these people were human beings (which is questionable), then they were in fact a lesser type of humanity who had no rights to life, land, or liberty. They could not use the land like Anglos, so they had no right to it; they had no civilizations, so they had no right to their own political institutions; their lives were not worth that of an Anglo, so they had no right to life. Any suffering felt by them is of their own making, or simply a byproduct of their inferior nature when placed in contact with the superior Euroamerican types of humanity. The fault resided with them not the Euroamericans. The fault was that they lived in contact with Euroamericans — Natural Law dictated the rest. Present conditions were used as proof that this was indeed the divine order. Anglos were the master of the non-Anglos therefore it was their nature to be masters. Non-Anglos were subservient to the Anglos, therefore it was their nature to be servants. Circular arguments were the order of the day. The terms used to describe the genocide are also very telling is this context — terms such as melting, receding, shrinking, dwindling, disappearing, vanishing. Most of these have connotations of natural processes, like the melting of the snow or the receding tide. None of them have any type of active component. They are all devoid of conscious effort. They “happen” under their own auspices without any intent. These terms are used consciously or unconsciously to, again, lift the burden from the perpetrators of mass murder, thievery, and genocide and place it solidly on the shoulders of the victims, or even more pointedly, on God. They also serve to halt any type of reflection on the realities of expansion. How can one stop the snow from melting in the sun? How can one stop the tide from receding from the shore? These are all processes that are beyond human design. They are Divine processes, natural process, scientific process, that are completely absent of human will or intent. Another excuse to hide from genocide and global dispossession of non-Euroamerican peoples was the myth of expansion ridding the world of tyranny and despotism. It made it quite easy to think of expansion in the context of spreading freedom and civilization to the rest of the world that lived under despots and tyrants, spreading culture and philosophy, knowledge and science, to the unlearned masses — bettering the world with Euroamerican genius and technology. The march of conquest was not genocide, slavery, and dispossession; it was the Peace Corps of the 19th Century. There are, as one might expect, inherent contradictions in the propaganda of Anglo-Saxonism. All non-Euroamericans were savage, brute, warlike, and ferocious — Euroamericans, contrastingly, were peace-loving, humane, civilized, moral, just, and bringers of freedom giving institutions. Yet when the mood was inviting, the formally negative attributes placed upon non-Euroamerican peoples were all of a sudden some of the most positive aspects of the Anglo-Saxon race. Instead of being brute, warlike, or savage, these attributes when used in the context of Anglo-Saxons conferred upon them heroic qualities; the heroic conqueror, the exterminator of inferior races, replenishing the world with superior institutions and peoples. The personification of this image of the Anglo-Saxon race was Alexander The Great. The U.S. had a somewhat “boyish” quality, of impetuousness, quick temper, youthful virility, yet with a golden heart. The inherent contradictions of this dual image of the Anglo-Saxon race are clear. Anglo-Saxon aggression and violence was virile, manly, and heroic; violence on the part of Indians conversely was savage and barbaric — proof of their animalistic qualities that in turn provided further excuse for more “manly” violence on the part of the Anglos. Indians murdered women and children, proof of their irredeemable savagery — Anglo-Saxons simply expanded, women and children “receding” before them. Manifest Destiny is, of course, much more than what is presented here. What I find most intriguing about it, however, is how a broad concept can combine many others into a unifying theory. This is what strikes me as being the power Manifest Destiny had on the American psyche. It gave a holistic and Divine rationale for what in any other era would have been simple conquest and empire building. It is what also made Euroamerican expansion uniquely cruel and genocidal. With the advent of racism and social Darwinism, extermination and supplantation replaced simple imperial designs. This is only one aspect of Manifest Destiny — mostly psychological — there is obviously much more to it, yet I do not think one can overestimate the power philosophy plays in human affairs. **A philosophy such as Manifest Destiny once internalized in the culture, is never really abolished, it merely adapts to the present conditions and transforms itself into a suitable** **logic for the times.**

## 2NC Impact---Capitalism

### The 1AC ideology of spaceflight advances conceptions of progress that turn capitalism and exploitation into a moral imperative

Billings 7 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Societal Impact of Spaceflight,” edited by Steven Dick and Roger Launius, 2007.)

The concepts of “progress” and the “frontier” require more extensive explication, as they are bedrock elements of the ideology of spaceflight. The root of “progress” is the Latin word meaning “to go forward.” J. B. Bury said progress is movement “in a desirable direction”—but he also noted that “it cannot be proved that the unknown destination towards which man is advancing is desirable.”7 in their histories of the idea of progress, both Bury and Robert Nisbet called progress a dogma. Christopher Lasch contrasted the premodern, Christian idea of progress— “the promise of a secular utopia that would bring history to a happy ending”— with the modern idea representing “the promise of steady improvement with no foreseeable ending.”8 Bury identified progress as an idea originating in the modern era, whereas Nisbet traced its roots to ancient Greek and Roman philosophy, and he documented how it evolved to take on the qualities of destiny and “historical necessity.”9 Nisbet declared progress the most important idea in modern Western history. This modern idea of necessary and inevitable forward movement is deeply embedded in the cultural narrative of U.S. spaceflight. The idea of progress became the dominant idea in Western thinking in the period 850– 900, according to Nisbet, serving as “the developmental context for other [key] ideas” such as freedom. 0 Nisbet credited nineteenth-century natural philosopher Herbert Spencer with melding the ideas of progress and freedom, in declarations of “the rights of life and personal liberty, “the right to use the earth,” “the right of property,” and “the right to ignore the state.” Spencer’s classical liberal thinking is noticeable in the rhetoric of space advocacy. From the seventeenth through the twentieth century, as Walter McDougall wrote, the Western scientific worldview—itself a cultural narrative of sorts— “elevated technological progress . . . to the level of moral imperative.” 2 Science and technology became the means of American progress, and conquest and exploitation became the morally imperative method. Ultimately, progress came to be thought of as the accumulation of material wealth. Robert Wright has said the idea of progress is “a Victorian ideal” of moral advancement that has evolved into an ideal of material improvement. 3 this belief in progress performs the mythic function of providing moral justification for material accumulation. Along those same lines, Kirkpatrick Sale has asserted that the contemporary “myth” of progress advances “the propaganda of capitalism,” the idea of continual human improvement by means of resource exploitation and material accumulation. 4

### The capitalistic imaginings of frontier rhetoric promulgate colonialism and encourage subjugation

Gouge 2 (Catherine, West Virginia University, “The Great Storefront of American Nationalism: Narratives of Mars and the Outerspatial Frontier,” Americana, Fall 2002, Vol. 2.)

When we transpose a fantasy of the originary frontier onto other spaces, we become so convinced of the utopian promise of frontiers, for example, by minimizing or romanticizing the suffering and loss of the originary frontier, that we forget, like some of Robinson's "First Hundred," that our referent for the frontier is as much a fiction, a simulacrum, as the science fiction which imagines future frontiers. This fiction is a capitalist one as Molly Rothenburg, cultural critic and psychoanalyst, argues: The fantasy of the frontier as [Zubrin] expresses it is coincident with the fantasy of capitalism—that there's always a place beyond where things are available with relatively little effort. . . . Ultimately for him it's a place of freedom. . . . . What I hear Zubrin talking about is creating essentially the conditions for capitalism to flourish on Mars. (personal interview) As "No More Jokes on Mars" warns, in reproducing the capitalist fantasy of the frontier, we train ourselves to imagine the frontier primarily from the perspective of the colonizer and contribute to the replication of a colonial dynamic predicated on the subjugation of the many for the profit of the few—"An imaginary relationship to a real situation" (Green Mars 235), one of Robinson's characters notes, a relationship the Martian ecology cures colonists of since Mars itself resists the easy application of historical paradigms. 19.Nonetheless, American culture is filled with images of "new" and "final" frontiers in outer space and cyberspace and other, even more loosely defined, figurative frontier "spaces." As a result, claims are being made which have so saturated our culture that our popular culture has, as Brandis and Dmistrevsky argued about American science fiction, imported many of the contradictions that come with frontier narratives: liberating communal rhetoric vs. self-aggrandizing desires. And when we draw on an American fantasy of the frontier to promote the exploration and, significantly, consumption of new "spaces," we are, indeed, muddying the waters and, in effect, living in a world of our own creation, creating new spaces in the image of the originary frontier. In so doing, we are investing in a notion of unified subjectivity and power that never existed for most of us in the real, non-frontier world. This unified subjectivity is aligned with the default subjectivity of the frontier-seeking American citizen, an implicitly white, masculine subject.

## Impact---Imperialism/Democracy

### US Imperialism is the root cause of modern violence

### **McGowan 2k8**(John, Ruel W. Tyson, Jr. Distinguished Professor of the Humanities in the Department of English & Comparative Literature at the University of North Carolina., “The Possibility of Progress: A Pragmatist Account”, The Good Society, Volume 17, Number 1, 2008 [TL])

The standard of progress, of civilization, not only justifies violence but offers a metric by which to determine which lives are “more precious” than others. And Chamberlain makes it clear that he understands progress and modernity as an imperative. He calls upon the British to summon “the strength” required “to fulfill the mission which our history and our national character have imposed on us.”3 Two years later (1899), Rudyard Kipling would write his famous poem, “The White Man’s Burden,” to urge the United States, in the wake of the Spanish-American War, to take up the same mission. The language is not often so crude today. But, then again, there is Niall Feguson’s Empire. After quoting Kipling’s poem, Ferguson writes: “No one would dare use such politically incorrect language today. The reality is nevertheless that the United States has—whether it admits it or not—taken up some kind of global burden, just as Kipling urged. It considers itself responsible not just for waging a war against terrorism and rogue states, but also for spreading the benefits of capitalism and democracy overseas. And just like the British Empire before it, the American Empire unfailingly acts in the name of liberty, even when its own self-interest is manifestly uppermost.”4 It is hard to know how to read that non-ironic “unfailingly.” Don’t most nations justify their wars by claiming to act “in the name” of high ideals? Is there some special reason to cut empires more slack on that score? If democracy is one of the names for a progressive principle used to justify violence in our time, “globalization” provides another stick with which to beat the recalcitrant. A nation like France is simply being backward and pursuing unsustainable economic policies when it retains generous pension and social insurance programs.5 William James, for one, was having none of it. In surveying America’s first little dirty imperialist war in the Philippines, James concludes: all the anti-imperialistic prophecies were right. One by one, we have seen them punctually fulfilled:—The material ruin of the Islands; the transformation of native friend- liness to execration; the demoralization of our army, from the war office down—forgery decorated, torture whitewashed, massacre condoned; the creation of chronic anarchy in the Islands...We used to believe that we were of a different clay from other nations, that there was something deep in the American heart that answered to our happy birth, free from the hereditary burden which the nations of Europe bear, and which obliges them to grow by preying on their neighbors. Idle dream!, pure Fourth of July fancy, scattered in five minutes by the first tempta- tion. In every national soul there lie potentialities of the most barefaced piracy, and our own American soul is no exception to the rule. Angelic impulses and predatory lusts divide our heart exactly as they divide the hearts of other countries.6 Progress is not inevitable; in fact, it is never even secure. Whatever gains toward tolerance, civility, and peace may be made, a reversion to more violent and brutal relations is always possible. And no country can complacently congratulate itself on being further down the path of progress, civilization, and modernity than any other. Those who would oppose the urge to “run things by main force and brute possession,” James tells us, have assumed an “interminable task.”7 History does not march forward in ways that make various past practices impossible in the future. The idea of progress entails an overly linear concep- tion of historical time. something deep in the American heart that answered to our happy birth, free from the hereditary burden which the nations of Europe bear, and which obliges them to grow by preying on their neighbors.

### Frontier mythology’s motives of profit drive imperialism and stifle democratic principle

Billings 97 (Linda, Washington-based research associate with SETI, science and risk communication researcher for NASA’s planetary protection office, “Frontier Days in Space: Are They Over?” Space Policy, 1997.)

The frontier spirit is still alive and well in the American space community. Aerospace leaders in government and industry continue to use the metaphor of the frontier in speaking of the future of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s official “vision” statement revalidates the concept, for example, stating that “as explorers, pioneers, and innovators, we boldly expand frontiers in air and space....” But at the end of the 20th century it may be time to abandon, or at least rethink, the frontier metaphor. The social, political, economic and cultural context of the U.S. civil space program has changed radically since the 1960s. NASA’s Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs were products of a geopolitical competition that is now, with the end of the Cold War, history. In the post-Cold War world, geoeconomic competition is a prevailing force. Thus, the rationale of national security no longer masks the aerospace industry’s relentless drive for profit. This profit motive threatens to undermine future space exploration efforts, by absorbing most of NASA’s budget into infrastructure projects. With profiteers landing contracts for multibillion- dollar launch systems and orbital facilities and talking of mining the asteroids and building on the moon, space advocates need to reexamine what the frontier metaphor means today. Dictionaries describe a frontier as a shifting or advancing zone that marks the limits of settlement and civilization. As historian Frederick Jackson Turner explained in his famous essay, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” a frontier is a physical and a psychological place, a sort of organizing principle. Patricia Nelson Limerick, a leading contemporary historian of the American West, has said that members of the space community should think more deeply about what they are saying as they exercise the frontier metaphor. “Too many advocates of space development, American history is a straight line, a vector of inevitability and manifest destiny linking the westward expansion of Anglo-Americans directly to the exploration and colonization of space.” By this model, space exploration is promoted as an escape from Earthly problems, colonization as a safety valve for social stresses. “ Space boosters promise a wide and open distribution of benefits,” says Limerick. But “in situations of colonization and settlements, occasions in which everyone gains and no one loses have been extremely rare.... Whether it occurs in terrestrial space or celestial space, expansion has been tough on the ideals and practices of democracy. Principle takes a beating and expediency triumphs....” (Proceedings, “What is the Value of Space Exploration?”, July 18- 19, 1994, Washington, D.C.) As Limerick explains and as Turner’s critics have argued, materialistic interests played a major role in driving U.S. westward expansion. And just as profit was a primary motive for conquering America’s Western frontier, profit is a primary motive for space exploration. Thus it is infrastructure development that consumes most of NASA’s budget; NASA’s most expensive endeavors are the international space station, the space shuttle, and the development of new launch vehicles are all multi-billion-dollar endeavors which fill up corporate coffers whether or not they ever fly. The U.S. aerospace industry lobbies hard to ensure that such programs survive and thrive. And, not coincidentally, salaries for chief executive officers and other top officials of U.S. Aerospace companies are obscenely large, and growing.

## Impact---Global Inequality

### Frontier mentality suppresses its violent and exploitative history and perpetuates massive inequity

Williamson 87 (Ray A, Research Professor of International Affairs and Space Policy in the Space Policy Institute of The George Washington University, “Outer Space as Frontier: Lessons for Today,” *Western Folklore*, Volume 46, No. 4, October 1987)

However, the analogy between conquering and settling North America and settling outer space, with its utopian overtones, is seriously flawed.9 As Stoeltje points out, the images of the frontier that space enthusiasts resort to bear little relationship to the actual experiences of life on the frontier.10 The picture they show is rather a construct of images rooted in the eastern seaboard: a deliberate attempt to conjure a positive, romantic, masculine image of life in the West. They convey none of the loneliness, the exploitation, or the risks actually experienced by settlers." Except to depict them as an enemy, these images virtually ignore the Native Americans who inhabited North America before European intrusion; suppressed too are the violence and struggle for domination characteristic of the west. Clothing their aspirations in the mythic garments of a romanticized frontier is a way of ignoring or pushing aside the possible negative aspects of the exploitation of space. For example, although in space there are no Indians and no plasmoid buffaloes to exploit, the only nations that can afford to make use of the potential material wealth in space are those that can now afford the enormous expense to reach them. It is likely that in exploiting space we shall continue the same imbalances of resources and material wealth we experience on Earth.

## Impact---Anthropocentrism

### Space exploration is anthropocentric—It ignores the inherent value of the cosmos

Daly and Frodeman, 08. (Erin Moore and Robert, Indiana University. "Separated at Birth, Signs of Rapprochement: Environmental Ethics and Space Exploration." Ethics & the Environment 13.1 (2008): 135-151. Project MUSE. Web. 21 Jan. 2011. <<http://muse.jhu.edu/>>. [TL]

To date, the discussion of natural places has turned on questions concerning intrinsic and instrumental values. Intrinsic values theorists claim that things have value for their own sake, in contrast to theories of instrumental value where things are good because they can be used to obtain something else of value (economic or otherwise). This debates tends tend to get caught up in attempts at extending the sphere of intrinsically valuable entities. Ethical extensionism depends on human definitions of moral considerability, which typically stem from some degree of identification with things outside us. This anthropocentric and geocentric environmental perspective shows cracks when we try to extend it to the cosmic environment. The few national or international policies currently in place that mention the environment of outer space (e.g. NASA’s planetary protection policy, United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space) consider the preservation of planetary bodies for science, human exploration, and possible future habitation, but there is not yet any policy that considers whether these anthropocentric priorities should supersede the preserva- tion of possible indigenous extraterrestrial life, or the environmental or geological integrity of the extraterrestrial environment.

### Space exploration disrupts the careful balance of space

Daly and Frodeman, 08. (Erin Moore and Robert, Indiana University. "Separated at Birth, Signs of Rapprochement: Environmental Ethics and Space Exploration." Ethics & the Environment 13.1 (2008): 135-151. Project MUSE. Web. 21 Jan. 2011. <<http://muse.jhu.edu/>>. [TL]

Martyn Fogg, on the other hand, notes that efforts to protect a barren environment are often misanthropic critiques of human nature emphasizing our capacity for evil, or sentimental illusions based on out- of-date ecology. He offers as an example the ecocentrist notion of ecological harmony—“that there exists an ideal balance in nature that is perfect, unchanging, and which nurtures and sustains” (Fogg 2000a, 209). Such a state is a cozy sentimentality, he claims. “Nature is...better regarded as a continuous state of flux dominated by chaos and disharmony” (ibid.). Fogg counters Alan Marshall’s argument that rocks exist in a state of ‘blissful satori’ by stating, “rocks don’t think, don’t act and don’t care. They cannot have values of their own” (ibid., 210). The question, however, of whether e.g., rocks have intrinsic value is different from whether they have values of their own. Abiotic nature can also have value through the relatedness of nature and natural objects to human beings. This value resides in the daily presence of humans in nature, humans as part of nature—something not (yet) true of the extra- terrestrial world. We may be confident that rocks do not think, or have values of their own. But humans can nonetheless value rocks for their own sake—they can be experienced as beautiful, sublime, or sacred. Metaphysical, aesthetic, and theological questions such as these must be included as we address issues of terraforming

## Alt – Astroenvironmentalism

### Astroenvironmentalism creates legal and ethical guidelines to reduce our exploitative, imperialist mindset and treat space as wilderness to be protected

Miller 1 [Ryder, editor of From Narnia to a Space Odyssey: The War of Ideas Between Arthur C. Clarke and C.S. Lewis and co-writer of San Francisco: A Natural History, “Astroenvironmentalism: The Case for Space Exploration As An Environmental Issue”, <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2d37b8cx>]

As I have outlined elsewhere (Miller, 1999), some of the concerns of astroenvironmentalism can include: Keeping the space surrounding the Earth clear of pollution, debris, and garbage. Efforts are necessary so we do not add to the reservoir of human waste and machinery left behind by space explorers. Such debris could cause damage to satellites and the space shuttles. Remembering and teaching the lessons learned from terrestrial conservation and preservation struggles of the past and applying them to the new frontier of space, that is, considering space and the celestial bodies pristine wildernesses that need to be protected rather than frontiers to conquer. Tracking and monitoring the environmental damage caused by the fuels used for space expeditions, that is, making space agencies adhere to the restrictions of environmental impact statements. In particular, it would be worthwhile to reduce the amount of plutonium that is being used in case of a mishap that would result in plutonium entering the atmosphere. Treating the Moon, Mars, Venus, and other planetary bodies as wildernesses that need to be protected, that is, arguing against the idea to "terraform" these celestial bodies. Terraforming introduces atmosphere-creating life into the barren celestial bodies in the effort to make these celestial bodies more amenable to human settlement. Terraforming is presently being explored despite the fact that we have not thoroughly explored these planets for indigenous life. Creating a set of ethical guidelines to protect the life that we encounter elsewhere, that is, study and protect rather than just study. The creation or re-publicizing of ethics applied to these concerns would be welcome. Creating safeguards to insure there is no contamination of celestial bodies, that is, safeguarding against the introduction of non-terrestrial life to and from celestial bodies. Non-indigenous life, whether it be Zebra mussels or microbes, under conditions where there are no controlling factors, can reproduce at exponential rates thereby changing the environment in the process. These changes can harm the organisms that were dependent upon the original environmental conditions. Counteracting the efforts of national and private agencies to terraform other planets. This idea to terraform is not just science fiction, and ecocritics can criticize science fiction writers who want terraforming to occur before a thorough search for life is conducted. This has been evident in Kim Stanley Robinson's award-winning science fiction trilogy Red Mars, Green Mars and Blue Mars, and recent films such as The Ghosts of Mars and Red Planet. Prohibiting national, international, and private agencies from owning property in space, in the interest of avoiding military conflicts. There is a need for more people to be involved in the efforts to see that space does not become another battleground. Creating the legal power to enforce these concerns. This would make more people aware of international space law and the need to enforce it. The United Nations rules on such issues through the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

### Embracing astroenvironmentalism abolishes exploitative practices on Earth proper and prevents ecological disaster of cosmic magnitude

Miller 1 [Ryder, editor of From Narnia to a Space Odyssey: The War of Ideas Between Arthur C. Clarke and C.S. Lewis and co-writer of San Francisco: A Natural History, “Astroenvironmentalism: The Case for Space Exploration As An Environmental Issue”, <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2d37b8cx>]

Over the years there have been many people who have been concerned with this issue, but they would not necessarily call themselves astroenvironmentalists. I put forth astroenvironmentalism as an argument that space should be considered an environmental issue and the term can function as an umbrella term for the related concerns. Astroenvironmentalism seems to fill a void, because there are no widely known organizations that focus on this issue. There is no widely known Mars First or Venus First organization arguing against terraforming. There is no Greenspace or Spacepeace. Most environmental groups are focused on more immediate issues and are more concerned with immediate and down-to- Earth issues. Leopold's Land Ethic, which focused on protecting life, is not easily applicable to the barren territories of space. But the argument of protecting space from exploitation is not solely about protecting rocks; it is also about making a statement about human behavior. If one succeeds in making the argument about protecting celestial bodies, we are also making the argument about protecting habitats here on earth. In Beyond Space Ship Earth: Environmental Ethics and the Solar System, probably the most thorough coverage of the subject, Hargrove (1986) writes that the only reason there are no people on the Moon or Mars is due to reduced NASA spending levels. "The attempts to apply environmental concepts to the Solar System represent a significant challenge for environmental ethics, since so far as we know at present the Solar System, except for Earth, is a collection of nonliving natural objects, the kind of entity that offers the greatest conceptual difficulties for environmental ethics." Hargrove warns, "If serious planning begins without adequate ethical and environmental input, then future NASA and associated industrial/commercial projects in the Solar System may simply produce a new environmental crisis that dwarfs our current one" (pp. x-xi). Hargrove argues that if we do nothing, the dark visions of science fiction could become true.

## Alt – Native Americans

### We should construct a new folktale of space that rejects the exploitative frontier myth and embrace inner understanding of our own nature

Young 87 (Jane M., professor at the University of New Mexico, “Parables of the Space Age: The Ideological Basis of Space Exploration,” *Western Folklore* Vol. 46, No 4, October 1987.)

Finally, my own essay explores aspects of folklore that are oppositional to the dominant myth of the frontier of outer space. For many Native Americans, the arguments for exploration and exploitation of outer space are parallel to the historic Euro-American settlement of the "unoccupied" lands of the "New World." The statement, "pity the Indians and buffalo of outer space," is a warning that the problems created by exploitation here on earth will be extended into outer space if we persist in justifying our behavior on the basis of the frontier analogy. We cannot escape from ourselves, not even by traveling to the moon. If, as both Farrer and Stoeltje suggest, we need a new mythology, perhaps we should look to the Native American view of the interrelationship of all aspects of the cosmos. It is a view that decries destructive exploitation, emphasizing instead inner-directed experience, the metaphysical over the physical, appreciation and respect. The real challenge we face, then, is that of understanding ourselves, understanding the beliefs that shape our actions. Simply put, our understanding of outer space is shaped by our understanding, or lack thereof, of our own nature.16

# Affirmative

## Frontier Imagery Good---Space Exploration

### Their alternative can never access the case---space nationalism is key to effective space exploration

Sadeh et. al., ’98 – (professors at CEISS, Colorado State [[E. Sadeh](http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/science?_ob=RedirectURL&_method=outwardLink&_partnerName=27983&_origin=article&_zone=art_page&_linkType=scopusAuthorDocuments&_targetURL=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scopus.com%2Fscopus%2Finward%2Fauthor.url%3FpartnerID%3D10%26rel%3D3.0.0%26sortField%3Dcited%26sortOrder%3Dasc%26author%3DSadeh,%2520E.%26authorID%3D6603044842%26md5%3Dc4129a930e9af495c196253eda4d7c20&_acct=C000007678&_version=1&_userid=99318&md5=2b40b1be48fae7ebacb7990d9e15d192), [James P. Lester](http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/science?_ob=RedirectURL&_method=outwardLink&_partnerName=27983&_origin=article&_zone=art_page&_linkType=scopusAuthorDocuments&_targetURL=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scopus.com%2Fscopus%2Finward%2Fauthor.url%3FpartnerID%3D10%26rel%3D3.0.0%26sortField%3Dcited%26sortOrder%3Dasc%26author%3DLester,%2520J.%2520P.%26authorID%3D7202753646%26md5%3D139538a6ef5c7e5d9cab4b5af9975081&_acct=C000007678&_version=1&_userid=99318&md5=529fbf6c881a748a84f68ced6816a68b), and [W. Z. Sadeh](http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/science?_ob=RedirectURL&_method=outwardLink&_partnerName=27983&_origin=article&_zone=art_page&_linkType=scopusAuthorDocuments&_targetURL=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.scopus.com%2Fscopus%2Finward%2Fauthor.url%3FpartnerID%3D10%26rel%3D3.0.0%26sortField%3Dcited%26sortOrder%3Dasc%26author%3DSadeh,%2520W.%2520Z.%26authorID%3D7003642062%26md5%3D702a184c09093e433957a64a808bc0e8&_acct=C000007678&_version=1&_userid=99318&md5=ccebf171139f75ea9c4ddbc50f486508), professors at the Center for Engineering Infrastructure and Sciences in Space at Colorado State University; “Modeling international cooperation in human space exploration for the twenty-first century;” published in [Acta Astronautica](http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/science/journal/00945765), [Volume 43, Issues 7-8](http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/science?_ob=PublicationURL&_tockey=%23TOC%235679%231998%23999569992%23255099%23FLA%23&_cdi=5679&_pubType=J&view=c&_auth=y&_acct=C000007678&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=99318&md5=f4391b98e38c73e008e2b59599f9b394), October 1998, Pages 427-435; Jay] )

The pessimistic scenario is characterized by political and economic divisions. International cooperation (when and if it exists) is structured and dominated politically and economically by a powerful state (e.g., U.S.) *vis-à-vis* weaker states based on power asymmetries. This scenario envisions regional polarization politically and economically between the U.S.–Canada, European Community, Russia–Eastern Europe, Japan–Southeast Asia and China. Cooperation is dependent upon the structure of interstate power whereupon states compare the political costs of cooperation (reduced national autonomy) with the pragmatic benefits (economic and technological augmentation). In this scenario, science and technological variables are secondary to the more salient political and economic concerns. States are the dominant and exclusive political actor. The values on initial condition dynamics include asymmetric power patterns, national interests, coordination and augmentation policy preferences and minimum knowledge patterns. Four trends and events are identified that discern the pessimistic from the optimistic scenario: (1) enhanced importance of science and technology relative to politics and economics; (2) economic interdependencies between states to an extent that no one individual state possesses the financial wherewithal to independently develop large-scale human space exploration endeavors; (3) emergence of dramatic political events that shift state interests and policy preferences that are more conducive for cooperation; and (4) development of enabling technologies that reduces space mission costs to a level that matches the current trends in state funding for space. The greater the likelihood of occurrence of these factors, the less probable the pessimistic scenario. Thus, the probability of occurrence of the pessimistic scenario is very high if all factors are not present; high if only one factor is present; 50–50 if two factors are present; low if three factors are present; and zero if all four factors are present. The probability of each model emerging as the determinative political process is assessed and shown in [Table 4](http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/science/article/pii/S0094576597001951#tbl4). Probable cooperative dynamics are limited to structural conditioning and convergence of norms. Structural conditioning implies that a powerful state and respective national space agency (e.g. U.S. and NASA) exploit power asymmetries to realize first and foremost their desired interests and policy preferences. Convergence of norms becomes possible if states emphasize the normative symbolic aspect of space exploration. In this case, symbolism rooted in national identity and international leadership and prestige is what provides the political will for space exploration. If other states reach the same conclusion, then cooperation becomes one vehicle for advancing these symbolic attributes. The pessimistic scenario of international cooperation is reinforced by the various reports that have been published regarding the future of the U.S. civilian space program[2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. These reports take the position that international cooperation is of secondary importance. Future space program scenarios are conceived in primarily nationalistic terms whereby cooperation with other states is not fundamental to either program design or execution. For example, the space exploration initiative (SEI) was justified on a number of rationale factors—exploration ethos, national prestige, advancing science education, developing technologies, commercializing space and strengthening the U.S. economy—of which international cooperation was not included[6]. The Ride Report[3] provides a systematic analysis of the U.S. civilian space program to show how the U.S. has lost its leadership position in space especially as it relates to maintaining a human presence there. To this end, a space strategic development plan for the 21st century is developed based on restoring U.S. leadership status. This requires that the U.S. have capabilities that enable it to act independently and impressively when and where it chooses. In the NASA Strategic Plan[9] , international cooperation is not considered crucial in realizing four space strategic enterprises (Human Exploration and Development of Space (HEDS), Space Sciences, Earth Sciences, and Aeronautics and Space Transportation Technology). The strategic plan focuses on developing these enterprises to meet the goals of various governmental (President and Congress) and domestic public constituencies with the ultimate benefactors being policy makers, science communities, aeronautics industry, other governmental agencies, public sector and academic communities all within the U.S. Although, cooperation does emerge as part of the HEDS enterprise (e.g., ISS), it is viewed as an inevitable outcome of the current state of international relations that must be exploited to advance U.S. interests and policy preferences in space exploration.

## Perm---Environment

### Discursive mechanisms and pragmatic options together are key to understanding the inherent problems in space policy

Daly and Frodeman, 08. (Erin Moore and Robert, Indiana University. "Separated at Birth, Signs of Rapprochement: Environmental Ethics and Space Exploration." Ethics & the Environment 13.1 (2008): 135-151. Project MUSE. Web. 21 Jan. 2011. <<http://muse.jhu.edu/>>. [TL]

Revolutions in philosophic understanding and cultural worldviews inevitably accompany revolutions in science. As we expand our exploration of the heavens, we will also reflect on the broader human implications of advances in space. Moreover, our appreciation of human impact on Earth systems will expand as we come to see the Earth within the context of the solar system. Most fundamentally, we need to anticipate and wrestle with the epistemological, metaphysical, and theological dimensions of space exploration, including the possibility of extraterrestrial life and the development of the space environment, as it pertains to our common understanding of the universe and of ourselves. Such reflection should be performed by philosophers, metaphysicians, and theologians in regular conversation with the scientists who investigate space and the policy makers that direct the space program. The exploration of the universe is no experimental science, contained and controlled in a laboratory, but takes place in a vast and dynamic network of interconnected, interdependent realities. If (environmental) philosophy is to be a significant source of insight, philosophers will need to have a much broader range of effective strategies for interdisciplinary collaborations, framing their reflections with the goal of achieving policy-relevant results. If it is necessary for science and policy-makers to heed the advice of philosophers, it is equally necessary for philosophers to speak in con- crete terms about real-world problems. A philosophic questioning about the relatedness of humans and the universe, in collaboration with a pragmatic, interdisciplinary approach to environmental problems, is the most responsible means of developing both the science and policy for the exploration of the final frontier.

## Turn---Space Frontier Imagery Good

### The space frontier provides education, opportunity, and freedom.

GRAY 1999 (D.M., president of Frontier Historical Consultants “Space as a frontier - the role of human motivation,” Space Policy, August [TL]).

Frontiers have an intrinsic appeal not only to nations and investors, but to individuals as well. Daniel Boone sought the solace of solitude of the wilderness. The Pilgrims were only the first of many groups to escape religious constraints by moving to the American frontier to set up utopian communities. Talented young men eager to prove their worth, tended to enter into frontiers to make a name for themselves. Others, with dubious pasts, escaped to the frontier so that they could start life anew with a clean slate. The reasons for individuals to participate in frontiers are many, but in their basic forms they can be listed as: freedom, opportunity and adventure. The call of the frontier brings meaning and challenge to personal lives. It inspires. The chance to live and work in space is a motivator that has inspired students for four decades. Homer Hickam in the autobiographical movie October Sky found a way out of a dying West Virginia coal town by following his rocketry interests. Ultimately, he was able to attend college and work for NASA as an engineer. The motivator is not exclusively American, Franklin Chang-Diaz who grew up in Costa Rica followed his dreams to the USA to graduate from MIT and become an astronaut. He has to date flown on six Shuttle missions. While space is associated with the sciences, it has a place in the dreams and goals of the common man. In the 22–26 March 1999, ‘March Storm’ lobbying effort of ProSpace, many of the participants came from more ordinary walks of life. One participant, Brian Miller of Ohio, is a young father who never got a chance to go to space. He became involved with the ProSpace lobbying effort so that there will be opportunities in space when his son grows up. He is not alone. In a recent American poll, 74% of those interviewed stated that space technology and research should be used for educational purposes in the classroom [5]. Spaceweek, an international organization, has dedicated the first full week of March 1999 to promote space in the classroom and in the community (www.spaceweek.org). Historic frontiers required the physical presence of participants on the societal/wilderness interface. Gold seekers trekked across the American continent or sailed around South America to take part in the California Gold Rush. Homesteaders sold their holdings and loaded up their possessions in ox-pulled wagons to travel to the Oregon land-rush. Until recently, participation in technological frontiers required personal presence at laboratories and manufacturing plants. However, with the advent of telecommunications and the Internet, virtual presence has increasingly allowed a greater freedom in where frontier activities can be conducted.

### **Nationalistic expansion into space empowers new freedoms—There’s no population to degrade**

GRAY 1999 (D.M., president of Frontier Historical Consultants “Space as a frontier - the role of human motivation,” Space Policy, August [TL]).

However, nationalistic expansion is given a more constructive venue when it is presented with a true wilderness in which it can grow. In the 20th century, physical frontiers were replaced by technological frontiers that provided arenas of expansionist opportunity with no native populations. The Wright Brothers, Henry Ford, Einstein, Yager, Glenn, Jobs and Gates became the new American folk heroes. They personified the expansion of the frontiers of technology and science. Instead of subjugating or pushing peoples aside, these technological frontiers tended to empower and provide new freedoms. The common man learned to put aside old ways of doing things and embrace new technologies. In 20th century America, the ideology of “Manifest Destiny” came to be replaced with ‘You can't stand in the way of progress!'. Nationalistic goals motivated President Kennedy to declare during a speech at Rice University on September 12, 1962, ‘I believe this nation should commit itself, before this decade is out, to landing a man on the moon and return him safely to the earth'. The speech resulted in the spear thrust of Apollo that proved the USA's superiority over the Soviet technological machine. On Sunday, 20 July 1969, America's sphere of influence extended to the lunar surface as Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin planted the American flag on the Sea of Tranquillity. Having proved its superiority, America could be magnanimous in victory with the symbolic handshake of Apollo–Soyuz. Since America's retreat from the successes of Apollo, nationalistic interests in space have become less clear. The USA began to quietly concentrate on orbiting satellites. Military and security organizations in the government viewed space as the most practical means of providing information they deemed necessary to maintain national security.

## Impact Turn---Globalization Good

### Globalizaiton removes cultural barriers that warrant conflict

Rothkopf 97 (David, “In Praise of Cultural Imperialism?”, Foreign Policy no. 107 (Summer 1997) pg 38-53, JSTOR, [TL])

The gates of the world are groaning shut From marble balconies and over the airwaves demagogues decry new risks to ancient cultures and traditional values. Satellites, the Internet, and jumbo jets carry the contagion. To many people, "foreign" has become a synonym for "danger." Of course, now is not the first time in history that chants and anthems of nationalism have been heard. But the tide of nationalism sweeping the world today is unique. For it comes in reaction to a countervailing global alternative that-for the first time in history-is clearly something more than the crackpot dream of visionaries. It is also the first time in history that virtually every individual at every level of society can sense the impact of international changes. They can see and hear it in their media, taste it in their food, and sense it in the products that they buy. Even more visceral and threatening to those who fear these changes is the growth of a global labor pool that during the next decade will absorb nearly 2 billion workers from emerging markets, a pool that currently includes close to 1 billion unemployed and underemployed workers in those markets alone. These people will be working for a fraction of what their counterparts in developed nations earn and will be only marginally less productive. You are either someone who is threatened by this change or someone who will profit from it, but it is almost impossible to conceive of a significant group that will remain untouched by it. Globalization has economic roots and political consequences, but it also has brought into focus the power of culture in this global environment-the power to bind and to divide in a time when the tensions between integration and separation tug at every issue that is relevant to international relations. The impact of globalization on culture and the impact of culture on globalization merit discussion. The homogenizing influences of globalization that are most often condemned by the new nationalists and by cultural romanticists are actually positive; globalization promotes integration and the removal not only of cultural barriers but of many of the negative dimensions of culture. Globalization is a vital step toward both a more stable world and better lives for the people in it.